

## NOTICE OF MEETING

# OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Monday, 22nd June, 2026, 7.00 pm - George Meehan House, 294 High Road, N22 8JZ**

(To watch the live meeting click [here](#) or watch the recording [here](#))

**Members:** Councillors Lucia das Neves (Chair), Luke Cawley-Harrison (Vice-Chair), Bethany Anderson, Marc Jenner and Adam Small

**Co-optees/Non Voting Members:** Christine Cordon (North Harringay Primary School) (Co-Optee) and Camilla Borwick-Fox (Ferry Lane School) (Co-Optee)

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**

### 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 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. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 22)**

To approve the minutes of the meetings held on:

- 11<sup>th</sup> March 2026
- 26<sup>th</sup> March 2026

#### **7. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS (PAGES 23 - 40)**

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

9<sup>th</sup> February 2026 – Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel – To follow  
23<sup>rd</sup> February 2026 – Culture, Community Safety & Environment Scrutiny Panel – To follow  
26<sup>th</sup> February 2026 – Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel  
9<sup>th</sup> March 2026 – Housing, Planning & Development Scrutiny Panel

#### **8. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

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

Report to follow.

**9. APPOINTMENT OF PARENT GOVERNOR REPRESENTATIVES (PAGES 41 - 46)**

To seek formal approval of the appointment of two Parent Governor representatives as voting co-opted Scrutiny members.

**10. APPOINTMENT OF NON-VOTING CO-OPTED MEMBERS (PAGES 47 - 56)**

To seek formal approval of the appointment of two non-voting co-opted Members to the Scrutiny Panels.

**11. ISSUES ARISING FROM 2025/26 WORK PLAN (PAGES 57 - 66)**

To provide a summary of issues arising from the previous Overview & Scrutiny Committee's work plan for 2025/26 which the new Committee may wish to consider for inclusion in the work plan for 2026/27.

**12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

**13. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (PAGES 67 - 68)**

To consider an initial draft work plan for 2026/27 and to discuss possible agenda items for future meetings.

**14. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Tues 21<sup>st</sup> Jul (7pm)
- Thurs 17<sup>th</sup> Sep (7pm)
- Mon 26<sup>th</sup> Oct (7pm)
- Mon 30<sup>th</sup> Nov (7pm)
- Thurs 10<sup>th</sup> Dec (7pm)
- Mon 18<sup>th</sup> Jan (7pm)
- Thurs 25<sup>th</sup> Feb (7pm)
- Thurs 18<sup>th</sup> Mar (7pm)

Dominic O'Brien, Principal Scrutiny Officer

Tel – 0208 489 5896

Email: dominic.obrien@haringey.gov.uk

Fiona Alderman

Assistant Director for Legal & Governance (Monitoring Officer)

George Meehan House, 294 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8JZ

Friday 12 June 2026

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 11<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2026, 7.00 - 9.40pm**

**PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Matt White (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Makbule Gunes, Anna Lawton and Adam Small**

**90. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred Members present to Agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda front sheet, in respect of filming at meetings, and Members noted the information therein.

**91. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

**92. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**93. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**94. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS**

None.

**95. MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record. It was noted that the outstanding action points would be followed up with responses circulated.

**RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2026 be approved as an accurate record.**

**96. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS**

The minutes of the following meetings were noted:

- 15<sup>th</sup> January 2026 – Children & Young People’s Scrutiny Panel

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

Cllr White reported that he had been informed that it had not been feasible for the Metropolitan Police to provide the report covering the statistical data requested by the Committee in time for this meeting. He reported that no formal explanation for this had been received by the Committee. He added that he had requested that the Police attend the meeting to provide a verbal update, given that the written report was not available, but this invitation had been declined.

Cllr White emphasised that this had been a straightforward request from the Committee about how group-based sexual exploitation crime was being recorded and classified in Haringey in order to determine whether the Committee should conduct further scrutiny work on this issue. Cllr White expressed his dissatisfaction that this information had not been provided, having originally been requested by the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel in December 2025.

Cllr Connor also expressed disappointment that the Police were not present to provide an update on this issue. She highlighted the relevance of the Baroness Casey's 2025 audit report on group-based child sexual exploitation and abuse which made recommendations on the recording and categorisation of police data in this area and on joint partnership working locally. She proposed a recommendation that the 2026/27 Overview & Scrutiny Committee should consider conducting a Scrutiny Review based on the local data and Baroness Casey's recommendations. She acknowledged that the membership of the Committee was likely to have changed by 2026/27 and that it would be for those Members to determine whether or not to proceed with this recommendation.

