

NOTICE OF MEETING

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Monday, 24th June, 2024, 7.30 pm - George Meehan House, 294 High Road, N22 8JZ (watch the live meeting [here](#), watch the recording [here](#))

Councillors: Matt White (Chair), Alexandra Worrell, Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Makbule Gunes and Lester Buxton

Quorum: 3

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Please note that this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Although we ask members of the public recording, filming or reporting on the meeting not to include the public seating areas, members of the public attending the meeting should be aware that we cannot guarantee that they will not be filmed or recorded by others attending the meeting. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on.

By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.

The chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence

3. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business. (Late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with at item 11 below).

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:

- (i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and
- (ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.

A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Register of Members' Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.

Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Part 4, Section B, paragraph 29 of the Council's constitution.

6. NOTES FROM THE MEETING OF 13TH JUNE 2024

To agree the notes from the informal meeting OSC on 13th June which was inquorate. N.B. The decisions that were due to be taken by the Committee on 13th June, as set out in the agenda papers for that meeting, will need to be formally ratified by the OSC at this meeting.

To follow.

7. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 24)

To agree the minutes of the meetings of 9th January 2024, 1st February 2024 and 11th March 2024, as a correct record.

8. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS (PAGES 25 - 66)

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

- Housing, Planning & Development Scrutiny Panel – 13th March 2024
- Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel – 22nd February 2024
- Climate, Community Safety & Culture Scrutiny Panel – 27th February 2024
- Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel – 5th March

9. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE (PAGES 67 - 106)

To agree the Membership and Terms of reference for Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the four Scrutiny Panels.

10. OSC WORK PROGRAMME (PAGES 107 - 120)

To agree the overall approach for developing a work programme, and suggest agenda items for upcoming meetings.

11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

12. FUTURE MEETINGS

- 23 July 2024
- 14 October 2024
- 25 November 2024
- 12 December 2024 (Budget – CSE).
- 20 January 2025 (Budget)
- 27 March 2025

Philip Slawther, Principal Scrutiny Officer
Tel – 020 8489 2957
Fax – 020 8881 5218
Email: philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

Fiona Alderman
Head of Legal & Governance (Monitoring Officer)
George Meehan House, 294 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8JZ

Friday, 14 June 2024

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE Overview and Scrutiny Committee MEETING HELD ON Tuesday, 9th January, 2024, 7:00PM – 10:00PM

PRESENT:

Councillors: Matt White, Pippa Connor, Simmons-Safo, Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Makbule Gunes, Matt White (Chair) and Alexandra Worrell.

ALSO ATTENDING:

Yvonne Denny

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to item one on the agenda in respect of filming at the meeting and Members noted the information contained therein.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

None

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting on 27th November were agreed as a correct record.

7. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS

RESOLVED

The minutes of the following Scrutiny Panels were received and noted and any recommendations contained within were approved:

- Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel – 16th November 2023.
- Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel – 13th November 2023.
- Climate, Community Safety & Culture Scrutiny Panel – 6th November 2023.
- Housing, Planning & Development Scrutiny Panel – 14th November 2023.

8. SCRUTINY OF THE 2024/25 DRAFT BUDGET / 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2024/25 - 2028/29)

The Committee received a report which set out the draft General Fund (GF) Budget for 2024/25; the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2024/29; the draft HRA Budget 2024/25 and its draft Business Plan including estimated income (funding) and expenditure adjustments, as well as the draft capital programmes for both funds.

The Vice Chair for this Committee highlighted that this meeting would focus on all other areas of the Council that had not been scrutinised through the panels, which included Culture, Strategy & Engagement, Resident experience, Corporate, Legal & Governance and Finance.

The report was introduced by Frances Palopoli, Head of Corporate Financial Strategy & Monitoring as set out in the agenda pack at pages 51-130.

The following was raised in the discussion of this item:

- a) Forecasts outlined an overspend of £3.6m for this financial year and this was predominantly due to inflation and the current level of interest rates.
- b) The Committee sought clarification around whether fixed interest rates at the time of borrowing was reflected in the overspend figures presented in the report. The Committee was advised that the increase in interest rates that had occurred was a result of refinancing and new borrowings and did not incur from existing borrowings made in the previous years.
- c) In response to a question regarding the ongoing issue of agency staffing, the Committee noted that this issue had been ongoing for a while despite efforts to reduce the number of agency staff being employed. Reducing the number of agency staff had been challenging as there were pressures on certain areas where it had been difficult to recruit full time staff into certain roles. In order to tackle this issue, all Directors had been tasked to produce data on the number of agency staff and a possible end date for each worker. In addition, a quarterly meeting was held with the Directors to discuss this further and to ensure that Directors were actively working to encourage the reduction of agency staffing. The Committee noted that these quarterly meetings had been successful as the number of agency staff had reduced substantially.
- d) The Committee was advised that in the Community Safety service, there was an underspend of around £29,000 in salaries budget for vacancies. In the ASB Enforcement team, there was an underspend of around £76,000 in relation to vacancies that were being held within the service. The majority of the underspend related to the actual Waste Management Client and Contract budget which was under spending by £430,000 and the main component of

that was from the rebate that the Council would get from Veolia in relation to pensions contribution.

- e) The Committee sought clarification regarding pressures within Digital Services. Officers advised that the main pressures were around IT contracts as many of the contracts were priced in other currencies, such as dollars and as a result the exchange rates were high. General inflation was also a contributing factor. Another pressure within Digital Services was around organisational changes. The cost of running the business had increased as there was a need to insource licences and additional hardware to support the service. However, the service aimed to make purchases in the most cost effective way and also ensured that any equipment purchased would be beneficial for the whole organisation. In addition, the service also aimed to reuse products rather than making new purchases. Officers added that the service purchased the new Microsoft E5, which was the latest version of Microsoft 365, to increase cyber security which enabled the service to terminate contracts for a number of standalone cyber security products.
- f) In response to a follow up question, the Committee noted that contracts were monitored closely within the service by the Contracts Management team. The team kept a track of all contracts on a spreadsheet to monitor costs and ensure appropriate negotiations were made.
- g) In response to another follow up question, the Committee noted that investing in digital products would help save money in other areas of the business as better systems meant that processes would work more efficiently and smoothly. In addition, smaller programmes could also be eliminated and unnecessary costs could be reduced. In summary, there may be an increase in cost in one area, but there would also be a reduction in other budgets, as well as savings in other areas.
- h) The Committee queried about the breakdown of figures on contract inflation and exchange rate and pressures. Officers advised that inflation rates had been very unpredictable and rough figures could be provided to the panel **(ACTION)**.
- i) The Committee queried about funds provided for the maintenance of Chestnut Park to manage flooding. Officers confirmed that the funding was from the GLA for a flood levitation scheme to deal with flooding risk to 98 properties downstream, as well as some of the flooding issues in Chestnut Park. It was confirmed that this issue was presented to the Planning Sub-Committee just before Christmas, where the Committee granted the planning permission. However, there were problems with the proposal, including a petition of over 1000 individuals who were against this scheme, which included Friends of Chestnut Park. The Committee noted that all options were being reviewed and a further meeting with the GLA would be held to review the situation and if possible, explore alternative options to repurpose the funding provided. However, this would be challenging as the funding would have to be spent during this financial year otherwise there would be a risk of losing the funds.
- j) In response to a question from the Committee, Officers advised that management actions were taken to reduce expenditure and manage pressures on a day to day basis within the Waste Management Service. In terms of green waste, garden waste was being collected depending on the capacity of the waste trucks and the collection rounds would need to be reconfigured to ensure maximum capacity. In terms of bulky waste, the current charge for

collection was at £20 for four items. In order to achieve an annual target of £400,000, there would need to be around 20,000 sales a year. Currently, the maximum capacity with the current number of staff and the size of the truck could only generate a maximum of £12,000 sales a year. The Committee received reassurance that the baseline structure for this would be revised and reconfigured to ensure annual targets were achievable.

- k) The Committee sought for clarification on a statement in section 6.2 *“The Budget Proposal include for growth of c£1m to meet the cost in the new leisure service provision and other minor changes”*. The Committee queried if this was capital or revenue growth. Officers confirmed that the c£1m was revenue growth and it related to the additional resources required to operate the insourcing of the service, including the need of additional IT resources.
- l) A follow up question was raised by the Committee. The Committee queried that of that £1m revenue growth, what portion of that would be allocated to paying staff. Officers were unable to provide accurate figures and advised the Committee that this information would be provided to the Committee at a later stage. **(ACTION)**
- m) In response to a question, the Committee noted that the pre-agreed growth that was presented in the previous MTFS covered a growth for pension increases. It was noted that every three years there would be a revaluation of the pensions fund and advice would be provided on whether to increase the amount of employer contribution or whether this needs to be reduced. Furthermore, there was also additional revenue to fund for the North London Waste Authority and the Capital Programme.
- n) The Committee noted that in terms of corporate growth, this included reduction in the concessionary fares that would be charged from the GLA and London Councils. There was also a small growth for the apprenticeship levy. Furthermore, as part of the financial planning process, all existing savings plans were reviewed and challenged robustly to ensure that they could still be met as agreed, if not, this may be re-profiled or even written-off.
- o) The table on page 56 of the report indicated - £35,000 for the year 2025/26 under Environment & Resident Experience, the Committee sought clarification on what this figure related to. Finance Officers were unable to provide details on this and advised information would be provided ahead of the next Committee meeting. **(ACTION)**
- p) The Committee also raised questions around the figures presented on table 7.3, Summary Revenue Budget position 2023 – 2029 and whether the figures highlighted in red under *“Further savings to be identified”* were forecasted accurately. Officers advised this was the position in the draft report. Further work would be completed on this report and the figures on the full report due for the 6th of February would be significantly reduced.

The following was raised in the discussion of the MTFS Savings Tracker – Q2 2023/24:

- a) The Committee queried about the RAG status for certain saving proposals in the MTFS Savings Tracker. In terms of *‘Events Income Increases’* this was RAG rated as green for 2022/23, however the future prospect was RAG rated as amber. The Committee questioned whether there had been some

uncertainty around this for the future years. Officers advised that the rating was set to amber as there had been no fixed plans in terms of where the income would come from. In terms of *'Additional sites for on street digital advertising & Out of home advertising income generation'* Officers advised that this was RAG rated as amber for 2024-2028 as some of the projects and proposals around this had not yet been approved

- b) In response to a question raised regarding Single Person Discount, the Committee was advised that a single person household was eligible to a 25% reduction on their yearly Council Tax bill. The Council was working to identify households which consisted of more than one adults and had been claiming for the Single Person Discount. In order to tackle this issue, the Council had procured an advanced IT system which would filter out households with more than one liable adult living in the property. A letter would then be sent to the resident to ensure details were updated accordingly to assess whether they were still eligible for this discount. The Committee noted that this savings proposal was RAG rated as amber as the system had only just been introduced and had gone live in November 2023. Officers added that a softer approach was applied to allow residents more time to make contact and get back with a response.
- c) In relation to the savings proposal on fleet, officers advised that the fleet had been split between two directorates including Environment and Resident Experience and Placemaking and Housing. There had been discussions around bringing the fleet management service into one directorate, which would be Placemaking and Housing. As the transfer was currently under progress and the saving identified of £50,000 for this financial year had not been achieved, this had been RAG rated as red.
- d) In response from a question regarding recovering full cost of match day cleansing, the Committee noted that there were negotiations made with Spurs regarding LAMP contributions for match day cleansing and this was progressing. There were no other further updates regarding this.
- e) In response to a question, the Committee noted that front line services would not be affected during the budget setting process. There would still be an element of face to face contact for people who were front line workers. The idea was to assess and incorporate digitalisation where possible so people within the service could invest their time and resources in other tasks which would contribute to improving the service.
- f) In response to a follow up question relating to digital poverty, Cabinet member informed the Committee that the Council would be embarking on a Digital Inclusion Strategy this year, this would in the long run save money if people were able to do things digitally. The Cabinet member added that this would support people who were digitally excluded, particularly for young children who do not have access to educational resources online.

The following was raised in the discussion of the New Revenue Growth Proposals:

- a) The table outlined the list of growth that had been proposed to be put forward for the coming years. The Committee sought for clarification of the acronyms on the table. It was noted that L&G was Legal & Governance, CORP was Corporate, ERE was Environment & Resident Experience and SCE was Culture, Strategy & Engagement.

- b) The Committee queried about the additional Principal Scrutiny Officer role as outlined on the table. In response to this question, the Committee was advised that this was a part funded position in the Scrutiny Team and later changed to a full time position due to growth within the service.
- c) In response to a question raised by the Committee, Officers advised that the total figures on the table were all to be assumed as ongoing growth in the budget. Further to this, the Cabinet Member added that growth predictions were difficult to make, but this would be the best forecast that could be provided, based on the Councils current position.
- d) In relation to the various cost pressures including the implications of the National 'Big Switch off', it was noted that this was an ongoing issue with additional cost to the Council. The Big Switch Off refers to the gradual phasing out of BT's ISDN (Integrated Services Digital Network) and Public Switch Telephone Network (PSTN). Concerns around this switch was raised around how the Council would manage an emergency arrangements, including lifts and sheltered accommodation. Officers added that alternative options would have to be considered and implemented.

The following was raised in the discussion of the New Revenue Savings Proposals:

- a) The Committee sought clarification on how the different spending and savings were being recorded in regard to staff employment. In response to this, officers advised that the costs shown was a part-cost in the first year and in the subsequent year, the cost of the post would be offset and would include savings. It was noted that in the final budgets, there would be further proposals to look at income generation regarding this because the cost of a post was across two financial years and the savings would be delivered in the second year.
- b) The Committee noted that fixed penalty notices would generate additional income.
- c) In terms of fly-tipping, the Committee was advised that data had showed that around 1600 people had been fined for fly-tipping and around 7-10 people were being taken to court every month. Evidence by Defra had indicated that fly-tipping had been increasing across the country for the last 10 years. To tackle this issue, the Council had proposed to seek support from a private company for extra resource of people that would be able to go out and fine people for fly-tipping and littering. It was also noted that the charges would be on a commission basis and would not cost the Council anything as an initial outlay. The fines would be split between the private company and the Council. The anticipated percentage rate was 35% to the company and 65% to the Council. Furthermore, the Committee was advised that with this additional support, the Council would see an extra growth of £100,000 of income based on these percentages.
- d) In response to a follow up question, the Committee was advised that if we were to bring this project in-house and employ additional staff, the Council would have to pay the employee recruited for this role. However, for the support from the private sector, no salary would have to be paid and their payment would solely be commission based, preventing any losses from the Council. It was also noted that the additional support from the private sector

would not be replacing the current in-house team, it would be an enhancement to the current in-house team.

- e) The Committee requested for further details on what the comparable savings would be if this project were insourced compared to being outsourced. **(ACTION)**

The following was raised in the discussion of the Draft Capital Programme:

- a) The Committee sought clarification on the figures presented on the table for the Corporate Laptop Refresh Scheme. Officers advised that the costs included an additional assessment on what would need to be funded. It was noted that the Council purchased laptops and had run out of supply, so there was a need to fund for laptop renewals.
- b) Cabinet Member added that, Officers across organisations had been looking at cost effective approaches and reviewing the type of laptop provided by IT to ensure that the specification of the laptop was most suited for each job role. In addition, a new smaller laptop was being tested to assess whether there were cheaper alternatives available for a replacement. However, this would be a rolling programme as the organisation was growing and laptops would need to be renewed or replaced.

RESOLVED

That the following recommendations were noted and agreed:

Recommendation 1 - 2024/25 Budget Position

Details to be provided on the part of the underspend relating to “curtailing uncommitted maintenance and improvement works” (page 52 of agenda pack). (Request for Information).

Recommendation 2 - 2023/24 Outturn Position & 2024/25 Budget Position

Noting the particular budget pressures relating to Digital and IT services and that this was exacerbated by the higher levels of insourced services in recent years, the Panel recommended that all knock-on costs associated with insourcing should be budgeted for over the longer-term at the time when that decision is made.

Recommendation 3 – 2023/24 Outturn Position & 2024/25 Budget Position

Noting that the budget pressures relating to Digital and IT services also included factors such as the exchange rate, general inflation, licences/contracts and hardware (in addition to insourcing costs as above), the Panel requested a breakdown of these costs. (Request for Information).

Recommendation 4 – Management Actions page 56 of agenda pack.

The Committee noted that under Environment & Resident Experience for 2025/26, there was an overspend of £35k predicted and requested details on the reason for this. (Request for Information).

Recommendation 5 – Savings Tracker PL20/9 - Full cost recovery of matchday cleansing service.

The Committee considered the use of Council taxpayers funds to meet the costs of matchday cleansing services to be unacceptable and recommended that the Council continues to urgent pursue negotiations with Tottenham Hotspur Football Club to secure full cost recovery of all matchday cleansing service, including recovery of funds retrospectively for costs incurred in previous years since the opening of the new stadium.

Recommendation 6 – Savings Tracker: Digital Together

The Committee noted that this proposal involved a substantive sum of money but that over 90% of the savings in 2023/24 had not yet been achieved. The Committee further noted that the savings needed to be achieved on a cross-cutting basis with all service departments adopting more efficient systems and processes. The Committee recommended that the Cabinet explain how each service department will be engaging with this proposal in order to achieve the savings over the MTFS period.

Recommendation 7 – EN SAV 004 – Event Income Increases

The Committee requested further details on how these savings would be achieved and clarification on the reasons for the variation in the savings target in each of the years over the MTFS period and whether these targets were realistic and achievable. (Request for Information).

Recommendation 8 – New Revenue Growth Proposals: Growth of £946k for the delivery of the Leisure Management Service in-house.

The Committee requested a breakdown of the expected extra costs. (Request for Information).

Recommendation 9 – EN24 SAV 003. New Revenue Savings Proposals - Enhance enforcement on environmental crime.

The Committee requested that details be provided of the estimated cost of hiring more permanent staff to enhance enforcement action compared to the proposed approach of entering into a partnership with a private contractor to carry out the additional enforcement action. (Request for Information).

Recommendation 10 – Capital Programme: 336 – New River.

The Committee requested further explanation of the self-financing of this scheme. (Request for Information).

Recommendation 11 – Capital Programme: 401 – Tottenham Hale Green Space

Noting that there were considerable S106 contributions for this area following large scale development, the Committee requested details on what proportion of Haringey Council funding and S106 funding was being used to support this mixed-funded programme of green space improvements. (Request for Information).

Recommendation 12 – Capital Programme: 457 – Future High Street Project

The Committee requested details on what proportion of Haringey Council funding and developer/S106 funding was being used to support this mixed-funded programme of infrastructure improvements. (Request for Information).

Recommendation 13 – Capital Programme: 657 – Corporate Laptop Refresh

Further details to be provided on the reasons for the significantly increased costs for this scheme. (Request for Information).

9. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

10. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the work programme report

11. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- 18th Jan 2024 (7pm)
- 1st Feb 2024 (7pm)
- 11th Mar 2024 (7pm)

CHAIR: Councillor Matt White

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE Overview and Scrutiny Committee MEETING HELD ON Thursday, 1st February, 2024, 7:00PM – 10:20PM

PRESENT:

Councillors: Pippa Connor, Matt White, Alexandra Worrell, Simmons-Safo, Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Makbule Gunes and Matt White (Chair)

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to item one on the agenda in respect of filming at the meeting and Members noted the information contained therein.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence received from Lourdes Keever and Yvonne Denny.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

None

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None

6. OUTSTANDING RESPONSES TO SCRUTINY QUERIES AND BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE 18TH JANUARY OSC MEETING

The Committee was presented with a table outlining the Outstanding Requests for Information on the MTFs/ Budget Scrutiny Proposals.

The following was noted in discussion around the Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Corporate, CS&E and E&RE):

- In response to a question from the Committee in relation to the budget position regarding Community Safety, Waste & Enforcement, Officers advised that the underspend predominantly related to an underspend in maintenance and there was a small element of the underspend in staffing.
- The Committee sought assurances around possible impact on services by the underspend in CCTV. The Committee was advised that the service was prioritising the use of CCTV in areas that most require it. The suspension in the

maintenance programme would have minimal impact as the current coverage in CCTV would be enhanced to cover a wider area.

- In relation to the response provided for the Outturn Position & 2024/25 Budget Position regarding Culture, Strategy & Engagement, The Committee recommended that colleagues in Strategic Procurement, Finance and Digital services should meet with members to provide a more informed briefing as to how contracts were managed across the Council; of which digital services have approximately 300 contracts. This should be discussed during an Overview & Scrutiny meeting.
- In regard to the Management Actions (page 56 of agenda pack) table 7.2c, the Committee noted that under Environment & Resident Experience for 2025/26, there was an overspend of £35k predicted. Officers advised that it was not unusual to see minus figures in tables as sometimes you would see a financial benefit that were greater in year one than in year two and thus would not necessarily constitute as an overspend. However, in relation to the overspend of £35k, this was not substantiated and the Committee recommended that this would need to be clarified when presented to the Cabinet. The Committee also suggested that if this could not be substantiated, this line in the report must be removed from the pack.
- The Committee sought assurances around the events income increases. The Committee had requested further details on how these savings would be achieved and clarification on the reasons for the variation in the savings target in each of the years over the MTFS period, and whether these targets were realistic and achievable. The response on the table stated that the figure of £124k shown in column N does not appear to be correct and the Committee queried why this was continuing on the tracker and the Cabinet papers. Officers advised that they would be reviewing this to confirm if the figure of £124k was correct and if not, then this would need to be removed from the papers.
- The Committee noted that there was a growth of £946k for the delivery of the Leisure Management Service in-house and in response to a follow up question, Officers advised that the decision to insource two and a half leisure centres meant that the Council was able to join up the provision into a wellbeing strategy to improve the health of the residents in Haringey. As a result, there was a reduction in cost in the Adults Social Care Budget. Officers added that the leisure centres themselves should not be seen in isolation and the benefit gained by bringing the leisure services together within a leisure and wellbeing strategy across the borough would outweigh any additional cost. The aim was to look into preventative costs and methods that would reduce costs in the future.
- To follow up, the Committee queried about transparency on how the revenue impacts of decisions were being shown. The Committee was advised that the positive effects on people's health would be reflected in other areas of the Council and the Committee sought assurances on how the Council was accounting for that. The Committee asked that when budgets were scrutinised, would there be transparency of the revenue impacts of the decisions that were being made as the figures presented on the report suggest that there would be a cost of around £1 million a year. In response to this, Officers advised that the

cabinet report at the time reviewed the assessments of the ramifications of the decisions to insource and had also gone through the risks and benefits associated. At the time the decision was made, it was recognised that there would be additional costs that would be incurred and would need to be built into the budget, this was what gave the rise to the £900,000 being discussed. Officers advised the Committee that when constructing a budget, it can be difficult as officers can only include figures that they were confident about and data that can be quantified. In addition, the budget would also need to factor in pressures in growth within services and the authority would need to respond to the demand.

- The Committee noted the response on the table in regard to the enhanced enforcement on environmental crime. In response to a follow up question, the Committee noted that by law, Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs) did not have an appeal or challenge system. If people felt they were unfairly fined, they could choose not to pay the fine, take the notice to court and then let the judge decide. It was also noted that although the Council being in partnership with a private contractor, all the appeals and challenges would be overseen by the Community Safety and Enforcement team within the Council.
- The Committee noted the response in terms of the self-financing for the New River Sports & Fitness. In response to a question from the Committee, Officers advised that there would be an investment of £533,000 into New River next year as part of the original assessment to take forward for maintaining assets. This would be a part of an overall investment in other assets at New River and not just in terms of achieving the additional revenue income savings and would be self- financing without incurring a cost to the Council.
- The Committee noted the update presented on the report on Tottenham Hale Green Space. The Committee sought assurance on if this scheme would be viable as the table highlighted £3.2 million as an unfunded amount. Officers advised that this would not be a case of assessing viability as when starting the Capital Programme, Officers included predicted totalities for what the scheme would cost and the budget would represent all its phases. It was noted that each phase would only progress once the funding solution was solved and that was when the project would go forward.
- The Committee noted that the term unfunded meant that the funding source was not identified, however, officers had to put totality of everything in the budget as it happens in phases once funding was identified. Most of the time the schemes would be waiting for funding from the GLA as they fund in tranches. The Council would need to bid or apply for the funding to progress with projects.
- The Committee was assured that the Capital Programme was a framework which enabled the delivery of all capital schemes that the Council would be engaging in the next 5 years. Officers explained that as it was a framework, it was difficult to predict exactly how the project would turn out in two or three years' time. As the phases were based on assumptions, Officers were only able report back to the Committee on how reality would be matching against the framework in real-time.

- The Committee noted the response received in regard to Future High Street Project.

The following was noted in discussion of the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel:

- In relation to the proposal on funding for Connected Communities and Continuing Healthcare, the Panel noted the response provided and recommended for this to be referred back to the Adults Health Scrutiny Panel to be looked at as part of a wider agenda item.
- In relation to Strength Based Working MTFS proposal, the Committee had requested details of support groups available in each of the three locality areas in the Borough. It was noted that a piece of work was underway with Haricare and this would be integrated into the locality model. The Committee recommended that this information to be rolled out to all community groups and not just on Haricare site, as this may not be accessed by all residents in the borough.

The following was noted in discussion of the Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel:

- In response to a question regarding the saving on the tracker being double counted, officers assured the Committee that the MTFS had been adjusted to eliminate the double count. The main report now reflects the overall financial position that was being reported and the final budget had improved in totality.
- The Committee sought for further clarification on this as it was noted that the initial proposed saving was being considered as a written off savings and then the adjusted saving was being considered as a new saving. The Committee questioned this approach as the adjusted figures would not be a new saving and wanted clarity on why this was being presented as a new saving. In response to this, Officers advised that this would be reviewed to assess whether this was the best depiction of how to make the adjustments.
- In response to a follow up question on how this double count occurred, the Committee was advised that there had been discussions with Directors to evaluate how this error occurred. It was noted that a presentational fault could have led to some of the savings being misinterpreted and being double counted. The Committee was assured that there had also been engagement with colleges to review and tighten processes to prevent this from happening in the future.

RESOLVED

That the responses to outstanding queries from 18th January OSC meeting were noted.

7. FINAL 2024-25 BUDGET AND 2024-29 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

The Committee was presented with the Final 2024-25 Budget and 2024-29 Medium Term Financial Strategy report. John Warlow, Director of Finance introduced the report as set out in the agenda pack.

The following was noted in discussion of this item:

- There was a £16.3m budget gap in the December Draft General Fund Budget. Considerable further work had been undertaken to identify additional savings and actions to close the gap. Consequently, the budget position had improved by c. £10.4m since December.
- The Council was required to draw-down £5.9m from the Strategic Budget Planning Reserves in order to set a balanced budget for 2024/25.
- Haringey had been a poorly funded local authority by the government for many years.
- It was noted that there had been updates on inflation and treasury assumptions.
- Extensive work had been done to further reduce the capital for the General Fund of just under £29m which was an overall reduction in the Capital Programme.
- Since considering the report previously, there was some improvement in the latter years of the forecast. The Housing Revenue Account had increased by around £1m in year four or five.
- The Committee noted that the figures may change again before this was submitted to the Full Council as there was a wait for the final local government settlement figures.
- In response to a question from the Committee regarding building reserves, Officers advised that in order to maintain and build reserves, the Council should ensure that funds were not drawn from these reserves. However, this would be challenging and there would be a need to have high level of financial improvement.
- In response to a question from the Committee, Officers clarified the Capital Programme had been revised and included reduction. These items included primary schools, repairs, maintenance, Pendarren house, borough roads, parks, asset management, active life in parks, parking, walk bridges, place making and housing, Tottenham Hale green space and Council building.
- Officers added that it was difficult exercise to identify areas on where and how the Capital Programme could be reduced.
- It was noted that the new build developments were assumed to be self-financing through extra income streams.
- The Budget/MTFS report in March 2023 forecasted a gap for 2024/25 of c. £6.3m. The draft Budget presented to Cabinet on 5 December 2023 had a gap of £16.3m. The December gap had reduced to £5.9m which was proposed to be met from the Strategic Budget Planning reserve. Further work had been carried out to ensure the reductions which included corporate changes along with corporate growth. The corporate changes included treasury income improvements, reduction in inflation, improvements in the Council tax position,

changes in grants, empty properties change and finally, the work done by each Directorate and portfolio holders in bringing forward savings.

- In terms of reserves, the Committee noted that there was a small number of usable reserves which would give the Council £23million worth of availability. This included the General Fund and the £7million annual contingency fund.
- The Committee recommended that the budget would need to be looked at as a whole by reviewing other elements that make up the budget and not primarily focusing on savings.
- To follow up, the Committee was advised that forward facing savings were a small proportion of the savings that the officers had worked on as management actions, reorganisations, and staffing changes. These savings were estimated to be around £4million since the December Cabinet report. Officers informed the Committee that this figure was a rough estimate and could change as an impact of corporate change factors that may come along, but currently these figures would be a working assumption.
- In response to a question, Officers advised that the Public Health Grant had been moved from corporate grant into Adults directories. The Committee noted that the tables in the report under Funding Assumptions had been amended to reflect this change.
- The Committee highlighted that the updated table on Table 7.1b – Total New Growth was missing £1million in the total figures and queried whether this was a presentational error or if there had been a £1million of new net growth that was proposed in December that was no longer being proposed. The Committee recommended that Officers provide a clear explanation for this at the Cabinet meeting.
- In response to a question regarding a reduction of £0.5m to the regeneration budgets, Officers advised that work had been done to ensure that there would be enough money to maintain the estates to keep it safe and operational. Whilst there was a reduction overall across the three years, there would be wider reviews on estates in general. Officers also advised that the service had sufficient funding for the programme of works that were scheduled for the next year.
- The Committee highlighted that there had been no changes in the figures presented on the tables for this report since the Cabinet in December, and why changes that had been discussed were not being reflected in the report. In response to this, Officers advised that revenue impact had been built into the MTFS and this included a reduction in the cost of debt and an improvement of around £1m and this is included in the report in table 7.3. Officers added that the treasury limits figures had not been altered as a result of timings and the figures were seemed as being reasonable and appropriate as it was not considered to have material impact.
- In response to a question regarding Parkland Walk Bridges, Officers advised that the changes included spreading the cost of investment over a longer period of time in order to reduce borrowing costs. It was also noted that there was no indication of final costs as the consultation is still ongoing.

- In terms of Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA) for library services, the service was carrying out a detailed approach for each individual library as the needs of the residents in the East and West of the borough are very different. The Committee was assured that the libraries would be protected and was looking at ways to safeguard them for the future, examine ways to generate income and ensure that libraries are public assets.
- The Committee emphasised that the EQIA would need to happen in the libraries before any changes to the library service are proposed.
- In terms of hard copy newspapers and magazines in libraries, some of the feedback seen in the consultation response was very mixed. There were some residents who were very against this and some who thought this would be a reasonable thing to do in terms of environmental impact. The feedback was considered and there was a review in footfall and the number of hard copies in the libraries. Some would be retained, but there would be some savings made, this is why the continuing saving of £25k was in the budget.
- The Committee sought further clarification on Appendix 3A, Officers advised that the descriptors of the savings that were shown in Appendix 3A were unchanged from the version that went out in the original report and this was done for consistency. This was particularly useful when receiving feedback from the public about the savings and it was easier to reference the feedback against the narratives that were in the report.
- The Committee noted that the self-service volunteer or community led libraries proposal was not going ahead. The committee was informed that savings would still need to make and the service was looking to develop a library strategy which would focus on income generation and how those buildings could be used different. The Committee recommended that this new proposal would need to be included in the report and updated for Cabinet.
- The Committee was advised that the final budget report would not be presented at the Cabinet meeting but at the Council meeting. It was also noted that the changes made in the library proposal would be made clearer graphically in the report presented to the Council.
- In terms of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme, this would go out for consultation on any changes publicly. It was noted that at this stage the figures were indicative subject to consultation. The changes and benefits expected was due to people transferring over to Universal Credit. Officers added that pensions were protected by legislation and no changes could be made from the 100% that was already being given.

RESOLVED

That the additional Budget Scrutiny recommendations to Cabinet were agreed. These are published in a separate table:

<https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/b30300/Budget%20Scrutiny%20Recommendations%20from%201st%20February%20meeting%2001st-Feb-2024%2019.00%20Overview%20and%20Scrutin.pdf?T=9>

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

9. FUTURE MEETINGS

11 March 2024

CHAIR: Councillor Matt White

Signed by Chair

Date

MINUTES OF MEETING Overview and Scrutiny Committee HELD ON Monday, 11th March, 2024, 19:00.

PRESENT:

Councillors: Alexandra Worrell, Simmons-Safo, Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Makbule Gunes and Matt White (Chair)

ALSO ATTENDING:

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to item one on the agenda in respect of filming at the meeting and Members noted the information contained therein.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Yvonne Denny.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

None

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Yvonne Denny.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Call-In meeting held on 3rd of January 2024 and the minutes of the meeting held on 18th of January 2024 as a correct record.

7. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Call-In meeting held on 3rd of January 2024 and the minutes of the meeting held on 18th of January 2024 as a correct record.

8. ANNUAL FEEDBACK AND RESOLUTIONS REPORT 2022-2023

The report was introduced by Elaine Prado, Head of Feedback and Resolutions Strategy Comms and Collaboration, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 61 – 84.

This report provided an update on how Haringey Council was seeking to learn from the feedback received from residents and used this to shape and improve services.

This report also sets out some of the key actions the service was undertaking to improve the complaints, FOI and Members Enquiry handling processes to ensure the system provided both a positive resident experience but also the strongest possible platform to utilise the feedback both positive and negative.

The meeting heard that:

- Feedback and complaints were utilised in a way of designing changes to the systems that contributed to running services.
- Currently, information on how services were specifically learning from feedback was being gathered manually from services.
- The feedback received indicated that not all complaints were about service failures. Some of the complaints was on policy decisions taken by the Council which some residents disagreed to, for instance the implementation of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods.
- The Committee noted that there may be an increase in complaints on standards and services as the Council was having to make considerable amount of service cuts and services would need to be prepared to see people not being happy with Council policies.
- Officers advised that it was important to focus on reasons why residents complained rather than focusing on the number of complaints and the reporting process. It was essential to ensure that proper measures were in place to deliver the needs of the residents.
- The Committee noted that from the 1st of April, every local authority in England would need to use a standard definition of what a complaint was. The standard definition highlighted that a complaint would be an expression of dissatisfaction made about the standard of service actions or lack of action by the organization, its own staff, or those acting on its behalf, affecting an individual or group of individuals.
- There was a real emphasis on reducing the number of complaints being escalated or upheld. If the service was living the values mentioned around really learning from complaints, then services should hopefully be resolving matters quickly.
- In response to a question from the Committee regarding the Haringey deal and involving residents in designing services, officers provided an example of how residents were involved in improving services. Officers explained that residents who complained that there was a lot of pavement parking, especially in the evening, in areas like Wood Green, Muswell Hill and Green Lanes and that

Civil Enforcement Officers only operate till 10:00pm. This response would not be sufficient for residents as it did not resolve the problem. The service then had to look at services available and assess the way the service was designed to see if it was meeting the needs of the issues that the residents were raising. The service then made improvements by having Traffic Wardens operating until 2:00am on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday night in the specified hotspot areas. This was an example provided by how the service had responded to complaint by involving residents.

- In response to a question regarding whether parking complaints had dropped overall, Officers advised that there was not a drop overall as there had been a complaint on a policy relating to the implementation of double yellow lines at junctions and it was also useful to note that new issues may arise.
- In relation to Housing repair follow-on calls, a result of resident feedback showing dissatisfaction with follow-on calls about housing repairs, a secondary phone line had been initiated so that residents could discuss existing repairs with officers within Property Services who could arrange subsequent repair appointments, removing the 'hand-off' and delays from the process.
- In response to a question regarding improvements in Children's Services made as a result feedback from parents, Officers advised that parents complained because they were in a position of not trusting the professionals within the Council to deliver the messages about what their children were eligible for. Having a trusted partner in the room like an advocate helped to have the message to become more acceptable.
- In response to a question from the Committee regarding reporting on complaints next year or on an annual basis, Officers advised that there had been a few challenges in the complaints processes and systems. The issues included delays in information handling and timeliness around responses, and these were the big theme of the improvement plan. One of the things that would make a difference in relation to delays would be the new system the service was developing which was a software through which all of complaints Members, enquiries have Freedom of Information requests would be managed. The current system is outdated and would be replaced with a new system which was being developed internally by Digital Services.
- In response to a question from the Committee, Officers confirmed that the independent partner agency experts that the Council were using was SENDIASS professionals (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Information Advice and Support Service).
- The Committee was advised that in terms of failure through shared mailboxes, this occurred when emails in the mailbox were not being handled in a timely manner. An example provided was if a member of the team were away on holiday or off sick, the email queries could take longer to be process or forwarded on to the correct officers. To tackle this issue the service had been exploring ways where they could work together as a team and manage workload accordingly.
- In terms of the difference between poor standard of service versus failure to provide a service, Officers advised that a poor standard of service was where the service had done something for the resident but did not do it to a good standard. Failure to provide a services was when the service just did not do the task at all.