Cllr Gunes spoke in favour of this recommendation, citing the Council's responsibility to children and young people in the Borough, particularly those to whom the local authority had a corporate parenting responsibility. She also suggested that a future Committee could choose to delegate this Review to a Scrutiny Panel as appropriate.

Cllr White noted that the remits of the Scrutiny Panels would be determined at the beginning of 2026/27 but that the recommendation could be included as part of a handover report summarising the issues considered in the 2024/26 work programme to the next version of the Committee.

**RESOLVED – That the 2026/27 Overview & Scrutiny Committee should consider conducting a Scrutiny Review on the subject of group-based child sexual abuse, specifically to consider the data available regarding relevant offences in Haringey and how the findings of Baroness Casey's recent audit report on this issue could be applied in Haringey.**

**98. FINANCE UPDATE - Q3 2025/26**

Cllr Dana Carlin, Cabinet Member for Finance & Corporate Services, introduced the report for this item, which provided an update on the Council's financial position at the end of Quarter 3 of 2025/26, and made the following points:

- The overall position had improved since Quarter 1 when a £34m overspend had been projected. This had fallen to £23.4m at the end of Quarter 2 and had now been reduced further to around £19m at the end of Quarter 3.
- There were around £8m of historic parking arrears and, while this was disappointing, it was not a service pressure that would impact on the following year's budget.
- The improvements in the service overspend were mainly in the areas of Adult Services and Temporary Accommodation.
- There had been an improvement in the Housing Revenue Account with reduced overall expenditure of £1.3m, due to improved contractor performance management and lower capital financing costs.
- Capital spend had been reduced and this would mean reduced revenue expenditure in future years. Capital spend was challenged throughout the year to ensure that it would deliver savings or income or was essential/emergency work.
- The government had recognised the need for additional funding for Boroughs such as Haringey with an additional £25m in core spending over the next three financial years. There had been increases in areas such as homelessness grants and the government had also committed to fully covering the cost of SEND services in future which would help.
- It was understood that the monthly financial reports received by officers had shown further improvements in month 10.
- She acknowledged the hard work of officers in achieving these improvements but noted that there was a lot more to do for the Council to get to a point of financial sustainability.

Taryn Eves, Corporate Director of Finance & Resources, added the following points:

- The £19m of projected overspend was expected to be reduced further by £8m of uncommitted corporate contingency. She clarified that the projected overspend was in addition to the £37m of Exceptional Financial Support
- Certain factors had been included at the Quarter 3 stage rather than at the end of the financial year in order to provide a more accurate forecast. These factors included bed debts provision, use of reserves and external finance.
- The improvements in the 2025/26 position could be partly attributed to the additional controls that had been put in place, further details of which were provided in Appendix 10. There had also been less volatility in the second half of the year and more accurate forecasting.
- The Council was still carrying some risks in areas including parking, adult social care debt and commercial property.
- The delivery of savings was still not being fully achieved and so this needed to be the focus of attention next year.

Cllr Carlin and Taryn Eves then responded to questions from the Committee:

- Cllr White observed that much of the improvements in the 2025/26 position appeared to be due to the reduction in demand rather than reductions in price and asked about the future impact of price rises due to external factors. Taryn Eves addressed the three main demand areas and wider economic issues:
  - Children's Services had remained steady throughout the year with the overspend due to the issues with the delivery of savings.
  - Adult Services was showing a further improvement in the most recent forecast and this was due to a combination of demand and price. A provision was made in the budget for inflation on adult social care contracts but negotiations were still underway. There had also been work on the contributions from health partners for joint care packages and Continuing Healthcare.
  - With Temporary Accommodation, numbers were steady but the prevention offer was strong which helped to manage demand. However, prices were higher than expected for nightly-paid accommodation.
  - Assumptions on interest rates for next year were based on a downward trajectory for inflation and there was a risk in this area due to global events, though this would be the same for every local authority.
  - The corporate contingency had been increased significantly for 2026/27 and now stood at £25m which helped to manage risk.
- Cllr White asked about the realistic feasibility of reaching a financially sustainable position in the medium term. Cllr Carlin acknowledged that this would not be easy but that the trajectory was heading in the right direction, such as through the capital position, the improvement in government funding, income from the commercial portfolio and some reductions in pressures on services compared to previous forecasts. She added that a strategic approach would be necessary, potentially including investment in areas where longer-term savings could be achieved. Overall, she felt that financial sustainability was achievable.
- Cllr Small queried why savings delivery appeared to have been more successful in Adult Services and Housing than in Children's Services. Taryn Eves explained that the delivery of savings in Children's Services was almost entirely related to the 5% staff savings target and there hadn't been the scope to deliver this in 2025/26. Although this 5% target also applied to other Directorates, there had been a wider range of savings in areas such as Adult Services and Housing. It was assumed in the Budget for 2026/27 that these savings would be achieved in full. Asked by Cllr Small about the possible lessons of relying on an area of savings that could not then be delivered, Cllr Carlin commented that this depended on the service, noting that there was not as much scope for savings in Children's Services compared to some other services. Taryn Eves added that the downside of setting targets across the Council was that it assumed that there was similar potential for savings across all services which was not necessarily the case. The focus of the Finance Recovery Board would be on the evidence for the deliverability of savings and so this process was expected to be stronger in 2026/27.
- Asked by Cllr Small about the likely impact of SEND funding being covered by the government in future, Taryn Eves said that this would be quite limited. She

explained that further details were still being awaited but that a grant would be received for 90% of the Council's Dedicated Schools Grant deficits for 2025/26, which was largely driven by SEND. In addition, the government had confirmed that no local authority that was part of the Safety Valve Programme would be worse off. However, there were still question marks about the future funding for the 10% of the deficit.

- Cllr Connor referred to Table 3 on page 30 of the agenda pack which indicated that 44% of the projected savings for 2025/26 would not be delivered and queried how financial sustainability could be achieved given that savings were not being fully delivered and that the deficit was becoming progressively worse. Taryn Eves acknowledged that, while some non-delivery of savings was typically expected, a rate of 44% was too high and this was a key reason why there was not a high level of new savings proposed for 2026/27 as the main focus was on delivery of agreed savings. This had been a challenge for some time as the budgets assumed that savings would be delivered, any non-delivery contributed to an overspend. She added that there was now more challenge in the run-up to the budget setting process while monitoring and reporting processes had also been tightened. She also felt that narrative reporting to Cabinet and the Overview & Scrutiny Committee should be strengthened in future and that there should be greater scrutiny of the RAG ratings. Josephine Lyseight, Director of Finance, commented that there could be more challenge on the profile of the savings as savings were sometimes delayed by the need for more lead-in time before the outcomes were achieved.
- Cllr Connor queried the impact of scrutiny given that the Committee often scrutinised the papers after the decision making and whether this process could be improved, including through the closer tracking of recommendations. Cllr Carlin replied that, constitutionally, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee scrutinised the decisions of the executive and so 'pre-scrutiny' would require a constitutional change. Taryn Eves agreed that closer action tracking between the quarterly monitoring should be implemented in future. **(ACTION)**
- Referring to the Disposals Policy on page 43 of the agenda pack, Cllr Connor noted that £800k of capital receipts had been received with up to £1.2m estimated by the end of the year and queried how positive this progress was against the overall total of £20m. Taryn Eves noted that the £20m figure had been agreed by Cabinet in June 2025 when the Disposals Policy was approved and an updated Disposals Policy would be provided to Cabinet in 2026/27. She noted that an accurate profile could not always be predicted and that the majority of disposals were now anticipated in 2026/27.
- Cllr Connor referred to paragraph 6.6 which specified a reduction of £1.9m in forecast interest costs, but noted that this reflected slippage in the capital programme. Cllr Carlin replied that this was due to a combination of planning and profile but reiterated that the Council was continually challenging throughout the year about reducing spending and borrowing. In relation to the accuracy of the forecasts on capital spend, Taryn Eves said that new capital governance had been in place for almost a year which meant tighter profiling and timing of new capital schemes and there was a higher level of confidence around the 2026/27 figures. She noted that capital spend was less predictable

than revenue and that much of the significant slippage related to the large regeneration schemes. A major cause of slippage was the delays to procurement processes and sometimes the forecasts about timescales had been too optimistic. Cllr White observed that it was important for Councillors to understand how long it could typically take for schemes to be implemented given the governance and procurement processes that needed to be completed.