- Officers also advised that around 90% of Members Enquiries was mainly Casework. Casework was where things had gone wrong, and the case was then referred to the correct team who would investigate the matter further.

RESOLVED

To note the report

9. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - COUNCILLOR GORDON, CABINET MEMBER FOR COUNCIL HOUSE BUILDING, PLACEMAKING AND LOCAL ECONOMY

The Committee undertook a Q&A Session with the Cabinet Member for Council House Building, Placemaking and Local Economy.

The following arose as part of this session:

- Haringey had a diverse business base with a diverse population and independent businesses. Most businesses were small and medium sized enterprises.
- Haringey economy was boosted by its diverse food offers, diverse cultural and diverse entertainment.
- Around 36% of Haringey business owners were also Haringey residents.
- It was noted that during the pandemic, it was not an easy time for the business community and around 90% of Haringey business owners have said that cost of living crisis was having a negative impact on their business.
- Unemployment in the borough remained at 6.8%, which was one of the highest rates in London.
- It was noted that high levels of unemployment were mainly around the Tottenham side of the borough and the borough also had the highest number of jobs that pay below the London living wage.
- The Council launched “Opportunity Haringey” throughout the pandemic years.
- The Council had an economic strategy which was geared towards ensuring that businesses survived as best as they could through the pandemic, and ensured businesses received the support they needed.
- Since the pandemic the Council had created a new strategy which evolved around “Opportunity Haringey. This was done by going through extensive consultations and Co-produced the strategy with businesses. This was launched on the 22nd of February.
- The strategy focused on a few themes which included job creation, investment, good work and skills, high streets and industrial estates, workspaces and workplaces and spaces.
- There were also other support services like “Haringey works”, which is free at the point of access to help drive employment in the borough. The Committee noted that this initiative had been successful as around 599 of 1440 residents had found work through Haringey Works last year. Officers added that many of these residents found work in the Council.

- Another service was “Haringey learns,” which helped residents to rescale and upskill people who wanted new qualifications.
- There was a Market strategy in place which supported easy entry into businesses. There were a few markets across the borough and they all operated in different ways, so the service was looking to develop an overarching strategy for that to see whether there was capacity for expanding markets.
- Officers added that the vacancy rate in Haringey was relatively low. Haringey’s vacancy rate was 7.64%, across London it was 9.2% and nationally it was 11%.
- The Council had networks for each of the high streets and was keen to develop those networks further. This would contribute to bring businesses together and people would be able to network, work with each other, and would have the synergy of businesses that would develop and sell to other local businesses.
- In response to a question regarding how Haringey Works was being funded, Officers advised that the Council had lost the Europe funding but managed to replace that with funding from the UK Prosperity Fund. The Committee was informed that no funds were drawn down from the General Fund Budget.
- In terms of apprenticeships through Haringey Works, Officers advised the Committee that the Council had received an apprenticeship levy which go into 15 businesses. It was noted that around 29 residents had been helped through that fund.
- Schools had a statutory duty to provide advice on careers and apprenticeships. In order to promote the apprenticeship scheme to young school leavers, the Council had organised a national apprenticeship week at a local youth hub.

RESOLVED

Noted.

10. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Committee considered its work programme as set out at pages 85-90 of the agenda pack.

RESOLVED

To note the report

11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

12. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Committee excluded the press and public for item 13 as it contained exempt information as defined in Section 100a of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended by Section 12A of the Local Government Act 1985); Paragraph 3.

13. EXEMPT MINUTES

RESOLVED:

The Committee approved the exempt minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Call-In meeting held on 3 January 2024.

CHAIR: Councillor Matt White

Signed by Chair

Date

MINUTES OF MEETING Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Wednesday, 13th March, 2024, Times Not Specified

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Dawn Barnes, Harrison-Mullane, Tammy Hymas,
Khaled Moyeed, John Bevan, Alexandra Worrell (Chair) and Diakides**

ALSO ATTENDING:

157. 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'.

158. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Moyeed.

159. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

160. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

161. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

There were no deputations, petitions, presentations or questions received.

162. MINUTES

The Panel requested that a further update be provide to a future meeting around the costs to the Council arising from legal disrepair claims. **(Action: Philip).**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting on 18th December 2023 were agreed as a correct record.

163. VOLUNTARY UNDERTAKING TO THE REGULATOR OF SOCIAL HOUSING

The Panel received a report which provided an update on the work being done following the Council's self-referral to the social housing regulator, and the subsequent notice issued by the regulator in relation to breaches of two parts of the Home Standard; for non-compliance with the Decent Homes

Standard, and the Council's identification of over one hundred Category 1

hazards within its own housing stock. The report was presented by Jahedur Rahman, Operational Director of Housing Services and Building Safety as set out in the report pack at pages 9-16. The Director Placemaking and Housing, as well as the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning were also present for this item. The Panel noted that nine of the ten actions agreed with the regulator as part of the short-term plan had been completed. The following arose from the discussion of this report:

- a. The Panel queried the statement in the report that 323 properties had returned back to Haringey and questioned whether this related to 323 illegal tenancies. In response, officers advised that this related to cases of properties without a valid electrical/gas safety certificate, and that due to problems with no access to these properties, the tenancy management team could do no more and so they were 'handed back' to the Council's legal department to take legal action.
- b. The Panel sought clarification around the term the 'big 6' indicators of compliance, and queried whether there were other compliance indicators that were relevant. In response, officers advised that these were the six statutory areas of compliance that the authority was assessed against by the regulator. It was commented that from a legal perspective these were the six areas that the Council had to focus its efforts upon.
- c. In relation to a question, officers confirmed that the report's allusions to new systems was the move to a new dedicated compliance system, so that the Council was no longer recording cases on spreadsheets.
Clerk's note at 18:47 – Cllr Moyeed joined the meeting at this point
- d. The Panel commended officers on the amount of work that had been done to undertake outstanding actions. The Panel noted that the regulator found that there were around 5k homes that did not meet the decent homes standard and that there were around 100 properties with category one defects. The Panel enquired whether any targets had been set for improving these outcomes. In response, officers advised that the Council had undertaken a stock condition survey and so had an up-to-date stock condition programme, which allowed it to have an accurate picture of the number of properties with category one defects. Officers advised that whilst surveyors had undertaken a robust survey regime and were prioritising category one hazards, it was the case that one of the category one hazards identified in HHSR legislation was overcrowding. In these cases, there was no repair that the Council could carry out to rectify the problem. Where the problem was repair based, the Council would rectify this. The Panel requested some further data on the number of category one hazards minus cases of overcrowding (**Action Jahed**).
- e. The Panel queried why some of the different compliance indicators had variable frequencies as identified in the report. In response, officers advised that the inspection frequency was determined by the regulatory requirements and that this was out of the Council's control. Different assessments had different regulatory regimes.

- f. The Chair queried whether the statement made under the Carbon & Climate Change section of the report related specifically to the voluntary undertaking. In response, officers clarified that these comments related to work being undertaken as part of the Strategic Asset Management plan that went to Cabinet.
 - g. In relation to a query about the role of external validation, officers advised that once all of the actions had been completed, external auditors would be used to validate the work that the Council had done internally. Only once these assurances had been received would the Council apply to the regulator to have the notice removed. In response to a follow-up question, officers confirmed that the regulator had advised that the authority did not need to resolve the ongoing cases involving access issues in order to have the notice removed.
 - h. The Panel sought assurances about the wider engagement work referred to in the report. In response, officers advised that that the wider engagement work was taking place but that it was not part of the response to the referral to the regulator.
 - i. The Panel contended that the a lessons learnt exercise should be undertaken, given the position the Council found itself in when Homes for Haringey came back in-house. In response, the Director advised that Pennington Choices had undertaken a piece of follow-up work and that there was raft of actions and follow-ups that sat outside of the voluntary undertaking. Part of the follow-up work would be around validating these actions and ensuring that they had been resolved. In this context, the Director advised that he was satisfied that a suitable level of lessons learnt work had been done across the service.
- *Clerk's note at 19:00 – Cllr Diakides left the meeting at this point.*

RESOLVED

That the panel noted the report and the information contained therein.

164. PREPAREDNESS FOR NEW SOCIAL HOUSING CONSUMER STANDARDS

The Panel received a report which provided an update on the Council's preparedness for the Regulator of Social Housing's new Consumer Standards. The report was presented by Jahedur Rahman, Operational Director of Housing Services and Building Safety and Nimisha Patel, AD for Housing Management, as set out in the report pack at pages 17-26. The Director Placemaking and Housing, as well as the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning were also present for this item. The following arose as part of the discussion of this report:

- a. The Panel queried what kind of weighting was given to the new consumer standards and what the repercussions would be for non-compliance. In response, officers set out that the governance arrangements would vary from authority to authority. In response to a follow-up question, officers advised that they were confident that, if the authority was inspected today, it would meet the standards on safety and quality due to the work done in the past 12 months. Compliance with some of the other standards still required some more work.
- b. The Panel sought clarification on whether the new approach would give the Council more teeth in terms of enforcing against cases of poor quality housing. A Panel member gave examples from their casework of CPNs not being

- actioned and cases taking a very long time to progress. In response, officers acknowledged that the Housing Enforcement Team had been very reliant on issuing CPNs, and that one of the things the AD for Housing Management would like to see is use of other powers, such as injunctions which carried more weight. It was noted that discussions were taking place to ensure that the Council was using all of the remedies available to it through housing legislation.
- c. The Panel sought assurances about whether the Council received sufficient support from police colleagues to deal with significant breaches. In response, officers acknowledged that there was a case for needing stronger liaison with police. The Panel were advised that there was an internal partnership problem solving group where high level cases were discussed and where officers tried to get a commitment from police colleagues at a senior level.
 - d. The Panel set out that it was very difficult to tackle ASB cases that involved drugs without police support, but that the police didn't always have the resources to help. They queried what enforcement measures could the Council put in place to tackle identified cases of ASB. In response, officers advised that they recognised that the way the authority exercised its landlord function could improve, and that there was a number of powers available to the authority to enforce against tenants who were causing ASB. It was commented that the Housing Service was working with colleagues to ensure that the authority maximised the use of the enforcement tools that were available to it.
 - e. The Panel sought assurances, that following the roll-out of the safer estates programme in 2018, that all of the estates had adequate CCTV in place. In response, officers advised that there was a capital budget allocation every year to support the roll-out of improving CCTV on estates. The Cabinet Member advised that CCTV was improved in areas where there was a known issue and that this was a targeted approach. The Cabinet Member suggested that she did not believe it was desirable to have CCTV covering every corner of the estates.
 - f. The Panel raised concerns about the fact that most tenants did not know the name of their housing manager and it was queried how this would impact the new consumer standards. In response, officers advised that as part of the Housing Improvement Plan, all residents were written to and advised of the name of their housing manager. Officers advised that they wanted to move away from having a single named point of contact towards a single mailbox that was monitored by multiple members of staff. In response to a follow-up, officers advised that residents should still know who their housing manager was so that they could join them on estate walkabouts, for instance. However the service wanted to move away from a single contact for emails as this could be a single point of failure.
 - g. The Panel sought assurances about placing residents with support needs in general housing and the extent to which support was offered. In response, the Panel was advised that there were a lot of different pathways into housing and that ensuring that the right support mechanisms were there was key. The Cabinet Member provided assurances that this was something that was considered. Officers advised that there was a growing trend nationally of increasingly vulnerable people being placed into general needs housing, due to the acute shortage of housing.
 - h. In response to a question around ASB and how we prioritised door entry systems for particular residents, officers advised that as part of the safer estates schemes, it was based on intelligence and knowledge of ASB taking

place. Officers clarified that door entry systems weren't always the answer as they were often vandalised. Instead, CCTV could be a far more effective tool for dealing with ASB. In cases involving severe issues with drugs, the Council had also installed 24 hour dog patrols in some locations.

- i. The Panel queried about the repairs service and communicating the work that was done, it was questioned when major works and repairs would be prioritised over compliance. In response, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that the initial focus had been on compliance and that there was a limit to how much the Council could focus its efforts on. The Cabinet Member set out that a lot of additional resources had been put into the repairs team and that as the Major works programme came online, the demand for reactive repairs should decrease. The Cabinet Member advised that it was anticipated that the partnering contract for major works would be in place soon. Officers acknowledged that the repairs service was not where it needed to be, but by way of context it was noted that the service carried out around 55k repairs a year and around 1% of these resulted in complaints.
- j. The Panel sought clarification about the number of ASB cases in social housing dealt with by the Council's housing enforcement service. In response, officers advised that about 50% of the cases dealt with by the enforcement team were housing related. Officers advised that they were in the process of revisiting the SLA that they held with the housing enforcement team to agree a revised model and to look at whether the recharging mechanism was fair and accurate.
- k. In response to a follow-up question, officers advised that examples of the types of things that constituted high-level ASB were drug dealing, threats of violence, criminality and persistent offending.
- l. In response to a question about housing association tenants, officers advised that the report in front of members was specific to Council tenants. Housing associations had their own ASB reporting mechanisms and that residents should complain to their Housing Association in the first instance and then the Housing Ombudsman.
- m. In the context of the existing SLA, Members commented that housing contributed 90% of the funding for the housing enforcement team and that it seemed as though they spent 50% of their time on cases involving social housing.
- n. The Panel requested a future update around the revised re-charging model/SLA between housing and housing enforcement, and what additional services residents would be available to residents. **(Action: Jahedur/Barry Francis)**

RESOLVED

That the report was noted.

165. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

The Panel received a report which provide an update on the Haringey Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), including both the Strategic CIL and Neighbourhood CIL. The report was introduced by Bryce Tudball, Interim Head of Planning Policy,

Transport and Infrastructure, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 27 to 34. The following arose as part of the discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel queried why there were differing CIL rates across different areas of the borough and questioned whether these were due to be updated to reflect appreciating land values. In response, officers advised that the CIL rates were set based on viability evidence and that evidence showed that viability was higher in the west and central parts of the borough. The CIL rates were relooked at in 2017 and an increase in CIL rates in the east of the borough was subsequently introduced. Officers advised that the CIL rates across the borough were at around the maximum level without putting future development at risk.
- b. In response to a question, officers advised that legislation permitted an area that had adopted a neighbourhood plan to retain 25% of the CIL receipts generated in that area. This was in contrast to around 15% of Neighbourhood CIL being redistributed to areas that did not have an adopted plan.
- c. The Panel sought clarification about the amount of money generated in the east versus the west of the borough, given differing CIL rates and a general lack of development in the west of the borough. In response, officers acknowledged that the levels of development differed across the borough and that the majority of CIL generated came from the east and centre of the borough. Officers contended that it was fair that the majority of CIL revenue should be spent in those areas. Officers advised that NCIL had a redistributive element to ensure that areas that had the most development received a higher proportion of CIL funding.
- d. In response to a follow-up question, officers set out that the evidence base showed that CIL rates were about right in the west of the borough and that it shouldn't be the CIL rates that detracted from development. Instead, the relative lack of development was ascribed to the fact that there were very few development opportunities in the west of the borough. The Neighbourhood Plan would be looking at how to increase these development opportunities.
- e. The Panel sought clarification around Schools Streets and whether these could be implemented anywhere across the borough. In response, officers advised that Strategic CIL could be spent anywhere in the borough and that this included School Streets, along with a number of other walking and cycling projects and road danger reduction projects that were being developed across different parts of the borough.
- f. In relation to the proposed Crouch End Neighbourhood Plan, officers advised that some funding to support this was allocated in 2022, however the neighbourhood forum were not quite ready at that point. Officers advised that the Council recognised that the money for this area needed to be spent and it was hoped that this would be allocated towards the end of the year at the next round of Neighbourhood CIL allocation.
- g. In response to a question about who got to choose how the funding was spent in an area without a neighbourhood forum, officers advised that funding was ringfenced in areas with neighbourhood forums. The neighbourhood forums were consulted on how the money was spent but they did not take the decision. Instead, there should be a wider engagement exercise with residents. The

- allocation of NCIL funding in areas without a neighbourhood plan (just as for those with a neighbourhood plan), would still be subject to a process of engagement but would ultimately be a decision taken by Cabinet.
- h. The Panel sought clarification about whether the amount of unallocated CIL money remained at £1.74m. In response, officers advised that the amount of unallocated CIL money as of 2022 was £1.74m but that further money would have been accrued since then. Some work was needed on the CIL approach following changes to ward boundaries.
 - i. In response to a question about participatory budgeting and the role of VCSOs, the Panel was advised that there was no agreed approach to participatory budgeting at present and that as the money related to infrastructure projects, it would be Council-led as per the relevant statutory framework.
 - j. In response to a comment, officers challenged the assertion that the majority of CIL spending was in one area. Officers set out that there was an allocation of parks funding in 2020 and that the projects were spread across different areas of the Council. It was emphasised that the allocation of CIL was part of an engagement process with residents.
 - k. In relation to a question about changes to ward boundaries, officers set out that the starting point would be to respect the boundaries of existing neighbourhood forums, both in Highgate and those in development.
 - l. The Panel commented that Camden and other neighbouring boroughs had higher CIL rates than Haringey. In response officers advised that Camden had higher levels of viability and so had higher CIL rates. Overall, it was suggested, Haringey was broadly in-line with its statistical neighbours. Officers also emphasised that CIL was just one of several ways in which developers provided contributions to local authorities. The other main example was Section 106 money, which included provision of affordable housing.
 - m. The Panel questioned whether any consideration had been given to having variable CIL rates depending on the size of developments. Officers responded that this had been given consideration in the past but that the government had been clear that local authorities should not seek to jeopardise smaller sites by seeking to extract additional developer contributions.
 - n. In response to a question, officers advised that government guidance sets out that strategic CIL should be spent on projects in the capital programme, and that these were quite broad in scope and also aligned with the Council's political priorities

RESOLVED

That the Panel noted the report.

166. UNDER-OCCUPATION IN COUNCIL HOUSING

The Panel considered a report which presented findings from council held census data on under-occupation in council and other social housing, set out the Council's policies to support under-occupying council tenants to move to smaller homes and set out the Council's ambition to develop a new rightsizing strategy. The report was

presented by Robbie Erbmänn, AD for Housing, as set out in the published agenda papers at pages 35-37. Denise Gandy, AD of Housing Demand was also present for this item, along with the Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning. The following arose as part of the discussion of this report:

- a. The Panel noted 46% of four-bed council properties were under-occupied and 61% of five-bed council properties were under-occupied. Officers set out that the data showed that Haringey was slightly more under-occupied, that it was overcrowded. Better use of the Council's housing stock could, therefore, improve the demand pressures that the Council faced in relation to housing needs.
- b. The Panel commented that they recalled a previous update on this issue and the fact that the incentives offered weren't enough to tempt people to leave their family homes. The Panel queries the extent to which the Council was able proactively engage with tenants on this issue, without pressuring them. In response, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that in many ways this was the key question, and that having a robust offer of incentives was crucial to rightsizing the council's housing stock. The Cabinet Member suggested that the authority was at the beginning of this process and that she did not have all of the answers at present. However, it was envisaged that directing additional staffing resources at this would help move it along. It was suggested that a key incentive for some people could be an offer to move into a new home that had much lower running costs.
- c. The Panel sought clarification about whether there were any examples of good practice from other local authorities that had implemented a successful incentive scheme, that could be considered. In response, officers advised that, broadly speaking, it was about having a range of options in place. One example given was a transferable discount scheme, whereby those who were under occupying could be given a discount to buy a shared ownership property, in the same way that people got discounts under Right to Buy. There were also seaside and country home schemes that facilitated tenants swapping tenancies for a home in the country or by the sea.
- d. The Panel commented that one solution could be around having different tiers of incentives, as some people would be incentivised by money but others may have different motivations. The Panel also commented that engaging with residents was key in order to find out where the under-occupations were and to gauge interest. In response, the Cabinet Member noted that offering different rates to different residents would probably result in the Council being taken to court.
- e. The Panel sought clarification about whether adult children who still lived at home would be classed as a property being under-occupied. In response, adults advised that only properties with empty rooms would contribute to the figures for under-occupied properties, not those with adult children living in them.
- f. In response to a suggestion about having split tenancies for those with adult children that wanted to get their own place or families that wanted to separate, officers advised that this was an avenue that they would be keen to explore.

- g. In response to a question, officers advised that the existing home swap scheme was an alternative option available to people and that it was run as a national programme that allowed tenants to agree to swap homes on a national rather than intra-Haringey basis.
- h. The Panel sought clarification about whether it was legal to for the Council to reserve a particular chunk of housing for those who were currently under-occupying. In response, officers advised that it was possible to do a targeted scheme on a one-off basis through a targeted lettings plan. Officers advised that the Neighbourhood Moves scheme had already been quite successful in facilitating people to move into new homes. Officers also highlighted the fact that the Ashley Road site was due to be 50% social housing and 50% homes for private sale, but that the Council had managed to secure all 272 properties for social housing. This meant that there would be a lot of one and two bedroom properties on the site, and the plan was to offer a bespoke product for older residents who may want to downsize into a more accessible property.
- i. The Panel requested that a further update be brought to the Panel in due course around the Neighbourhood Moves scheme and its implementation to date. **(Action: Philip).**

RESOLVED

Noted.

167. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Panel requested a further update on under-occupation and work to increase staff resources beyond the one officer currently assigned to it.

The Panel also commented that they should meet informally to learn lessons on recommendation setting that arose from the recent scrutiny review on PRS housing.

RESOLVED

That the work programme was noted.

168. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

169. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

TBA

CHAIR: Councillor Alexandra Worrell

Signed by Chair

Date

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ADULTS & HEALTH
SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY 22ND FEBRUARY 2024,
6.30 - 10.15pm**

PRESENT:

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

Co-optees: Ali Amasyali & Helena Kania

43. 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'.

44. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

It was noted that Cllr Sheila Peacock was attending the meeting online.

45. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

46. 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.

Cllr Mary Mason declared an interest as a Trustee of the Bridge Renewal Trust.

Cllr Thayahlan Iyngkaran declared an interest as a consultant radiologist and a deputy medical director.

Helena Kania declared an interest as a co-Chair of the Joint Partnership Board.

47. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/ PRESENTATIONS/ QUESTIONS

A deputation was received by the Panel on the subject of Osborne Grove Nursing Home. This was presented by Mary Langan, chair of the severe complex autism and learning disabilities reference group, Gordon Peters from the Haringey over 50s forum, Ann Gray from the older people's reference group and the Haringey over 50s forum, Sharon Grant, chair of Healthwatch Haringey and a co-Chair of the Joint Partnership Board and Vida Black, chair of the Carers forum.

Gordon Peters set out the key points, stating that:

- A vision for Osborne Grove, as a home of health and well-being integrated into local community life, had been produced in 2017 with several Councillors and others in an early example of co-production. Details of this vision are available online at: <https://osbornegrovenursinghome.commonplace.is/>
- There had been an established co-production steering group that had worked together on the design and plans for over five years, with due consideration of scale, environmental impact, community interaction and neighbourhood integrity, as well as creating a multifunction facility appropriate to the needs of vulnerable people and a meeting place for local residents and visitors all on one site.
- The project would have provided at least 70 places for elderly people in need of nursing care and people with learning disabilities who would otherwise be placed outside of the borough. This would reduce the long-term financial burden to the Council of making placements elsewhere.
- The project design had been reduced in size to take into account resident and service need feedback and was ready to seek planning permission for building completion within two years when the project was paused in 2023. They were concerned that the project would not recommence for some time or could be deprioritised altogether.
- Communications from the Council had been reduced in 2023 compared with previous years and details such as cost-benefit studies and current working assumptions had not been shared with the co-production steering group.
- The deputation therefore had four requests:
 - That Osborne Grove be made a priority within the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)
 - The full cost-benefit analysis of the redesigned facility should be provided to stakeholders, including capital costs, revenue costs and the income potential of the facility compared to doing nothing.
 - The co-production steering group should be reconvened before the end of the 2023/24 cycle with an updated timetable for the implementation of the project.
 - The Council should issue a statement specifying that Osborne Grove remained a part of its strategy for health and social care in the Borough and recognised the importance of co-production with local partners.

Mary Langan then emphasised the commitments in the Haringey Labour manifesto for locally delivered care and to empower communities by working with them. She expressed disappointment that the members of the co-production group that had worked on this project for five years, as part of what had been a positive and productive relationship with the Council, were now at this meeting as petitioners. She felt that the recent handling of the project, and the lack of information provided to them, had cast some doubt on the Council's commitment to co-production.

The members of the deputation then responded to questions from the Panel:

- Asked by Cllr Brennan about the decline in communications from the Council, Gordon Peters pointed out that Cllr das Neves had been in contact to explain that there needed to be a pause in the full meetings but offered a one-hour meeting with Vicky Murphy in January. Prior to this meeting, there had been no meetings between approximately February and November 2023. Mary Langan added that, prior to the last year or so, most information on factors such as likely future demand for placements was shared with the co-production steering group. However, this information was now only available in percentage form, or for North Central London as a whole, rather than as hard numbers.
- Asked by Cllr Mason about the financial viability of the project given the Council's current budget difficulties, Gordon Peters responded that at least a medium-term perspective was required as the demand for nursing home placements and also the level of need would increase and so a new nursing home opening by 2025/26 would bring 70 or more residents and the income that would come with them. This was why the details of the cost-benefit analysis were important to see. He also noted that local authorities had preferential capital borrowing rates and could also partner with the NHS who were keen for this project to go ahead.
- In response to a query from Cllr Mason about the importance of bringing services back into the Borough, Gordon Peters said that sending someone to a private placement elsewhere in the country involved a cost that the Council could not control and could not be cost effective compared to in-house provision.
- Asked by Cllr Peacock how many other local authorities in London ran a nursing home, Gordon Peters said that Osborne Grove was the only one in the country which was all the more reason to preserve a unique facility.
- Cllr O'Donovan queried whether the co-production steering group would be part of the review process for capital projects after they had recently been paused. Gordon Peters added that the Council should issue a statement to clarify that the capital financing for Osborne Grove would remain in the budget as part of its medium/long-term strategy.
- Cllr O'Donovan noted that the Osborne Grove site was currently being temporarily used to provide accommodation for vulnerable people suffering

from homelessness. Gordon Peters agreed that there was a need for homeless accommodation across the Borough and that the Council must find ways of providing this, but that this should not be the long-term use for the Osborne Grove site.

- Helena Kania expressed concern about the potential impact of the steering group's experience over Osborne Grove on the future relationships with other community stakeholders who might be involved in co-production work.

Cllr das Neves, Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Wellbeing, provided a formal response to the concerns raised, expressing disappointment that the future plans for Osborne Grove had been put on hold. The key points of the response were that:

- The aim of the project had been to enable more Haringey residents to be able to access high quality care in the Borough, to reduce reliance on the private sector and the amount of public money spent on placements.
- The Council had worked in good faith to deliver on these shared aims and Cllr das Neves placed on record her thanks for the time and expertise given by the members of the co-production steering group and Council staff. She acknowledged that there were some things that could have been done differently but said that no kind of joint work could have negated the current economic circumstances.
- However, the economy and the costs of care, construction and borrowing had all risen significantly while the structures and priorities of local health partners had also changed.
- The Council had spent months looking at how to keep the project going but this was not possible and so the co-production steering group was informed of this in December.
- During the pause period, the space would continue to be used for the important function of providing accommodation for homeless residents.

Cllr das Neves then responded to specific points raised by the deputation:

- A significant sum remained in the Council's capital programme for the future development of Osborne Grove nursing home. Resources were available from 2027/28 subject to a business case.
- The Council would be happy to share the financial analysis which set out the changes in costs since the original business case from 2019 including the increased cost of borrowing and construction. **(ACTION)**
- While the Council was planning to keep the co-production steering group informed and updated, they were not in a position to continue the co-production work as the project had been paused.
- With regards to the request for a statement, Cllr das Neves said that she was happy to place on record that the Council remained committed to the shared vision of a local care system providing high quality services to

residents, maximum value for money and, where possible, provided by the public sector.

Cllr Connor commented that a co-production group that had committed time and effort to a project would expect to be an equal partner at a point where there were problems as well as at times when things were working well. While acknowledging that there was a pause and that decision making on the future of the project was for the Cabinet, she also emphasised the importance of communication with the co-production group so that they understood clearly what this meant for them. She suggested that a meeting with the co-production group should take place shortly and that this should include details about the financial position.

Cllr Brennan added that the co-production group should also have direct input to the decision-making process over what would happen to the project after the pause. Cllr Mason concurred that a co-production strategy should be maintained throughout the ups and downs of a project and suggested that there should be a statement from the Council on the approach to co-production on Osborne Grove. She added that the priorities should include transparency, particularly on finances and open debate.

Cllr Connor concluded that, after the proposed meeting with the co-production group, the Panel would welcome feedback from the Cabinet Member/officers on the agreed future relationship with the group so that the structure is clear going forward. Details on the financial position should also be provided. **(ACTION)**

48. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 12th December 2023 be approved as an accurate record.

49. MATERNITY SERVICES & START WELL PROGRAMME

Anna Stewart, Programme Director for Start Well, introduced the report for this item and was joined by Clare Dollery, Medical Director at Whittington Health NHS Trust and Vicky Jones, Medical Director at North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust.

Anna Stewart provided an overview of the NCL (North Central London) Start Well programme, a long-term piece of change work to improve maternity and neonatal and children's surgical services. A public consultation was in progress which included details of options to reduce the number of maternity and neonatal units in NCL from five to four:

- Option A would involve the closure of services on the Royal Free site in Hampstead but remain open at the Whittington Hospital site. This was the

preferred option based on the modelled flows of patients and the expected number of staff that would need to be move to a new location.

- Option B would involve the closure of services on the Whittington Hospital site but remain open at the Royal Free site.
- In both cases, the services at UCLH, North Middlesex University Hospital (NMUH) and Barnet Hospital would remain in place.

The proposals were based on a case for improving services and meeting best practice standards against a backdrop of declining birth rates and increasing complexity of both women giving birth and babies who needed care. The changes were not about reducing funding and around £40m of capital investment had been earmarked for the remaining sites. The ICB strongly believed that, by having a smaller number of units, staffing resources could be better used to meet quality standards.

In addition, there were separate proposals for:

- The closure of the birthing suites at Edgware Birth Centre, due to declining use with only 34 births in the last financial year.
- The streamlining of pathways for paediatric surgical care with the consolidation of some surgical care at Great Ormond Street Hospital and day case surgery at UCLH.

The public consultation was due to run until 17th March with several events having taken place in Haringey already. There had been an unprecedented amount of hard-to-reach groups as part of the integrated impact assessment and the data was being used as part of the improvement programme. The Start Well team were keen to hear from a wide range of voluntary and community sector voices and any recommendations from the Panel on local groups would be welcomed.

Anna Stewart, Clare Dollery and Vicky Jones then responded to questions from the Panel:

- Cllr Connor expressed concerns about the existing provision of services given the latest CQC ratings for maternity services at the Whittington Hospital, which was rated as 'requires improvement' and at the NMUH, which was rated as 'inadequate'. Particular areas of concerns raised in the CQC report on the NMUH included staffing issues, a lack of detailed treatment records and failure to implement lessons learned from incidents.
 - Regarding the NMUH, Vicky Jones acknowledged that the CQC report highlighted failings that they were acting to rectify. The visit was in May 2023 and since then there had been a five-day visit from NHS England to inspect services and provide further insights. She also acknowledged that staffing was clearly a big issue, as highlighted in the report, but 20 new midwives had started in the department since then which had made a substantial difference to staffing levels. This had enabled additional focus on an appropriate level of training, sharing/embedding lessons when things had gone wrong and addressing pockets of poor culture that had been

identified in the report. There was also a specific piece of work on organisational development, including external support, which was being monitored on a monthly basis by the Board. Triage processes were being regularly audited to demonstrate compliance with standards. Overall, the issues described in the report were improving and this was demonstrated through audit data.

- Regarding the Whittington, Clare Dollery explained that key areas for improvement in the CQC report were completion of training modules for medical staff and safeguarding training, both of which were now in place, and risk assessing women attending triage, for which a systematic traffic light approach had been implemented and would soon be followed by moving onto the BSOTS national system. The leadership of the unit had received a 'good' rating and the good team working between obstetricians and midwives, including a co-mentoring programme, had been highlighted. She also cited the FGM clinic and the 'Ockenden cafes' initiative, which helped staff to discuss safety issues, as other examples of positive work.
- Anna Stewart added that NCL had an active maternity and neonatal system in which all the providers worked together to foster a learning environment and share good practice.
- Cllr Iyngkaran expressed some sympathy about the CQC ratings as the majority of maternity units nationally were rating as 'requires improvement' or 'inadequate'. However, he requested further details on what was being done to address staffing, culture, training and infrastructure issues and also about water births at NMUH.
 - Vicky Jones said that the increase in midwife numbers had gone a long way to manage shortages and that obstetrician staffing was good. There had been positive feedback about the culture of obstetricians and midwives working together. In terms of infrastructure there were very large rooms which were state of the art. Across the organisation, mandatory training was above the standard. There was still some life support training to complete where the target of 90% had nearly been reached. There had been a specific issue around training to ensure that everyone could undertake an evacuation of the water birth area if required and now all staff had completed that training.
 - Clare Dollery said that, in advance of the CQC inspection they had agreed to fund six new consultants, five of which were now in post with locums in other areas. On culture, the CQC report has acknowledged that staff felt supported, valued and respected, focused on the needs of women receiving care, promoted equality and diversity, provided opportunities for career development and had an open culture in which concerns could be raised. There was also positive commentary about working with Maternity Voices partners. With regards to mandatory training, the staff groups highlighted were all now compliant.

- Cllr Iyngkaran asked whether the Trusts had pushed back on the CQC ratings or any of the issues raised. Vicky Jones and Clare Dollery both said that the usual factual accuracy checks had been completed with corrective data provided to the CQC where necessary.
- Asked by Cllr Brennan for further details on the use of capital funds for modernisation, Anna Stewart explained that, under Option A, the vast majority of the funds would be used to upgrade the unit at the Whittington or, under Option B for the Royal Free. Under either option, some funds would also be made available for other hospitals and there was some additional capacity available at the NMUH that could be used for an increased flow of cases.
- Cllr Mason asked about recent complaints and any whistleblowing and also raised concerns about communications between staff on the ward and with patients.
 - Vicky Jones said that acting on complaints was important and that the Maternity Experience survey was a particularly useful source of feedback. The NMUH had only scored below average on 2 of the 36 questions and the scores had improved from previous years, including on communications issues. The NMUH was highly rated on partners being able to stay overnight on the ward which many families valued. On whistleblowing, the executive team had received letters from staff, but they had shared their names which was a positive sign that they felt able to highlight concerns directly. On communications, the obstetricians and midwives had regular discussions in huddles on safety issues and other points throughout the day.
 - Clare Dollery said that they thought deeply about complaints and how they could be used to improve. The Whittington also had results from the Maternity Experience survey and areas of improvement had included people feeling that they were given appropriate advice and support at the start of labour, information about risks during labour and feeling that their concerns were taken seriously. The CQC had said that the Whittington worked closely with Maternity Voices partnerships who could raise issues when required. They were also carrying out various training programmes, including for maternal and neonatal emergencies.
 - Anna Stewart added that the engagement with patient and resident groups, including specific concerns of various minority groups, was driving the thinking about changes and mitigations that would need to be put in place.
- Referring to pages 30 and 32 of the agenda pack, Cllr O'Donovan noted that under Option A there were projected to be 1,525 Haringey deliveries at NMUH but under Option B there would be 2,146 and asked how this additional capacity would be accommodated. Anna Stewart explained that the sizes of the units that would be closed were different with around 2,500 births per year at the Royal Free compared to just under 3,500 at the Whittington so there would be a larger redistribution under Option B where the Whittington would be closed. Not all cases would go to NMUH but it did have some spare capacity

that wasn't currently being used. There had been close working with the relevant Trusts on the modelling approach for both options.