- Referring to paragraph 9.14 on page 42, Cllr Connor noted the slippage on capital support for digital outcomes and queried how this would impact on services for residents, the modernisation of the Council website and any associated savings. Taryn Eves explained that the service modernisation programme had been running for about 18 months but, because there was so much to do in the digital space, it couldn't all be done at once. Areas with the largest impact on customer services, such as housing, had therefore been prioritised. An investment of £2m had been estimated but the plans on implementation in 2025/26 had been too ambitious so the unspent funding had been carried over to 2026/27.
- Cllr Small then had to leave the meeting (8:02pm) and his remaining question was read by Cllr White which queried the large write-off of parking debts. Taryn Eves said that the service itself would be able to provide a detailed response if required, including on collection rates, but she explained that an extensive piece of work had recently been carried out to address the high level of debt that went back a number of years. This had looked at outstanding debt and PCNs up to March 2025 and, as a consequence of this, the bad debt provision for parking had been increased by £9.9m. Asked by Cllr Connor for clarification on the figures in paragraph 1.4 of the report, Taryn Eves explained that, as illustrated in Table 2, bad debt provision had reached £3.9m in Quarter 2 followed by a further £6.0m in Quarter 3 to make a total of £9.9m for the year. She clarified that bad debt provision involved an estimate of how much debt could be recovered, while the write-offs were a separate category as these were unrecoverable debts and had recently been approved by Cabinet. Cllr White noted that there were significant sums of money involved and suggested that a future piece of scrutiny work could be to compare the Council's performance in this area to other Boroughs, including the collection rates, level of bad debt and write-offs. Cllr White proposed that parking debts should be included as an issue of concern in the hand-over report to the 2026/27 Overview & Scrutiny Committee. **(ACTION)**

## 99. CORPORATE DELIVERY PLAN UPDATE - Q3 2025/26

At the outset of this item Cllr White noted that, due to a clash with the Staff Awards event, the senior service officers were not available to respond to relevant questions on the Corporate Delivery Plan. However, responses to any questions from the Committee could be provided in writing.

It was noted that Cllr Dana Carlin and Taryn Eves were available to respond to questions relating to their remits. Taryn Eves introduced the report noting that it

provided the Quarter 3 performance update on the Council's Corporate Delivery Plan (CDP). The information was presented by eight themes with detailed appendices to show the progress against 188 individual activity lines. She added that this would be the final performance update of the current CDP cycle because a new Corporate Delivery Plan would be developed following the May 2026 local elections. This would include a revised performance framework, a revised set of indicators and local outcomes framework metrics.

Regarding progress at Quarter 3, Taryn Eves made the following points:

- There had been strong delivery progress with 93% of outcomes rated green or amber at the end of Quarter 3.
- Eight activity lines were rated as red and explanations for each of these were provided in the report.
- The 'RAG' (red/amber/green) ratings were subjective and a negative rating did not necessarily mean that nothing had been delivered but rather that parts of the commitment had not been met.
- The majority of activity lines had remained stable since Quarter 2, 15% had improved and only six had declined.
- In February 2026, the government had published a new Local Government Outcomes Framework which introduced a new outcomes-based set of measures. This Framework would be used to inform the development of the new CDP and provide the basis for the quarterly performance updates.
- The Council's aspired to develop more integrated reporting across finance, performance and risk into a single narrative in 2026/27.

Taryn Eves and Cllr Carlin then responded to questions from the Committee:

- Cllr White noted that, due to the development of the previous CDP, Scrutiny had not had access to any performance data during this transition period and sought reassurance that this would not be the case again in 2026/27. Taryn Eves explained that the new CDP would have a new set of performance indicators based on the new national outcomes framework as well as local priorities. The timescales for the new CDP was anticipated to be Autumn 2026 but the national indicators were expected to be reported on earlier than this after the local elections in May 2026. It was therefore possible that there could be a period of hybrid reporting before the new CDP was fully established. Cllr White commented that these timescales would be satisfactory as they would fit broadly in line with the Committee's previous work programmes but emphasised the importance of data being available for scrutiny by Autumn 2026. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr Connor highlighted a number of questions, some of which would require written responses:
  - **Adults, Health & Welfare – Immunisation uptake improving** (page 180 of the agenda pack). Cllr Connor expressed concerns about the recent rise in cases of measles that had been reported in Haringey and Enfield and requested a written update on the public health response to this. **(ACTION)**
  - **Theme 1 – Resident experience and enabling success – Number of complaints upheld by Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman** (page 181 of the agenda pack). Cllr Connor noted that this

matter had previously been discussed by the Committee but expressed concern that the high number of upheld complaints continued to be an issue and requested a written update on how this was being addressed.