- Asked by Cllr O'Donovan whether they could reach all the resident groups listed on page 48 of the agenda pack, Anna Stewart said that over 100 community meetings and staff meetings had been held across the five NCL boroughs and also Brent and Harrow, which could potentially be impacted by the changes. Some specific focus groups had also been commissioned through a specialist partner working with asylum seekers, homeless people and communities identified as being impacted geographically due to their proximity to the hospitals. There were also direct mailings to a significant sample of residents in these areas.
- Asked by Cllr Opoku how the ethnicities were defined, Anna Stewart said that these were based on the framing and terminology used by the specialist partner and that the modelling had involved looking at groups based on travel analysis and catchment areas and then overlaid with groups that had poorer outcomes in terms of maternal health.
- Cllr Peacock observed that there was an issue in the Northumberland Park area with Somali women not presenting for prenatal treatment. Anna Stewart confirmed that there had been two or three focus groups with Somali women with experience of using local services in Haringey.
- Cllr Iyngkaran queried the impact on residents of moving some paediatric services. Anna Stewart said that this had been covered in the integrated impact assessment and that, while there were cost implications in terms of travel, these cases typically involved children who were already being admitted quite far afield, including to the Royal London Hospital or the Chelsea & Westminster Hospital. Colleagues from emergency departments considered that the current pathway did not work well for staff or parents and so, through a surgical assessment unit, the pathway could be smoothed with automatic acceptance rather than staff going through a process of phoning around to find a bed.
- A local resident spoke about her experience as the parent of a disabled child who she said was failed by maternity services. She said that, due to the severe nature of her son's disability, they needed to make frequent journeys for appointments and asked about the impact on families such as hers if journey times would be longer and costs higher. Anna Stewart explained that the cases impacted by these changes were predominantly for one-off surgeries rather than for children with complex needs which was a separate pathway. The wider implications of the changes on families would be included in the report following the consultation.

Cllr Connor summed up the Panel's conclusions which included support for Option A as outlined in the report. She also reiterated concerns about the NCUH's CQC rating for maternity services and said that the Panel should continue to receive further information about the investment to improve

services at the NMUH and other hospitals as a result of this programme. Finally, she highlighted the need to consider any unintended consequences of the changes that might emerge from the consultation and, in particular, any concerns raised by residents about transport issues and how these would be offset. (ACTION)

50. AIDS & ADAPTATIONS - UPDATE

Kerine Smith, Acting Head of Service, introduced the report for this item which provided an update on progress against the recommendations on communication issues and delays previously made by the Panel in September 2022:

- A key action was on initial assessments and ensuring that the family was fully involved. The occupational therapists were now providing more regular updates with a 4-6 week pathway review including details on their position on the waiting list. An additional occupational therapist (OT) and occupational therapist assistant (OTA) had been recruited. The OTs were working closely with those within the adaptation process and there was also an adaptation delivery manager overseeing the process and providing further support.
- Another recommendation was for the Council to offer advocates and this was now being done at the assessment stage with residents referred to Voiceability, Disability Action Haringey, POWhER and Connected Communities.
- On the recommendation that key decisions should be confirmed in writing, a series of communication actions carried out by the service was provided in the report including a summary of input to the resident following an assessment/review, support plans and a copy of the OT specification.
- On the recommendations that delays should be explained to residents and that details of a named contact should be provided to residents, everyone on the waiting list had been contacted in the past year and the additional recruitment had improved capacity for individual communications with residents.
- On the recommendation that suggestions made by residents/families should be recorded on the case file, the new case management system enabled this to be recorded using bespoke forms.
- A recommendation on recording and communicating delays and timescales to residents had been addressed through a new recording system for all adult social services.
- On the recommendation about widening provider choices for aids and adaptations, it was noted that standard equipment was provided through a contract involving a consortium of 20 local authorities. Further details about this were provided in the report.

Kerine Smith responded to questions from the Panel:

- Asked by Cllr Connor about further reducing the waiting list, Kerine Smith explained that the waiting list was for the OT assessment after which the

recommendations were passed to the adaptation team which included the surveyors. In addition to the new recruitment, some of the OT assessments were being outsourced to speed this part of the process up.

- With reference to a specific case, Cllr lyngkaran queried what happened where a Haringey resident was discharged out of the Borough because their current home was unsuitable. Beverley Tarka, Director of Adults, Health & Communities, said that it was not generally the policy of the Council to place people out of Borough but that she would be happy to look into the details of the specific case outside of the meeting. Cllr Lucia das Neves, Cabinet Member for Health Social Care & Wellbeing, highlighted the impact of the housing crisis and that the Council was consequently in a position of having to place some residents out of Borough when other options were unavailable.
- A local resident with experience of using the aids and adaptations service for her disabled son, disagreed that the service had improved, citing further delays, poor communications, lack of record keeping and difficulties in obtaining the correct information in meetings or updates on questions/actions. Cllr Connor asked how the team approached complex cases such as this where coordination with various other services was a factor. Kerine Smith explained that the meetings were held with families, Council staff and other organisations involved with supporting the family. Jon Tomlinson, Senior Head of Service for Commissioning, Brokerage & Quality Assurance, added that the actions and improvement plan had been put in place to change processes that had previously not worked well, particularly with communication, keeping people informed and responding to the issues that they raised. Cllr das Neves commented that, while she it would not be appropriate to share details of an individual case in the meeting, there were some points raised that she would take up with the team outside of the meeting.
- A local resident involved with the same case observed that interruptions in continuity could be an issue with useful, detailed discussions having taken place before an individual leaves the service and the issues then not being followed up. Cllr das Neves acknowledged that communications were not always good enough and that she had heard the frustration in relation to complex cases. She added that the waiting list was very high following the pandemic but that there had been successful recruitment of more staff and the waiting list had now been halved, meaning that a lot of people now had their adaptation and that it was working.
- Cllr Mason referred to an individual case which involved the installation of a stairlift where the family had been waiting for 12 months and said that the length of the wait time had not been made clear at the outset. She recommended that a clear expectation of timescales should be set out following the initial assessment. Cllr Connor added that there should a clear explanation of any delays and that the resident should be given the opportunity to discuss any changes. **(ACTION)**

- Cllr Brennan observed that the proposed changes on communications, as set out in the report, appeared to be very positive but asked how successful implementation would be achieved. Jon Tomlinson said that there was a performance management team meeting each month and that these issues could potentially be built into that performance report. **(ACTION)** Kerine Smith added that an Aids & Adaptations Board had recently been created to meet regularly and develop an action plan to deliver changes.
- Cllr Brennan asked about the use of agencies for advocacy and Cllr O'Donovan added that it was important to ensure that organisations providing advocacy services were active and well resourced. Beverley Tarka explained that advocacy services in Haringey, such as POWhER, Voiceability and Disability Action Haringey, were commissioned by the Council. She also noted that many people chose to use a family member to act as their advocate. Cllr das Neves added that, while the Council generally pursued a policy of insourcing, this was an example of a service where its users valued the independence brought by an external organisation. Kerine Smith confirmed that all those who took up the offer of an advocate were provided with one so there was not a shortage in terms of resourcing.
- A local resident highlighted the significant demands placed on Disability Action Haringey from casework such as the complex issues relating to her family's case. Cllr das Neves responded that there was an issue about the sustainability of organisations such as this and that there were ongoing conversations with partner organisations about the different activities that they were called upon to do and how they should be supported.
- Helena Kania asked whether an electronic record was kept when a family member or friend was acting as an advocate. Kerine Smith confirmed that their system included a section for the details of the main person that should be contacted in relation to the case and that there was an option to select 'advocate' on the field showing the relationship status to the client.
- A local resident commented that it was the OT's responsibility to write their report, including specifications, and send this to the resident but queried what process was in place to record this and ensure that it happened. Kerine Smith explained that these details were recorded on the case management system and that OTs and surveyors got supervision once a month where each of their cases was looked at and any necessary actions followed up. Cllr O'Donovan noted that some timescales for this were set out on page 69 of the agenda pack. Kerine Smith responded that the some of the exact specifications for timescales were still being worked on. Cllr Connor recommended that timescales should be specified, including details of actions to be taken if these timescales were exceeded, should be provided to the Panel. **(ACTION)** Cllr Brennan suggested that automated alerts could be added on an electronic system to trigger actions. Jon Tomlinson agreed to look into this further and

commented that this could be picked up in the performance report process that he mentioned previously. **(ACTION)**

- Noting the progress cited in the report on individual communications with residents about the adaptation process, Cllr Connor asked about the timescales and monitoring for this. Kerine Smith said that residents were now contacted every 4-6 weeks to provide an update on where they were in the process. This had been made possible by the recruitment of the new OTAs and an adaptation delivery manager. Asked by Cllr Iyngkaran about the total number of active cases, Kerine Smith said that there were 289 cases on the waiting list. She added that, in March 2023, there had been 448 cases on the waiting list and that a piece of work was carried out to call all of them to provide an update. The further update calls every 4-6 weeks were a follow-up measure implemented after this initial work. These calls were primarily to update residents on where they were in the process but were also an opportunity to review any issues, for example if the resident's needs had changed.
- A local resident commented that her preference was not to be contacted on a mobile phone as record keeping was more difficult and that it was important to keep an audit trail. Asked by Cllr Connor about the records of update phone calls, Kerine Smith said that these were added to the case management system. She confirmed that the preferred method of contact could also be specified on the case management system.
- Asked by Helena Kania about the recommendation to provide residents with a named person and contact details for their case, Kerine Smith confirmed that this was now happening, initially for the OT and then for the surveyor when the case reached that stage.
- Regarding the recommendation that suggestions made by residents/families should be recorded on the case file, Cllr Connor commented that this could be complicated when there were differences of opinion on how a case should progress. Kerine Smith explained that the initial meetings would involve the client (and their advocate if required), the OT and the surveyor and then, if agreement on a decision was not reached, then a panel meeting would be set up involving managers to look at the options and determine the best way forward. Beverley Tarka referred to a previous complex case where a family representative had been invited to participate in the panel meeting and it had led to a positive outcome.
- Cllr O'Donovan commented that, if there were undue delays, there should be a trigger for action to be taken. Cllr Iyngkaran asked whether apologies and/or compensation is provided to residents in such cases. Kerine Smith said that, where a complaint was received, and it was accepted that it was the fault of the Council then apologies were made and she confirmed that there had been circumstances where compensation had been paid.
- A local resident cited an example in her family's case where an item had been cancelled without being reordered but that this had not been communicated to

them. Cllr Connor highlighted the importance of keeping residents updated about changes relevant to their case.

- Cllr Opoku commented that service user representation could help with improvements to services and asked whether this had been considered for the new Aids & Adaptations Board. Kerine Smith explained that the Board had only just been set up and that a recent meeting had been held to discuss terms of reference and who would be involved. There was no service user involvement yet at this stage, but any future involvement had not yet been determined. Cllr Connor added that some residents may not know or may not have the confidence to put in complaints or escalate cases and asked how the experience of residents such as this would be considered. Kerine Smith responded that a future planned initiative was to hold a workshop with residents to look at their journeys and the issues that they had encountered. Cllr Connor emphasised the importance of providing feedback to residents who had participated in a workshop about the changes that were being implemented as a result of their input. **(ACTION)**
- Asked by Cllr Iyngkaran about the internal processes for learning lessons from mistakes, Beverley Tarka explained that there was a Quality Assurance Board that examined complaints and considered how issues could be prevented from happening again.
- Asked by a local resident how local ward Councillors provided feedback from their conversations with carers and others, Cllr Connor explained that she would regularly submit issues on specific cases or concerns raised about services through the Council's Members Enquiry system. Cllr das Neves added that she met with Cllr Connor on a monthly basis and that she often received feedback from residents via these meetings. She would also receive feedback on these issues from other Councillors and from community engagement events such as roving surgeries or meetings with faith leaders and others.
- Asked by Cllr Connor whether it was possible to commission enough services through the contract involving a consortium of London local authorities, Jon Tomlinson said that they were currently working with a newly appointed manager in this area on how to widen choice and would need to come back to the Panel with some further details in due course. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr O'Donovan requested details of when the draft Aids and Adaptations Policy 2024-27 would be finalised and it was agreed that this information would be provided to the Panel in writing. **(ACTION)**

Cllr Connor then moved to invoke Committee Standing Order 63 to allow Committee Standing Order 18 to be suspended and allow the meeting to continue after 10pm. This was to complete the business on the agenda. The Panel agreed this motion without dissent.

RESOLVED – The Panel recommended that:

- A clear explanation of any delays to be provided to residents and the resident to be given the opportunity to discuss any changes.
- Feedback to be provided to residents who had participated in a workshop about the changes that were being implemented as a result of their input.
- Successful implementation of proposed changes on communications to be monitored (potentially built into the monthly performance management report).
- Details to be provided on how the coordination of complex cases involving multiple services will be managed.
- Target timescales for a standard adaptation to be specified, including details of actions to be taken if these timescales were exceeded (including the possible use of automated alerts), to be provided to the Panel.
- Details to be provided about how services could be commissioned through the NRS contract to widen choice.
- Details to be provided of when the draft Aids and Adaptations Policy 2024-27 would be finalised.

51. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS

Cllr Lucia das Neves, Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Well-being, responded to questions from the Panel on issues related to her portfolio:

- Cllr Mason asked about the future of the Burgoyne Road project which she had understood had been due to replace two women's refuges in Hornsey which were no longer fit for purpose. Cllr das Neves noted that Burgoyne Road was no longer in her portfolio as it now sat with Housing. She explained that the main difficulty with the project was that the funding required from the GLA was no longer forthcoming and agreed to provide a written response on refuge provision for women, which may require input from Cllr Williams as Cabinet Member for Housing Services. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr O'Donovan raised concerns that life expectancy in Haringey had gone down and was now amongst the worst in London and observed that factors may include Covid, poverty and air quality. Cllr das Neves agreed that this was worrying and added that 'healthy life expectancy' rates and the gap in rates between the west and east of the Borough were also causes for concern. She added that the impact of poverty on this was a large multi-faceted issue and advocated the development of a 'Marmot' approach nationally to tackle health inequalities. Will Maimaris, Director for Public Health, said that Covid deaths in Haringey had been relatively low compared to statistical neighbours. However, the broader picture in terms of life expectancy related to poverty and issues such as housing. The male life expectancy had gone down in particular. Further details were available in the Council's annual public health reports which Will Maimaris would circulate for information. **(ACTION)** Cllr das Neves highlighted the impact of 'long Covid' on people's health, particularly those with multiple health conditions.
- In response to a request from Cllr Iyngkaran for an update on Canning Crescent, Cllr das Neves reported that she had recently signed a decision to

give the contract to an organisation to finish the project because the previous contractor had gone voluntarily bankrupt. However, the new organisation had also now gone voluntarily bankrupt so the project was back in the same situation and future options were being discussed. A lot of local authorities were seeing these issues with contractors at present due to economic circumstances.

- Asked by Cllr Iyngkaran about the uptake of the measles vaccine in Haringey, Will Maimaris explained that there was some concern about the increase in measles cases nationally and in London and acknowledged that vaccination rates were low in London and parts of Haringey. He had previously circulated a briefing on this to all Councillors which he would recirculate. **(ACTION)** This included information about communications campaigns and targeted work in areas with low take-up rates.
- Cllr das Neves reported that Haringey had the highest rate of flu vaccinations in schools in North Central London because of the partnership work with schools from the public health team.
- In response to a question from Cllr Connor about Osborne Grove Nursing Home, Cllr das Neves confirmed that the process had been paused for two years and would then be reconsidered. She added that they would be working with an external organisation on best practice, training and support for co-production. On communication with the existing co-production group, she wished to place on record that the group had been contacted in mid-2023 regarding the problems with the project, but a suitable date could not be found and this was regrettably not then picked up in the autumn. Cllr Connor requested that further information be provided to the Panel about the co-production work on best practice when this became available. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr Connor raised concerns about the use of physician associate positions in GP practices. Cllr das Neves acknowledged that there had been a tragic case of a death in the Borough relating to this issue. She was concerned that there was a shortage of GPs and emphasised the importance of patients understanding the role of the person they were seeing when using a GP practice as there were rules that patients should not be seen twice by a physician associate except in certain circumstances. Cllr das Neves added that she had written to the ICB about the role of physician associates and they had agreed to discuss this at the Health and Wellbeing Board. She also added that there was a role for physician associates, but that this required the right kind of oversight and that it was important to learn from GP practices with good practice in this area.
- Cllr Mason drew attention to a recent report stating that Haringey had the largest number of low paid workers in London. Cllr das Neves suggested that this could be examined further by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

52. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

It was noted that a further evidence session for the Panel's scrutiny review on hospital discharge would be taking place the following week.

53. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Meeting dates for 2024/25 will be published shortly.

CHAIR: Councillor Pippa Connor

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF MEETING Climate, Community Safety & Culture Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Tuesday, 27th February, 2024

PRESENT:

Councillors: Culverwell, George Dunstall, Gina Adamou, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Simmons-Safo (Chair), Ibrahim Ali and Carroll

11. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings and this information was noted.

12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence was received from Councillor Cawley-Harrison.

13. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

14. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest

15. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

There were no deputation, petitions, presentations, questions.

16. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Climate, Community Safety and Culture Panel held on the 19th December 2023 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

17. COMMUNITY SAFETY AND HATE CRIME STRATEGY

Councillor Jogee, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Cohesion, introduced the item and highlighted the importance and collaborative development involved in the production of the strategy with its various stakeholders. He thanked individuals involved in the process and noted the significant community engagement, with over 1000 locals who had participated. Councillor Jogee emphasised the joint endorsement of the strategy by the police and outlined its key themes and objectives. He mentioned that while the Hate Crime strategy did not require full council approval, it would be presented to the full council to note.

The following points were noted in the discussion:

- Councillor Ali welcomed the strategy but raised concerns about boosting reporting in communities with low engagement. He highlighted successful initiatives in the Jewish community regarding reporting issues with antisemitism and urged similar strategies elsewhere. Seeking clarity on plans, Councillor Jogee emphasised councillors' role in advocating reporting and ongoing efforts to enhance effectiveness. He underscored the strategy's adaptability and the importance of reporting in securing funds and challenging stereotypes and affirmed a commitment to address issues ahead.
- Councillor Ali expressed concerns about unequal treatment of hate crimes by police sections and stressed the need to build confidence in reporting. Councillor Jogee emphasised the council's role as a critical friend to the police and advocated for open engagement. He noted the alignment between councillors' concerns and earlier discussions which would inform plans in the future.
- Councillor Gina Adamou inquired about monitoring the report's progress and potential to revisit or make amendments. Joe Benmore, Integrated Lead for Offender Management, stated that there would be an annually reviewed action plan following the report at the Community Safety Partnership Board.
- The Chair inquired about police visibility and effectiveness in addressing recurring crime in hotspot areas. Councillor Jogee emphasised community leaders' role in informing and holding the police accountable. Council officers' communication role was noted, along with the need for adequate police resources and the new Metropolitan Police plan to restore neighbourhood policing. Ultimately, the police were responsible for addressing crime and the Council had a role in engagement and information sharing.
- The Chair inquired about measures in place to ensure the police were held to account in the implementation of the new Metropolitan Police plan for London in response to the Baroness Casey Review. Councillor Jogee responded and highlighted the role of the Police as critical friends to the Council and highlighted the importance in communication of the council priorities and resident concerns. There was an emphasis on the need for open dialogue, addressing frustrations, and collaborating with various agencies to tackle challenges effectively. Ultimately, ensuring their voices are heard in discussions and building necessary links and communications.
- The Chair asked about the outreach strategy to ensure proactive engagement with marginalised communities beyond just Community Safety. In response, Councillor Jogee praised the inclusivity of the consultation process, directing attention to the feedback report for specifics. Additionally, he highlighted the importance of providing multiple opportunities for councillors to contribute.
- Councillor Dunstall inquired about trust and confidence in the police and council, and highlighted impacts across various areas. Councillor Jogee responded that trust and confidence are frequently discussed issues, particularly concerning community diversity and safety. The Metropolitan Police Commissioner's plan to restore neighbourhood policing, aimed to strengthen trust. It was emphasised that the community safety and hate crime strategy aims to provide a framework for addressing these concerns rather than providing direct answers.
- Ian Sygrave raised concerns about the uncertainty residents face in reporting incidents and the lack of clarity on the best reporting methods. The importance of clear guidelines to ensure all incidents are recorded effectively was also emphasised.

Councillor Jogee acknowledged the issue of underreporting and highlighted the strategy's framework as a solution to address reporting challenges.

- Councillor Ali inquired about the focus on third-party reporting going forward and suggested the establishment of centres in trusted community locations. Councillor Jogee indicated that this would be taken further with the team to develop a structure for community input on this aspect.

ACTIONS:

Circulate The feedback report for the draft community safety strategy and hate crime strategy which includes table A.

RESOLVED:

The Climate, Community Safety and Culture Panel resolved:

1. That the Scrutiny Board note the content of the accompanying presentation, which highlights the key findings from the Community Safety and Hate Crime Public engagement and consultation that took place in 2023.
2. That the Board note the next steps including Cabinet Approval to take the Community Safety Strategy to Full Council for approval in March 2024.

18. DOCKLESS BIKES - TRANSPORT PLANNING

Councillor Hakata, Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment, and Transport and Deputy Leader of the Council introduced the report on Dockless Bikes, Transport and Planning. The report provided an update on the rollout of dockless bikes as part of the wider initiative to transition from car-based transportation to active sustainable travel. The report emphasised the benefits of dockless bikes in promoting active lifestyles and addressing climate change impacts. Councillor Hakata updated the panel on the next steps which included to launch the dockless bike scheme and publicise the date widely, to monitor feedback and make necessary adjustments to bike locations and pricing and to ensure ongoing communication and transparency with the community regarding the scheme.

The following points were noted in the discussion:

- Councillor Ali, raised concerns about the pricing of the bikes and inquired about concessions for specific groups. Hakata addressed this by highlighting the initial free period and discounts for students and key workers.
- There was disappointment expressed regarding the placement of bike stations and lack of early engagement on location selection. Hakata assured ongoing feedback mechanisms and short-term adjustments based on community input.
- On E-Bike friendly areas, members discussed the suitability of certain areas for e-bikes, suggesting utilising more road space rather than pavements.
- A comparison table of pricing among operators was suggested to clarify pricing and concession details.
- Clear messaging regarding concessions and pricing variations to users, including information on subscription options and associated fees, was discussed.
- The availability of concessions through various channels, including social media, websites, and signage at bike stations, was considered.
- Mechanisms for users to easily identify concession options and access relevant information, such as through mobile apps or websites, were proposed.

- Councillor Dunstall raised concerns about the cost, highlighting that Lime bikes were initially free or inexpensive upon launch. He inquired if this pricing model could be maintained for a longer duration. It was clarified that the pricing structure is outlined in the tender and agreement for the initial 24 months, with no certainty beyond that period due to contractual obligations.
- Assurance was given regarding improved arrangements with Lime, providing the council with greater influence moving forward. Lime had been enabled to deploy the bikes with plans to make a formal announcement through a clear press release.
- Councillor Carroll shared experiences from other boroughs where the rollout of bikes led to tensions in the community, particularly regarding access to pavements. Concerns were raised about the impact on wheelchair users and individuals with buggies due to limited space. Steps were acknowledged to address these concerns, with hopes for improved outcomes.
- Councillor Hakata acknowledged that there was a need for infrastructure development and noted there had been a notable shift towards cycling in recent year.

ACTIONS:

- To circulate a comparison table of pricing among operators.
- To arrange feedback meetings with relevant stakeholders.
- To publicise the launch date of the dockless bike scheme widely.
- To ensure clear communication channels for reporting issues with bike usage.
- To Organise walkabouts for community feedback.

RESOLVED:

The contents of the report were noted for information.

19. WARD LEVEL DATE - ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR (ASB) OVERVIEW

Joe Benmore, IOM Strategic Lead introduced a presentation on the ward level data for Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) review. The presentation highlighted that between February 2023 and January 2024, Haringey recorded a total of 10,220 ASB incidents, ranking the borough 12th in London for ASB volume. The rate of ASB per 1,000 population in Haringey was 34.6, surpassing the London average by 18%. Notably, Bruce Castle ward stood out with the highest volume (1,083 incidents) and rate (74.9 per 1,000 population) of ASB among all Haringey wards. Common types of ASB identified included Rowdy/Inconsiderate Behaviour, Rowdy/Nuisance Neighbours, ASB Nuisance, Noise, and Vehicle Nuisance. Additionally, it was observed that ASB tended to peak during the summer months compared to winter in Haringey. Lower levels were recorded during winter months, especially January/February.

The police utilised the Council's CCTV control room for key operations, focusing on drugs and serious crime. CCTV operators collaborated closely with the police, waste enforcement, and the ASB enforcement team. There were improvements in CCTV partnership working across and beyond the ERE, resulting in an increased number of fines for fly-tipping incidents and overall enforcement actions. Additionally, two fly-tipping vehicles were seized based on Council CCTV evidence. A hate crime incident was also captured on Council CCTV, leading to the identification and arrest of the suspect.

The following points were noted in the discussion:

- Councillor Ali proposed the idea of providing ward councillors with information about hotspot areas. This would help address community perceptions and ensure transparency. Additionally, it would enable the dissemination of any mitigating actions taken by the police to keep residents informed.
- Councillor Ali recommended incorporating year-by-year comparisons in future presentations to provide a comprehensive overview of trends. Additionally, there was a suggestion for including more detailed information about the types and locations of anti-social behaviour (ASB). This entails distilling ASB occurrences and identifying specific areas affected. For instance, there may be cultural acceptance of low-level drug offenses in certain areas, highlighting the need to address perceptions and promote change.
- The Chair inquired about the demographic of the perpetrators of anti-social behaviour (ASB) and stressed the importance of including this information in the report, emphasising its crucial role in determining response priorities. Understanding the demographics could inform how services are allocated and tailored. Joe informed the panel that currently, this information is not available as it is extracted from police data. However, he noted that efforts could be made to request additional data from the police to address this gap.
- Councillor Dunstall raised concerns about residents submitting complaints through the council portal and not receiving any feedback. He suggested implementing clear response timeframes, such as assessing complaints within 24 hours and resolving them within 5 days. Additionally, Councillor Dunstall inquired about data on the council's performance against these commitments. In response, Councillor Jogee proposed reviewing the statistics and providing an update on improving the response process for the next meeting.

ACTIONS:

- To look into requesting additional data around demographic of ASB perpetrators from the police.
- To review existing statistics around complaint handling from residents and to present at the next meeting, along with proposals for improving the response process and providing an update on progress.

RESOLVED:

- The content of the presentation was noted for information.

20. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

There were no significant updates to the work programme

21. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

22. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

It was noted that the next meeting of the Climate, , Community Safety and Culture Panel would be held on Tuesday 25th June 2024. This date is subject to confirmation at full Council in March 2024.

CHAIR: Councillor Michelle Simmons-Safo

Signed by Chair

Date

MINUTES OF MEETING Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Tuesday, 5th March, 2024, 7.00 - 9.15 pm

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Makbule Gunes (Chair), Anna Abela, Marsha Isilar-Gosling,
Sue Jameson and Grosskopf**

ALSO ATTENDING:

37. 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.

38. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for Absence were received from Lourdes Keever and Yvonne Denny.

Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Abela.

Cllr Adamou joined the meeting online.

39. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

41. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

42. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting on 4th January were agreed as a correct record.

43. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, EDUCATION AND FAMILIES

The Panel received a short verbal update from Cllr Zena Brabazon, Cabinet Member for Children, Schools & Families on recent developments within her portfolio. This was followed by a Q&A session with the Panel members. The key points put forward by the Cabinet Member in her introduction are summarised below:

- The Council underwent a three-week SEND inspection shortly after the Christmas holidays. Verbal feedback was given and the inspection report was expected to be published at the end of March. The Cabinet Member thanked Amanda Bernard and SEND Power for their participation and collaboration during the inspection. The Cabinet Member set out that co-production had been how Children's Services operated.
- Corporate Parenting Week took place last week and the Cabinet Member commented that it was a wonderful event that culminated in an awards ceremony for the foster parents. The Cabinet Member was effusive in her praise of the foster parents, the tremendous work they did, and the love and care that they showed the children.
- The Cabinet Member set out that the Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee had really moved forward. They were participating in a champions project, where members had taken an area of interest and acted as an advisor/critical friend around children's social care.
- The first Youth at Risk conference took place at Spurs. It was reported that this event was well attended by partners and that they received a data presentation by the police.
- A event with school governors had taken place. The Cabinet Member welcomed this, but advised that there was a lot of work to do to support school governors in what was a very difficult time for school finances.
- An event with SEND Power took place which focused on mainstream education for SEND children. The event was attended by around 30 parents and a number of head teachers.

The following arose during the Q&A session with the Cabinet Member:

- a. The Panel queried the extent to which it was possible to match a child with a foster parent who wanted a long term placement, and the extent to which this was done with children and young people who had additional care needs. In response, officers advised that the Council adopted a therapeutic approach when matching placements, particularly those which involved children who were using CAMHS. Reassurance was provided that social workers were mindful of where strong relationships had been developed with foster carers. Following, the required assessments taking place, foster carers could apply for adoption or Special Guardianship. Where it was right for the child the Council would support the child to move on to another placement. The DCS reiterated that all decisions were driven by the needs of the child first and foremost.
- b. The Panel sought assurances about whether the Council had a process in place for Jewish foster placements. In response, officers advised that there were existing links with the Charedi community and that they were working to move forward on a more formalised process, but that this had met a few challenges. Officers advised that they were working hard to develop a diverse

- group of foster carers. In response to a clarification, officers suggested that the key challenge was around a national paucity of foster parents.
- c. In response to a follow-up question about the diversity of foster placements, the Cabinet Member advised that the foster carer event was very representative of the different communities in Haringey and that she was very proud of the diversity of the borough's foster carers. Officers advised that it was important that the borough had a wide pool of foster carers to reflect its communities, but that there were also circumstances where children needed to be moved very quickly. The Cabinet Member suggested that there were no hard and fast rules and that some foster parents looked like the children they cared for and some did not. It was emphasised that it was the courts who made a decision about whether a child was in danger and needed to be moved on, not the child's social worker.
 - d. The Panel sought assurances about what the biggest challenges were over the next six months. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that a lack of money in the system was the biggest challenge. There was simply not enough money in the education system. Schools were funded on a per pupil basis and so funding levels for future years were variable, these would largely be determined by the number of children in the borough.
 - e. The Panel sought assurances around permanent social workers, and comments were made around the parents of SEND children found it very difficult when social workers who were on temporary contracts moved on. The Panel queried whether there was a portal that could be used by parents to logon and check the details of their social worker. In response, the Panel was advised that the Council had moved from the previous Mosaic system to Liquid Logic. The new system had an add-on for a portal that could be accessed by parents with a child with an Educational Health and Care Plan. The portal would be orientated towards professionals and parents being able to access it. It was commented that the timescales for implementation were between 12 and 18 months.
 - f. The Panel emphasised the need to ensure that parents and carers were consulted on the design of how the portal would work. Officers set out that it was an existing system that had already been developed, it wasn't being designed from scratch, as such it had already undergone extensive user testing.

RESOLVED

Noted.

44. PRIVATE FOSTERING SEPTEMBER 2022-23

The Panel received a report which provided an update on private fostering notifications, assessments, and monitoring activity, and also provided a level of assurance to members that privately fostered children were being adequately safeguarded. The update covered the period from September 2022-23. The report was introduced by Keith Warren, Head of Children in Care & Placements, as set out in

the agenda pack at pages 9-16. Cllr Brabazon, Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families was also present for this item, along with the Director of Children's Services. The following arose during the discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel queried what incentives there were for people to come forward and notify the Council of their private fostering arrangements. In response, officers advised that the incentive was that the Council would provide them with a social worker who they would meet on a six-weekly basis to ensure the child's support needs were being met. In relation to a follow-up question, the Director acknowledged that people did not automatically associate that having another person's children staying with them for the summer constituted a private fostering arrangement. In this example, the child would not be in school and there would be limited interactions between that child and the state. It was acknowledged that part of the problem was around identifying children who were under private fostering arrangements and the challenge was to raise awareness of this through schools, GPs, hospitals and faith groups.
- b. The Panel sought clarification on whether private fostering arrangements came to the fostering or adoption panels, and whether councillors still sat on that panel. In response, officers advised that private adoptions were a separate process as they involved a family arrangement, and therefore those cases did not come to the fostering panel. The Cabinet Member advised that both the fostering and adoption panel still existed and that she sat on the fostering panel. The adoption panel was organised on a regional basis and the Cabinet Member advised that she was unsure of how Member representation on this was organised.
- c. The Panel commented that in terms of a social worker being an incentive, that many people may not see this as an incentive and may see this as a negative judgement on them. In response, the Director advised that the key selling point of private fostering arrangements should be seen as the safety and care of the child and emphasised that Members should encourage people to make a referral to Children's services if they were involved in a private fostering arrangement.
- d. In relation to SEND fostering needs, officers set out that any child with additional needs that was part of a private fostering arrangement would be treated the same as any other members of the child population when it came to access to SEND services.
- e. In response to a request for clarification about the regional adoption arrangements, officers advised that previously every local authority had its own in-house adoption agency but that this was changed in around 2016 when the government brought in regional clusters of adoption agencies. Haringey was part of the London North cluster and the lead authority was Islington. Lydia Samuels already brought an annual adoption report to CPAC. The Cabinet Member suggested that the report could be brought to the Panel in future if Members wished.

RESOLVED

Noted.

45. SOCIAL CARE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE 2022/2023

The Panel received a report which provided an overview of safeguarding and looked after children activity and performance for 2022/2023. The report was introduced by Ann Graham, Director of Children's Services as set out in the report pack at pages 21-40. The Panel noted that the AD for Social Care and Safeguarding had given her apologies for the meeting and that any questions that required a detailed response would have to be responded to in writing. The following arose during the discussion of this report:

- a. The Chair welcomed the report and highlighted the fact that the report identified that child poverty levels in Haringey were the 8th highest in London and suggested that this was something that the Panel may want to have a more detailed update on in future.
- b. The Chair also noted the number of children who were in contact with the police and suggested that at a future meeting members may want an update on how the Council and its partners were supporting children who came into contact with domestic violence.
- c. The Panel sought further information about what the strategy was for supporting children with SEND needs as they made the transition to adulthood. The Panel commented that they were concerned about cases of young people falling through the net and that they would like to better understand how future transition pathways would be improved through a dedicated transition service. In response, the DCS advised the report was specifically focused on children but that she was happy to have a discussion about this issue outside of the meeting.
- d. The Panel queried the statement in paragraph 9.8.5 of the report, which stated that 80% of children were placed within 20 miles of Haringey. In response, officers advised that this was a performance indicator set by central government and that 20 miles was the maximum. This would also include children placed in neighbouring boroughs. The DCS also emphasised that that a placement would be made based on what was best for the child, and that there were situations where that child's family might be in another city and being placed out of London was best for the child.

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the report and, in particular:

- i. Noted the service improvement and challenges contained within the report as well as the actions taken during 2022/23 in response to local demand and the financial pressures experienced by the service in relation to placements.
- ii. Noted the areas identified as priorities for 2023/24 following analysis and review of the year's performance and the Ofsted findings as published in April 2023.

46. LOOKED AFTER CHILDREN SUFFICIENCY STRATEGY 2022/26: PROGRESS REPORT

The Panel received a presentation, which provided a progress update on the Looked After Children Sufficiency Strategy 2022-26. The strategy had previously been considered by Corporate Parenting Advisory Committee in February. The presentation was introduced by Keith Warren, Head of CIC & Placements as set out in the additional report pack. The Director of Children Services, along with the AD Early Help and Prevention were present for this item. The Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families was also present. The following arose during the discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel sought clarification around unaccompanied asylum seeking children (UASC), the psychological impact on those children and the carrying out of age assessments. In response, officers advised that the service followed all of the relevant guidelines and legislation. Age assessments were carried out in line with the relevant guidelines and were carried out by trained staff. These assessments were also open to challenge by the child's family. The DCS emphasised that the process was absolutely carried out in a child-centric way.
- b. The Panel queried the age cut-off point for children in care and the transition arrangements for when they were no longer children. In response, officers advised that young people were classed as children in care up until the age of 18. After 18, they leave care and become young adults. The Council continued to support care leavers, according to criteria, up until they are 25, such as supporting them with a disability or if they go to university. The DCS advised that from 14 onwards, social workers would begin to have conversations with young people, about them getting older. It was noted that the Council had a statutory duty to know where its care leavers were after 18, and that all support did not just stop on the advent of their 18th birthday.
- c. The Panel sought clarification about the reduction in LAC numbers and the reasons behind this. In response, the DCS advised that significant improvement in the early years' service had an impact, but that there were a number of factors involved. The Director emphasised that the number of children in care was the number, and that it didn't really matter if it went up or down. The key thing was that the right number of children, who needed to be in care were in care. If the numbers increased or decreased significantly, she would be asking her staff to do an audit of every child in care to make sure the right number of children were in care.
- d. In response to a question around training for foster carers for UASC, officers advised that that the care needs of a child were universal and that training was provided to foster carers. The key difference would be when that child had suffered trauma and specialist support was available for those children.
- e. The Panel emphasized the importance of overnight respite care for parents, particularly those with SEND children. Officers advised that previously there had been overnight care arrangements available, officers were working to find alternative provision and would update members when they had something in place.