**(ACTION)**

- **Theme 1 – A supported and enabled workforce – Implementation of the Procurement Modernisation Programme** (page 184 of the agenda pack). Cllr Connor observed that, according to the report, the reason for the red RAG rating on this item was due to the introduction of a new e-procurement system that was now not going ahead and asked how much money had been lost on this. Taryn Eves explained that the Procurement Modernisation Programme had been in existence for three years, large elements of which had been delivered. However, the e-procurement system had not been delivered. The intention had been to replace the existing system to improve the alignment with the Procurement Act but there was now a much wider project underway to replace the system that managed finance, HR and payment issues. In order to avoid having separate systems, the new e-procurement system was being included in the wider project and therefore had not yet been delivered.
- Asked by Cllr Connor about a £200k saving relating to this in the budget papers, Taryn Eves explained that Haringey managed the London Construction Partnership which was based on a series of procurement frameworks. This generated a small income which had been projected to rise but, due to complications related to the Procurement Act, income had been lower than expected. Some mitigations had been identified by holding vacancies within the team.
- **Theme 3 – Children & Young People - Rate of first-time entrants into the Youth Justice System** (page 186 of the agenda pack). Cllr Connor noted that the direction was negative for this indicator and requested a written response on the reasons underpinning this and how this was being addressed. **(ACTION)**
- **Theme 4 – Adults, health and welfare – Percentage of people in adult social care extremely or very satisfied with the service/support they receive** (page 188 of the agenda pack). Cllr Connor requested a written response on why the direction was negative for this indicator. **(ACTION)**
- **Theme 5 – Improving social housing and the private rented sector – Complete void works to existing and newly acquired properties to bring up to a lettable standard** (page 193 of the agenda pack). Cllr White requested a written response on why the direction was negative for this indicator. **(ACTION)**
- **Theme 5 - Homes for the future – Repairs fixed right first time** (page 192 of the agenda pack). Cllr Connor noted that this was an issue on which Councillors received considerable correspondence from residents and requested a written response on why the direction was negative for this indicator. **(ACTION)** Cllr Carlin responded that the need for asbestos testing was a key reason for this.

- **Theme 6 – Safer Haringey – Domestic abuse offences per 1,000 population** (page 196 of the agenda pack). Cllr Connor noted that the rate of domestic abuse offences was down and that the raw number of offences had seen a slight rise but at a slower rate than elsewhere in London. She requested a written response on whether there was an explanation for why the rise was lower in Haringey than London as a whole. **(ACTION)**
- **Theme 6 – A reduction in violence against women and girls – Increase the number of safe havens in local businesses for women to use at night** (page 197 of the agenda pack). Cllr Connor commented that, while it was useful to have these safe havens, many women would not know that they existed and queried how their availability was being communicated. A written response was requested. **(ACTION)**
- **Theme 6 – A reduction in violence against women and girls – Continue to develop and pilot work on a Safer Parks for Women and Girls Network** (page 197 of the agenda pack). Cllr Connor reported that residents had contacted her to improve lighting in the Alexandra Park area but it had proved difficult to obtain a positive response from the Council on this. She requested clarification on who was leading on this at a senior level so that the concerns of residents could be raised. **(ACTION)**
- **Theme 8 – Place and Economy – Employment rate of 16-64 year olds** (page 201 of the agenda pack). Cllr White noted that the direction was negative for this indicator and queried why this was the case and whether employment support programmes such as Haringey Works were delivering effectively. A written response was requested. **(ACTION)** Cllr Lawton said that she had some further detail to add to this question which she would submit in writing. **(ACTION)**
- **Theme 8 – Place and Economy – Percentage of non-major planning applications decided on time** (page 201 of the agenda pack). Cllr White noted that the RAG rating for this indicator was green but that the direction was negative with a slight decline compared to Quarter 2. He requested a written response on how a further decline would be avoided. **(ACTION)**

As this was the last Committee meeting of the current administration, Cllr White wished to place on record his thanks to Cllr Carlin, Taryn Eves, Haydee Nunes de Souza and other officers for their attendance at the meetings over the past few years and for the detailed answers that had been provided.

#### **100. NORTH CENTRAL LONDON JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (NCL JHOSC) - AMENDED TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Cllr White explained that the purpose of this item was to approve the new draft terms of reference for the North Central London Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (NCL JHOSC) which covered five Boroughs (Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Haringey and Islington) The draft terms of reference had already been approved by the NCL JHOSC and, if approved by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, would then

be sent to full Council for ratification the following week. He noted that a key part of the report was on how the support for the NCL JHOSC would be resourced as Haringey had been providing the administrative support for several years without any financial contribution or contribution in kind from the other four Boroughs.

Cllr Pippa Connor, who was the Chair of the NCL JHOSC, added that an agreement had been reached on officer support by the Committee and that a letter, signed by all NCL JHOSC members was to be sent to the Chief Executives of each of the Boroughs regarding the details of how this could be done.

Cllr Connor observed that there were two recommendations for the Committee in the main cover report for this item. The first of these was to approve the terms of reference and the second was to note that the terms of reference would be subject to further review later in the year after further details on the governance arrangements had been established following the merger of the North Central London Integrated Care Board (ICB) and the North West London ICB. However, Cllr Connor clarified that the NCL JHOSC had determined to continue as a five-Borough committee because a merged committee to cover both areas would involve thirteen Boroughs and was therefore considered to be too difficult to manage. She added that a future iteration of the NCL JHOSC could choose to revise the terms of reference if required.

Cllr White proposed that the first recommendation to approve the new terms of reference be agreed but that the second recommendation on a further review of the terms of reference later in the year should not be agreed because the NCL JHOSC had determined that the new terms of reference should remain in place. This proposal was approved by the Committee.

**RESOLVED – That the amended terms of reference for the NCL JHOSC be approved.**

**RESOLVED – The proposed further review of the NCL JHOSC later in the year was not approved by the Committee, though it was noted that the NCL JHOSC could choose to carry out a review in future if required.**

## 101. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Cllr White reported that there were four Scrutiny Reviews for the Committee to consider, two of which were ready to be approved and sent to Cabinet, while some further work was required in relation to the other two.

### Walking & Cycling Safety

Cllr Gunes provided a summary of the Interim Report on Walking and Cycling Safety on behalf of the Culture, Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel. The Review examined the walking and cycling action plan with a particular focus on safe cycling and issues relating to e-bikes. The Panel held evidence sessions with relevant Cabinet members, Directors and stakeholder groups. Key findings included that there had been an unfortunate increase in the collision rate for both pedestrians and cyclists over the past couple of years.

Regarding next steps for the Review, Cllr Gunes said that further work was expected in the next municipal year, including an analysis of best practice in other local authorities. Cllr White suggested that details about the progress of the Review should be included in the handover report to the 2026/27 Overview & Scrutiny Committee given that it was not yet known who the scrutiny members would be. **(ACTION)**

#### Communications with Residents (Adult Social Care)

Cllr Connor provided a summary of the Interim Report on Communications with Residents (Adult Social Care) on behalf of the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel. She explained that difficulties in communicating with the Council had been a longstanding issue for residents and that it had also emerged as a prominent issue in the most recent 'Scrutiny Café' consultation event. The Panel had spoken to representatives of service users at local groups including the Joint Partnership Board to obtain details of specific concerns, such as issues with safeguarding referrals. The Panel had also received information about the redesigned adult social care directory on the Council's website.