RESOLVED

Noted

47. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Chair passed on her thanks to Lourdes Keever, who had sat on the Panel since 2019 as a co-opted Member.

RESOLVED

Noted

48. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

49. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

It was noted that this was the last meeting of the municipal year. Dates for 2024/25 would be agreed at Annual Council on 20th May.

CHAIR: Councillor Makbule Gunes

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 June 2024

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

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**), Protocol for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and its Panels (**Appendix B**), and the Protocol for non-voting co-opted Members on Scrutiny Panels (**Appendix C**);
 - (b) Establish the following Scrutiny Panels for 2024/25:
 - Adults and Health;
 - Children and Young People;
 - Climate, Community Safety and Environment; and
 - Housing, Planning and Development;
 - (c) Approve the remits and membership for each Scrutiny Panel for 2024/25 (**Appendix D**); and
 - (d) That Cllr Matt White and Cllr Pippa Connor be appointed as the two Haringey representatives to the North Central London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2024/25.

3. Reasons for decision

- 3.1 The terms of reference and membership of the scrutiny panels above 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 2024/25 will be:
- Cllr Matt White (Chair);
 - Cllr Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair);
 - Cllr Makbule Gunes;
 - Cllr Lester Buxton;
 - Cllr Alexandra Worrell.
- 4.2 The Committee will also include statutory education representatives, who shall have voting rights solely on education matters.
- 4.3 The terms of reference and role of the OSC is set out in Part Two (Article 6), Part Three (Section B) and Part Four (Section G) of the Council's Constitution. Together, these specify 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.
- 4.5 In addition, there is a Protocol (**Appendix C**) for non-voting co-opted scrutiny Members on scrutiny panels. The purpose of this is to ensure openness and transparency in their appointment and clarify their role.

5. Scrutiny Panels

- 5.1 Article 6 of the Constitution states the OSC shall appoint Scrutiny Panels in order to discharge the Overview and Scrutiny role.
- 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 proportionate 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 The proposed 2024/25 membership for the four Scrutiny Panels is listed below.

| Scrutiny Panel | Membership |
|---|---|
| Adults and Health | Cllr Pippa Connor (Chair), Cllr Cathy Brennan; Cllr Thayahlan Iyngkaran; Cllr Mary Mason; Cllr Sean O'Donovan; Cllr Felicia Opoku; Cllr Sheila Peacock. |
| Children and Young People | Cllr Makbule Gunes (Chair), Cllr Anna Abela; Cllr Gina Adamou; Cllr Anna Lawton; Cllr Mark Grosskopf; Cllr Marsha Isilar-Gosling; Cllr George Dunstall. |
| Climate, Community Safety and Environment | Cllr Lester Buxton (Chair); Cllr Gina Adamou; Cllr Liam Carroll; Cllr Eldridge Culverwell; Cllr Ibrahim Ali; Cllr George Dunstall; Cllr Luke Cawley Harrison. |
| Housing, Planning and Development | Cllr Alexandra Worrell (Chair); Cllr Dawn Barnes; Cllr John Bevan; Cllr Isidoros Diakides; Cllr Holly Harrison-Mullane; Cllr Tammy Hymas; Cllr Khaled Moyeed. |
| 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. | |

5.4 The policy areas to be covered by the four existing Scrutiny Panels are attached at **Appendix D**, together with the relevant portfolio holders for each scrutiny body.

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 Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Haringey and Islington;
- 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 Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Haringey and Islington;
- 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.

6.4 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.

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 Two (Article 6), Part Three (Section B), and Part Four (Section G) of the Constitution of the London Borough of Haringey.

Appendix B - Scrutiny Protocol

Appendix C - Protocol for Non-Voting Co-opted Scrutiny Members

Appendix D - Overview & Scrutiny Remits and Membership 2024/25

10. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

N/A

APPENDIX A

PART TWO – ARTICLES OF THE CONSTITUTION

Last updated 24 July 2017

Article 6 - Overview and Scrutiny

6.01 Terms of reference

The Council will appoint an Overview and Scrutiny Committee to discharge the functions conferred by section 9F of the Local Government Act 2000, the Health & Social Care Act 2001 and the NHS Reform & Health Professionals Act 2002.

6.02. General role

Within its terms of reference, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee may:

- (a) Exercise an overview of the forward plan;
- (b) Review or scrutinise decisions made or actions taken in connection with the discharge of any of the Cabinet's or Council's functions;
- (c) Make reports and recommendations to the full Council, the Cabinet or relevant non-Executive Committee in connection with the discharge of any functions;
- (d) Make reports or recommendations on matters affecting the area or its inhabitants;
- (e) Exercise the right to call-in, for reconsideration, key decisions made but not yet implemented by the Executive;
- (f) Receive the reports and recommendations of its commissioned Scrutiny Review Panels; and
- (g) In accordance with statutory regulations to review and scrutinise matters relating to the health service within the Authority's area and to make reports and recommendations thereon to local NHS bodies;
- (h) 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.

6.03 Specific functions

(a) Scrutiny Review Panels.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall appoint Scrutiny Review Panels in order to discharge the Overview and Scrutiny role for designated public services and will co-ordinate their respective roles.

(b) Policy development and review.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and any Scrutiny Review Panels it may establish may:

- (i) Assist the Council and the Cabinet in the development of its budget and policy framework by in-depth analysis of policy issues;
- (ii) Conduct research, community and other consultation in the analysis of policy issues and possible options;
- (iii) Consider and implement mechanisms to encourage and enhance community participation in the development of policy options;
- (iv) Question members of the Cabinet and chief officers about their views on issues and proposals affecting the area; and
- (v) Liaise with other external organisations operating in the area, whether national, regional or local, to ensure that the interests of local people are enhanced by collaborative working.

(c) Scrutiny.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and any Scrutiny Review Panels it may establish may:

- (i) Review and scrutinise the decisions made by and performance of the Cabinet and Council officers both in relation to individual decisions and over time;
- (ii) Review and scrutinise the performance of the Council in relation to its policy objectives, performance targets and/or particular service areas;
- (iii) Question members of the Cabinet and chief officers about their decisions and performance, whether generally in comparison with service plans and targets over a period of time, or in relation to particular decisions, initiatives or projects;
- (iv) Make recommendations to the Cabinet or relevant non-executive Committee arising from the outcome of the scrutiny process;
- (v) Review and scrutinise the performance of other public bodies in the area and invite reports from them by requesting them to address the overview and scrutiny committee and local people about their activities and performance; and
- (vi) Question and gather evidence from any person (with their consent).

(d) Finance

Overview and Scrutiny Committee may exercise overall responsibility for the finances made available to them.

(e) Annual report.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee must report annually to full Council on their workings and make recommendations for future work programmes and amended working methods if appropriate.

6.04 Proceedings of Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and any Scrutiny Review Panels it may establish will conduct their proceedings in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 of this Constitution.

6.05 Votes of No Confidence

The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or the Chair of a Scrutiny Review Panel shall cease to hold that office as a Scrutiny member if a vote of no confidence, of which notice appears on the agenda, is carried at the meeting of the relevant body. The responsibilities of that member shall be carried out by the relevant Vice-Chair until such time as a subsequent meeting of that body has been notified of the appointment of a replacement or the reappointment of the member concerned. In the event of all members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee having been removed from office in this way at any time, Scrutiny functions shall in the interim be carried out by full Council.

PART THREE – RESPONSIBILITY FOR FUNCTIONS
SECTION B

Last updated 24 July 2017

SECTION 2 – COMMITTEES

The following shall be committees of the Council and they shall have the membership as described in the Appointments of Committees, Sub-Committees, Panels, etc (as approved by the Annual Meeting):

- 1. The Corporate Committee**
 - 2. Combined Pensions Committee and Board**
 - 3. Staffing and Remuneration Committee**
 - 4. Overview and Scrutiny Committee**
 - 5. Standards Committee**
 - 6. Alexandra Palace and Park Board**
 - 7. The Regulatory Committee**
 - 8. The Health and Wellbeing Board**
-

4. Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee may:

- (a) exercise an overview of the forward plan;
- (b) review or scrutinise decisions made or actions taken in connection with the discharge of any of the Cabinet's or Council's functions;
- (c) make reports and recommendations to the full Council, the Cabinet or relevant non-Executive Committee in connection with the discharge of any functions;
- (d) make reports or recommendations on matters affecting the area or its inhabitants;
- (e) exercise the right to call-in, for reconsideration, key decisions made but not yet implemented by the Cabinet;
- (f) receive the reports and recommendations of its Scrutiny Review Panels;
- (g) in accordance with statutory regulations to review and scrutinise matters relating to the health service and all NHS funded services within the Authority's

area and to make reports and recommendations thereon to local NHS and NHS funded bodies;

- (h) 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;
- (i) review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken, in connection with the discharge by the responsible partner authorities of their crime and disorder functions;
- (j) make reports or recommendations to the Cabinet or full Council where appropriate with respect to the discharge of the crime and disorder functions by the responsible partner authorities;
- (k) make arrangements which enable any councillor who is not a Committee member to refer any crime and disorder matter to the Committee under the Councillor Call for Action procedure; and
- (l) make arrangements which enable any councillor who is not a Committee member to refer to the Committee any local government matter which is relevant to the functions of the Committee under the Councillor Call for Action procedure.
- (m) there is a Protocol outside this Constitution setting out how the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is to operate. The Protocol shall be applied in a manner consistent with the Committee Procedure Rules in Part 4 and any issue on procedure at the meeting shall be subject to the ruling of the Chair. The Protocol can be amended by the written agreement of the Leaders of the Political Groups on the Council.
- (o) to appoint two representatives to the standing Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for North Central London. (Since this appointment is for only two members to the Joint Committee, the "political proportionality" rules in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 do not apply.)

SECTION 3 - SUB-COMMITTEES AND PANELS

The following bodies shall be created as Sub-Committees of the relevant Committee of the Council under which they are listed. Bodies described as "Panels" are Sub-Committees unless otherwise stated. Sub-Committees shall report to their parent bodies and they shall have the membership as described in the Appointments of Non-Executive Committees, Sub-Committees, Panels, etc as approved by the Annual Meeting.

2. Under Overview and Scrutiny Committee

2.1 Scrutiny Review Panels

- (a) To carry out scrutiny processes relevant to particular services as determined by Overview and Scrutiny Committee and within the parameters, protocols and procedures agreed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee for all Scrutiny Review Panels.
- (b) Within these scrutiny processes to request and receive submissions, information and answers to questions from Cabinet Members, officers and other senior employees of the Council, service users, external experts and relevant members of the public.
- (c) To refer the 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.

PART FOUR – RULES OF PROCEDURE

SECTION G – OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES

Last updated 21 July 2014

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;
- (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.
- (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.
- 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 appoint up to three people as non-voting co-optees.
- 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.
- 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 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, an Area Committee, 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 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;
 - (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)

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) business arising from Area Committees;
 - (ix) 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;
 - (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 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.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (OSC) PROTOCOL 2021**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 new 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 also takes into account learning from recent Haringey scrutiny work as well as the new 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 shall be a member of the majority group. The Vice-Chair shall be a member of the largest minority group. The Committee shall also comprise 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 of 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 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 appoint up to three non-voting co-optees. 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 but consideration can be given to specific individuals where particular expertise/experience is required that would not be otherwise available¹.
- 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 six scheduled meetings each year. One meeting shall include agreement of the annual work programme for Overview and Scrutiny. 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).

¹ 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 lead Committee member from the largest 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 ACCESS TO INFORMATION

- 10.1 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.
- 10.2 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.
- 10.3 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.
- 10.4 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.
- 10.5 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.
- 10.6 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.
- 10.7 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.

11 TRANSPARENCY AND OPENNESS

- 11.1 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.
- 11.2 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.
- 11.3 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.

12 OFFICER ADVICE

- 12.1 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.
- 12.2 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.
- 12.3 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.
- 12.4 The Statutory Scrutiny Officer cannot be the Council's Head of Paid Service, the Monitoring Officer or the Chief Finance Officer.
- 12.5 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.
- 12.6 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.

Protocol for Non - Voting Co-opted Members

Introduction

- 1.1 The primary purpose of establishing a protocol for the co-option of non statutory, non-voting scrutiny members is as follows:
- To set out how the appointment and role of non- voting scrutiny Panel members is taken forward.
- 1.2 Each Scrutiny panel is entitled to appoint up to three non-voting co-optees to assist scrutiny with its work. Non -voting co-optees are intended to bring an additional element of external challenge to the work of the scrutiny panels. By bringing a diverse spectrum of experience and adding a different perspective to many items, they are expected to add value to scrutiny by performing the following roles:
- 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 bring an element of external challenge by representing the public.
- 1.3 For the purposes of this protocol, the term ‘Co-opted members/Co-optees’ refers to Co-opted Non-statutory, Non-voting scrutiny members. Sections 2.4, 3, 4 and 5 of this protocol could also be applicable to Standards Committee which is also able to appoint up to 6 non-voting co-opted members as set out in the Constitution at Article 9 - paragraph 9.02.

2. Non - Voting Co-opted members

- 2.1 Most members on Scrutiny Committees are elected members and voting co-opted members. Although provision is available for the appointment of up to three co-optees on for each Scrutiny Panel. The decision making on appointment of non – voting co-opted members should take place at the start of the Municipal year.
- 2.2 Non-voting Co-opted members will be an integral part of Scrutiny Panels and are able to contribute to questioning of witnesses and analysis of evidence. Scrutiny Panel chairs are advised to invite individuals who have specific and detailed knowledge of a particular issue to act as expert witnesses or independent external advisers instead of being applicable to the appointment process at section 5 below , as this will provide them with greater scope to contribute to evidence received by panels.
- 2.3 It is expected that appointed non-voting co-optees will:
- Attend formal meetings of the Panel, which are usually held in the evening.
 - Attend additional meetings and evidence gathering sessions such as site visits.
 - Prepare for meetings by reading the agenda papers and additional information to familiarise themselves with the issues being scrutinised.

- Prior to meetings consider questions they may wish to put to Cabinet Members, officers, and external witnesses.
- Help the Panel to make practical suggestions for improvements to services.
- Assist in the preparation of reports and the formulation of recommendations.
- Contribute to the development of the annual scrutiny work programme.
- Establish good relations with members, officers and other co-optees.
- Abide by the relevant sections of the Council's Constitution in terms of the rules and procedures for Overview and Scrutiny; and
- Keep abreast of key issues for the authority and bear these in mind when scrutinising services and making recommendations for improvement!

2.4 Non-voting co-opted member should also note the following:

- Co-optees on Scrutiny Panels will have no voting rights.
- Each co-opted member will usually be appointed for a period of 1 year by the Scrutiny panel at their first meeting of the Municipal year and their membership reviewed on an annual basis by the Scrutiny Panel.
- Employees and existing Councillors of Haringey Council are excluded from applying to be Co-optees.

3. Appointment process

3.1 Primarily, Scrutiny will seek nominations from established community groups for Non -voting Co-optee positions. Where the panel identifies that a Non - voting Co-opted member maybe beneficial to the work of the Panel and its work programme for the coming municipal year, the Chair of Scrutiny and Panel Chair , supported with advice from Scrutiny Officers, will identify the appropriate community organisation to invite nominations for this role. The community groups will be known through established contact with the Council and through their existing contact with scrutiny members by participating in reviews.

3.2 Where the above is not possible and a particular experience/ expertise is required to assist the Panel for the duration of the municipal year, consideration can also be given to advertising the position on council's website and social media

3.3 Community organisations will be sent:

- Information on the role of overview and scrutiny non -voting co-opted members.
- Protocol for co-opted non-statutory non-voting members
- Information on the relevant Scrutiny Panel, the Scrutiny Work programme, and the skills and experience being sought to allow the community organisation to identify the appropriate individual to nominate.

3.4 Where the Panel is seeking particular expertise/ experience which is not available through contact with community organisations and the role is advertised, an application form will be sent to interested applicants. This will include a number of questions that have been devised by the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny and Scrutiny

Panel Chair and Scrutiny Officers which will draw out the experience, community involvement and expertise needed for participation in this role.

- 3.5 The Scrutiny Panel Chair, along relevant scrutiny officer will shortlist suitable candidates. This will include an assessment against the Scrutiny Work Plan , role in the community, and considering the criteria at section 1.1 above. Applicants will also be asked to attend a short interview and provide a reference.

4. Term of office

- 4.1 Non-voting Co-opted members will be appointed for the duration of the Municipal year and the Scrutiny Panel will annually renew their membership according to consideration of their work plan.
- 4.2 Any Non-voting Co-opted members shall be appointed at the first Scrutiny Panel meeting of each Municipal year. A report shall be made to this meeting that specifies how they will add value to the work of the Panel and in particular:
- 4.3 The specialist knowledge and/or skills that the proposed Co-optees will provide; and the basis on which they can represent the local community and articulate their concerns.
- 4.5 At the end of the local election year period of office, each Scrutiny Committee will ask the Co-opted members if they wish to continue. If they do want to continue, they will be subject to the appointment process outlined above.
- 4.6 Co-optees may terminate their membership by giving one month's notice to the Democratic and Scrutiny Team Manager.

5. Code of Conduct

- 5.1 All Co-optees, including non-voting co- opted members, are required to sign the council's code of conduct which sets out the standards of behaviour expected.
- 5.2 Co-optees must also sign a declaration of interest form identifying any interests which an individual may have which require recording. Advice will be provided on these requirements.
- 5.3 Induction, training, and ongoing support
- 5.4 Non-Co-optees will receive an individual induction following appointment and prior to attending their first scrutiny meeting.
- 5.5 The induction will involve meeting with the Chair of the panel they are joining and the scrutiny officer responsible for the Panel.
- 5.6 Non-voting Co-optees are voluntary positions and there is no allowance provision for this role.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX D: Draft Overview & Scrutiny Remits and Membership 2024/5

| Scrutiny Body | Areas of Responsibility | Cabinet Links |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Overview & Scrutiny Committee Cllr Matt White (Chair), Cllr Pippa Connor (Vice Chair), Cllr Makbule Gunes, Cllr Lester Buxton, Cllr Alexandra Worrell</p> <p>The Committee shall also comprise statutory education representatives, who shall have voting rights solely on education matters</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Haringey Deal: coproduction, codesign, participation and local democracy • Communications • Corporate governance, performance, policy and strategy • External partnerships | <p>Cllr Peray Ahmet Leader of the Council</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council finances, budget and MTFS • Participatory budgeting • Community wealth-building: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement policies, frameworks and systems • Insourcing policy and delivery • Capital strategy • Council Tax policy • HR, staff wellbeing and corporate recruitment • Legal • IT and digital transformation • Data policy and reform • Information management • Elections • Emergency planning | <p>Cllr Dana Carlin Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services</p> |

| Scrutiny Body | Areas of Responsibility | Cabinet Links |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts & Culture • Delivery of Borough of Culture • Libraries • Parks and Green Spaces • Sports and Leisure • Local food strategy | <p>Cllr Emily Arkell Cabinet Member for Culture & Leisure</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jobs and skills • Local business • Town centres and high streets. | <p>Cllr Ruth Gordon Cabinet Member for Placemaking and Local Economy</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local welfare • Resident Experience | <p>Cllr Seema Chandwani Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality</p> |
| | Cross cutting, significant or high profile issues; Matters outside the remit of individual panels | To be determined according to issue |
| <p>Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel Cllrs Connor (Chair), Brennan, Iyngkaran, Mason, O'Donovan, Opoku & Peacock. Co-optees: Helena Kania.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult social care • Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) • Mental health and wellbeing • Refugee and migrant wellbeing • Public Health • Safeguarding adults • Transitions (Joint with Cabinet Member for Children, Schools & Families). | <p>Cllr Lucia das Neves Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Well-Being</p> |

| Scrutiny Body | Areas of Responsibility | Cabinet Links |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel Cllrs Gunes (Chair), Abela, Adamou, Grosskopf, Lawton, Isilar-Gosling, & Dunstall.</p> <p>Co-optees: Amanda Bernard & Yvonne Denny</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption and fostering • Early help • Early years and childcare • Looked after children and care leavers • Unaccompanied minors • Safeguarding children • Schools and education • Services for children with disabilities and additional needs • 16-19 education • Youth services • Transitions • Youth justice (Joint with Cabinet Member for Communities) | <p>Cllr Zena Brabazon Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families</p> |
| <p>Climate, Community Safety & Environment Scrutiny Panel. Cllrs Buxton (Chair), Carroll, Ali, Culverwell, Dunstall, Adamou & Cawley Harrison</p> <p>Co-optees – Ian Sygrave</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Action Unit • Strategic Transport • Air pollution • Liveable Neighbourhoods & School and Play Streets • Urban Greening and biodiversity • Local renewable energy • Sustainability and decarbonisation • Circular Economy • Vision Zero (Joint with Cabinet Member for Resident Services & Tackling Inequality) | <p>Cllr Mike Hakata Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment & Transport</p> |

| Scrutiny Body | Areas of Responsibility | Cabinet Links |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waste management and Recycling • Fly-tipping and Waste Enforcement • Highways • Flooding • Parking | <p>Cllr Seema Chandwani Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime prevention and reduction • Anti-Social Behaviour • Community cohesion and inclusion • Licensing and regulatory services • Active citizenship and Voluntary & Community Sector | <p>Cllr Ajda Ovat Cabinet Member for Communities</p> |
| Housing, Planning & Development Scrutiny Panel Cllrs Worrell (Chair), Barnes, Bevan, Diakides, Harrison-Mullane, Hymas & Moyeed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Strategy and Development • Council housebuilding • Council housing services • Housing Major Works • Housing associations • Private sector housing • Housing needs • Homelessness and rough sleeping • Planning policy and enforcement (inc Local Plan) | <p>Cllr Sarah Williams Cabinet Member for Housing & Planning (Deputy Leader)</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placemaking • Council assets | <p>Cllr Ruth Gordon Cabinet Member for Placemaking & Local Economy</p> |

| Scrutiny Body | Areas of Responsibility | Cabinet Links |
|---|--|---------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estate Renewal | |
| <p>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 4 standing Scrutiny Panels shall be the responsibility of the main OSC.</p> | | |

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 June 2024

Title: **Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panel Work Programme Development Report**

authorised by: Ayshe Simsek, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager

Lead Officer: Philip Slawther, Principal Scrutiny Officer
Tel: 020 8489 5184, E-mail: 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 This report sets out how the foundations will be laid for targeted, inclusive and timely work on issues of local importance, where scrutiny can add value.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee agree the overall approach outlined at Section 5 of the report, including developing a two-year work programme for Overview and Scrutiny for 2024-26, for approval at its meeting on 14 October 2024; and
- 2.2 That the Committee give comments on how they would like to proceed with a consultative 'Scrutiny Café' event to engage with the local community about the work programme, as well as conducting an online scrutiny survey.
- 2.3 That, pending commencement of the finalised work programme, the Committee agree the provisional items for its meetings on 23 July and 14 October.

3. Reasons for decision

- 3.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) is responsible for developing an overall work plan, including work for its standing scrutiny panels. In putting this together, the Committee will need to have regard to their capacity to deliver the programme and officers' capacity to support them in that task.

4. Describe the issue under consideration

- 4.1 Following the expiry of the previous OSC work programme, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has the opportunity to develop a new work programme for itself and the scrutiny panels that ensures the Council's scrutiny function is used to best effect. Suggestions for what may constitute a successful work programme are outlined at Section 6 below.

- 4.2 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee's should be mindful of its role in supporting policy development, and the opportunity it has to undertake more 'proactive' scrutiny work, as well as scrutinising the work the Council's Cabinet retrospectively.
- 4.3 In previous years, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has held a "Scrutiny Café" that brings together Council officers and community and stakeholder representatives to discuss which matters they believe would merit further consideration from Overview and Scrutiny, based on the concerns and views of the community and the expected areas of priority for the Council and its partners. This has been helpful in developing engagement with key external representatives and cultivating relationships that allow on-going ad hoc communication. Previously, the 'Scrutiny Café' had been supported by an online scrutiny survey, which provided a further avenue to hear from local residents about their views on what the areas of priority should be for Overview & Scrutiny.

5. Work Planning Process

- 5.1 A new work planning process will now need to be developed for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and its panels. One of the key priorities of the current administration is around co-production and the need to engage with the community in a more meaningful way. Careful consideration will need to be given as to how engagement might best contribute to the development of the work plan.

Scrutiny Café

- 5.2 In 2022, a previous iteration of this committee agreed to undertake a two-year work programme. This work programme was informed by an online scrutiny survey that was open to local residents, businesses and community group representatives. The survey took place over July and August 2022 and it asked contributors to prioritise areas of focus for each of the scrutiny panels, based around the policy areas that each panel had responsibility for. The results of the survey then augmented a scrutiny café event on 16th September 2022. Invitations for the scrutiny café were sent out to a raft of community groups and VCS organisations in the borough. OSC members were also asked to spread the word of the event through their existing contacts and community networks.
- 5.3 The format of previous scrutiny café events was a group session, where participants were split into groups and they were asked to rank in order which policy areas they thought were most pressing, and therefore which policy areas they would like scrutiny to consider as part of its work programme. The results of the scrutiny survey and the scrutiny café were then consolidated and a list of the suggested areas for consideration were submitted to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee at the following meeting. The results were incorporated into the work plan and the committee undertook to provide feedback on how it would incorporate the suggestions that were put forward. These ranged from undertaking detailed scrutiny review on a particular topic, through to requesting

reports on a topic at a meeting of the committee or one of the panels, through to submitting question/s to the relevant Cabinet Member at future scrutiny meeting.

- 5.4 Previous scrutiny café events have had mixed results. It is not easy to ask people to come and take time out of their day to speak to scrutiny when they have work and family commitments. It's also probably fair to say that many residents may not fully understand what the council does and how it works. Most would have even less understanding of the role of scrutiny within the council. Previous events have tended to end up with quite broad outcomes and have tended to gravitate to a position where all of the issues discussed were felt to be important. There is also a recognition that many of the people who contribute to these type of events are people who probably engage with the Council through a number of other forums. Furthermore, having fifty or sixty people in a room can have challenges around effective participation and making sure everyone is able to contribute.
- 5.5 In light of some of the challenges faced in previous scrutiny café events, Members should give careful consideration as to how best we can engage with service users on the work programme for 2024 [and 2025, if a two year work programme is agreed]. Members may wish to agree some minor amendments to the format used in the past or they may wish to agree a different format altogether. The below is put forward as a suggestion, in the hope that it may illicit further discussion. Members may have their own ideas about how a scrutiny café or other consultative event may be better formulated.
- 5.6 As an alternative to the previous scrutiny café events, one suggestion is that the Committee undertakes an open-day type event, possibly in George Meehan House. It is envisaged that members of local community groups and local residents would be able to come along and meet the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and put forward suggestions for areas that they would like to see included in the work programme. Individuals or groups would each have, say, a five-minute slot in which they would effectively be making a deputation to the committee about a particular topic or issue, and why they think that OSC should be looking into it as part of its work programme. It is anticipated that this will allow more qualitative proposals to be received and will facilitate members to be able to dig a bit deeper behind the issues and the extent to which it should be seen as a priority. There would be scope for members to ask questions and for the format of the event to be a bit more conversational in nature.
- 5.7 A consultative scrutiny café session is proposed for September. It is also proposed that an online scrutiny survey would be held prior to the event, following the end of the pre-election period in July. In the past, these have been a useful way of getting feedback from a wide group of people (and only require a few minutes of somebody's time). They tend to work best in providing quantitative feedback but are less effective on qualitative matters. It is proposed that the scrutiny survey will support the scrutiny café session. The information received from both would be compiled into a long document and the results would then undergo a process of deciding which areas members would like to incorporate into the work planning process and how these should be prioritised.

5.8 The work programme should reflect the council's priorities and should be targeted on issues where scrutiny can add real value. To enable this to happen, it is suggested that the long list of proposed items for the work programme could be consolidated on the basis of the following criteria:

- Relevance to council priorities
- Concerns about current performance
- The availability of resources
- The timeliness of the issue and whether it is being considered by another body within the council.
- The expected value added to the work of the council by incorporating it into the work programme
- The need to obtain a balance of different areas within the programme.

The Wider Work Programme

5.9 Given that it is likely that the process for creating a work programme will generate a large number of ideas, it is proposed that it again leads to a two-year work programme. This will provide a broad framework for the committee and panels to follow over their first two years, leaving some room for any highly significant matters that may arise. This will take the scrutiny work programme up until the next set of local elections in Haringey which will take place in May 2026.

5.10 There are meetings of the committee and its panels scheduled to take place before the new work plan for Overview and Scrutiny has been finalised. It is suggested that the panels should have a discussion about the work their respective work programmes at their next meeting.

5.11 The Leader and Executive have been invited to attend the next meeting of the Committee, on 23 July, to report on the Leader's priorities for the forthcoming year. This will hopefully inform the Committee's decision making about its work programme for the coming year. It is proposed that the Cabinet Member for Finance and Local Investment be invited to attend the following meeting, which takes place on 13 October. In addition, an update on the Council's financial position is normally provided to the first meeting of the committee of the autumn.

5.12 There may also be pressing issues or other matters that the committee wishes to add to the agendas for these upcoming meetings. It is proposed that the agenda for these meetings be finalised in consultation with the chair of OSC.

6. Effective Scrutiny Work Programmes

6.1 An effective scrutiny work programme should reflect a balance of activities:

- Holding the Executive to account;
- Policy review and development – reviews to assess the effectiveness of existing policies or to inform the development of new strategies;
- Performance management – identifying under-performing services, investigating and making recommendations for improvement;

- External scrutiny – scrutinising and holding to account partners and other local agencies providing key services to the public;
- Public and community engagement – engaging and involving local communities in scrutiny activities and scrutinising those issues which are of concern to the local community.

6.2 Key features of an effective work programme:

- A member led process, short listing and prioritising topics – with support from officers – that;
 - reflects local needs and priorities – issues of community concern as well as the Corporate Delivery Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy priorities
 - prioritises topics for scrutiny that have most impact or benefit
 - involves local stakeholders
 - is flexible enough to respond to new or urgent issues

6.3 Depending on the selected topic and planned outcomes, scrutiny work will be carried out in a variety of ways, using various formats. This will include a variety of one-off reports. In accordance with the scrutiny protocol, the OSC and Scrutiny Panels will draw from the following to inform their work:

- Performance reports;
- One off reports on matters of national or local interest or concern;
- Issues arising out of internal and external assessment (e.g. Ofsted, Care Quality Commission);
- Reports on strategies and policies under development or other issues on which the Cabinet or officers would like scrutiny views or support;
- Progress reports on implementing previous scrutiny recommendations accepted by the Cabinet or appropriate Executive body.

6.4 In addition, in-depth scrutiny work, including task and finish projects, are an important aspect of Overview and Scrutiny and provide opportunities to thoroughly investigate topics and to make improvements. Through the gathering and consideration of evidence from a wider range of sources, this type of work enables more robust and effective challenge as well as an increased likelihood of delivering positive outcomes. In depth reviews should also help engage the public and provide greater transparency and accountability.

6.5 It is nevertheless important that there is a balance between depth and breadth of work undertaken so that resources can be used to their greatest effect.

7. Contribution to strategic outcomes

7.1 The contribution of scrutiny to the corporate priorities will be considered routinely as part of the OSC's work.

8. Statutory Officers comments

Finance and Procurement

- 8.1 There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations set out in this report. Should any of the work undertaken by Overview and Scrutiny generate recommendations with financial implications these will be highlighted at that time.

Legal

- 8.2 There are no immediate legal implications arising from the report.
- 8.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the approval of the future scrutiny work programme falls within the remit of the OSC.
- 8.4 Under Section 21 (6) of the Local Government Act 2000, an OSC has the power to appoint one or more sub-committees to discharge any of its functions. In accordance with the Constitution, the appointment of Scrutiny Panels (to assist the scrutiny function) falls within the remit of the OSC.
- 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 Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such reports can then be referred to Cabinet or Council under agreed protocols.

Equality

- 8.6 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.
- 8.7 The committee should ensure that it addresses these duties by considering them within its work plan 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.

8.8 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

9.1 Draft Work Programme for 2024-25.

10. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Draft Work Plan 2024-26

| <p>1. Scrutiny review projects; These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.</p> | | |
|--|--|---|
| Project | Comments | Priority |
| Prevention of Violence Against Women & Girls (VAWG) | <p>Terms of reference: To review the current arrangements for specific areas of VAWG prevention in Haringey under the remit of the Council’s VAWG Strategy 2016-26 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Council’s approach to schools-based engagement on VAWG, including the progress of recent pilot projects, the likely future resource requirements, national policy/guidance and approaches to school-based engagement elsewhere in London and the UK that Haringey could potentially learn from. the Council’s approach to community engagement on VAWG, including the progress of recent work in this area, the likely future resource requirements, national policy/guidance and approaches to community engagement elsewhere in London and the UK that Haringey could potentially learn from. | <p>1</p> <p>Evidence sessions commenced in December 2022.</p> |
| | The term of reference is to be agreed. However, during 2023-24 Committee had previously indicated that it would like to undertake a piece of work to look at how robust the Council’s | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Review on Financial Planning and Sustainability | financial planning processes are. This is felt to be particularly relevant, given the perilous state of Local Government finances and the sharp rise in the number of authorities who have either had to issue, or are close to issuing, Section 114 Notices, effectively declaring themselves bankrupt. | |
|---|--|--|

| 2. “One-off” Items; These will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Committee. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled. | | |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| Date | Potential Items | Lead Officer/Witnesses |
| 13 June 2024 | Membership & Terms of Reference | Principal Scrutiny Officer |
| | Overview and Scrutiny Work Plan | Principal Scrutiny Officer |
| 23 July 2024 | Cabinet Member Questions - Leader of the Council | Leader and Chief Executive |
| | Scrutiny Review Report - Prevention of Violence Against Women & Girls (VAWG) | Principal Scrutiny Officer |
| | | |
| | | |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 17 October 2024 | Cabinet Member Questions – Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services | Cabinet Member and Officers |
| | 2023/24 Provisional Financial Outturn report | Director of Finance |
| | Overview and Scrutiny Work Plan | Principal Scrutiny Officer |
| | Finance update – Q1 | Director of Finance |
| 25 November 2024 | Cabinet Member Questions; Cabinet Member for Resident Services and Tackling Inequality. | |
| | Annual Feedback and Resolutions Report 2023-2024 | Head of Feedback and Resolutions |
| 12 December 2024 | Budget Scrutiny – Culture, Strategy & Engagement | Cabinet Member and Officers |
| | Cabinet Member Questions; Cabinet Member for Culture and Leisure | |
| | | |
| 20 January 2023 (Budget) | Budget Scrutiny; Panel feedback and recommendations. To consider panel's draft recommendations and agree input into Cabinet's final budget proposal discussions (Deputy Chair in the Chair) | Deputy Chair (in the Chair) |
| | | |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|------------------------------|
| | Cabinet Member Questions; | Cabinet Member and Officers |
| | Treasury Management Strategy Statement | Assistant Director - Finance |
| 27March 2025 | Cabinet Member Questions; Cabinet Member for Placemaking and Local Economy | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 2025/26 | | |
| Meeting 1 | Cabinet Member Questions - Leader of the Council | Leader and Chief Executive |
| | Membership & Terms of Reference. | Scrutiny Officer |
| | OSC Work Programme | Scrutiny Officer |
| Meeting 2 | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Meeting 3 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Meeting 4 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Meeting 5 | Budget Scrutiny – Culture, Strategy & Engagement | Cabinet Member and Officers |
| | | |
| Meeting 6 (Budget) | Budget Scrutiny; Panel feedback and recommendations. To consider panel’s draft recommendations and agree input into Cabinet’s final budget proposal discussions (Deputy Chair in the Chair) | Deputy Chair (in the Chair) |
| | | |
| | | |
| Meeting 7 | | |
| | | |