The evidence for the Review had been gathered with recommendations developed and so it was anticipated that a final draft could be provided to the first meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in 2026/27 without the need for any additional work by the new scrutiny members. **(ACTION)**

#### Provision of Services for Children Under One Year Old

Cllr Lawton reported that the Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel had conducted an extensive review of services for children under the age of 1 in the Borough. Due to the large scope of services in this area, the Panel had decided to focus less on healthcare services and more on services such as childcare, children's centres and family hubs. Evidence had been received from various witnesses, including those involved with providing childcare services, and the Panel had visited children's centres and family hubs. Specific issues had included:

- The government provided some childcare funding for babies over the age of nine months but only for working parents. However, there was evidence that childcare was beneficial for most children, particularly those from more deprived backgrounds, regardless of whether their parents were in work. There was therefore a recommendation about lobbying the government regarding the current situation in Haringey.
- Another recommendation concerned improved communications to residents about the services for under-1s in the Borough, including through a directory and by using social media channels.
- After receiving evidence about the difficulties that childminders experienced in accessing Haringey provision, there was a recommendation about the Council improving partnerships with childminding businesses, including by considering greater use of Council spaces such as libraries.
- Improved antenatal support was considered by the Panel. A free online NHS offer was available which mainly focused on providing information, but this did not enable the development of the type of support network that was typically developed through paid-for services such as NCT groups. There was therefore

a recommendation for the Council to work with health partners to provide free perinatal peer-support groups for parents on low incomes.

Committee members welcomed the report and endorsed in particular the recommendation on free access to support groups, noting the importance of physical meetings and support networks.

Cllr Lawton noted that the report was essentially completed but with some minor checks to be carried out. It was therefore proposed that the Committee approve the draft report as currently available and to delegate any minor amendments to the Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel. It was anticipated that the final version of the report could be approved at the first 2026/27 meeting of the Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel and then sent to the Cabinet. This proposal was agreed by the Committee on the understanding that only minor amendments would be made by the Panel and it was further agreed that the final version of the report would be made available to the Committee. **(ACTION)**

### Violence Against Women and Girls

This report had been developed through the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and so members were already familiar with the recommendations. Cllr White noted recent feedback that had been received from members proposing minor amendments to the recommendations which had been circulated to the Committee:

- **Recommendation 7** (Family Hub Navigators) - a minor edit to specify that advice, guidance and referrals to support services to be provided within the Family Hubs.
- **Recommendation 8** (Consultation with young people) – a minor edit to include different communities and areas of the Borough in the consultation.
- **Recommendation 9** (Children & young people) – a minor edit to add online harms as a consideration.
- **Recommendation 14** (Supreme Court ruling) – the removal of a sentence on waiting for the publication of the updated Statutory Code of Practice as this was advised to be unnecessary.

The Committee agreed that these minor amendments should be accepted. **(ACTION)**

Cllr White also referred to some new more substantive amendments to the recommendations that had been proposed:

- **Recommendation 1** (Domestic Abuse Awareness training) – the draft recommendation welcomed the introduction of mandatory Domestic Abuse Awareness training for all Council staff, but a proposal from a member was that there should also be mandatory specialist training for those who delivered services directly.
- **Recommendation 6** (Whole school approach) - the draft recommendation stated that the Council should aspire to developing a whole school approach as it was understood that this would be one of the most resource intensive of the recommendations. However, a proposal from a member was that the senior officers should submit a detailed implementation programme within 12 months and to seek funding to develop a pilot programme.

- **New recommendation** – A new recommendation proposed by a member was that *“Given the short-term nature of some government funded projects, the VAWG team are asked to assemble the end of project reports with a brief introduction on the learnings and the future viability of projects in the lifetime of the upcoming strategy.”*

The Committee approved the amended recommendations and the new recommendation to be included in the final report. **(ACTION)**

**RESOLVED – That the Scrutiny Review on Violence Against Women and Girls be approved (included the amendments outlined above) and sent to Cabinet.**

**RESOLVED – That the Scrutiny Review on Provision of Services for Children Under One Year Old be approved, subject to any minor amendments deemed necessary by the Children & Young People’s Scrutiny Panel, and sent to Cabinet.**

**RESOLVED – That the Scrutiny Review on Communications with Residents (Adult Social Care) be completed within the current municipal year and then sent to the first 2026/27 meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for approval.**

**RESOLVED – That the Scrutiny Review on Walking & Cycling Safety be referred to the 2026/27 Overview & Scrutiny Committee for consideration to be given on next steps.**

**102. FUTURE MEETINGS**

Cllr White advised the Committee that the dates of the 2026/27 meetings of the Committee were yet to be determined but would be published when available.

Noting that this was the last Committee meeting of the current administration, Cllr White also thanked the Councillors and officers for all their work on the Committee over the past few years. As vice-Chair, Cllr Connor also recorded her thanks to Cllr White for his work as the Chair of the Committee and this was supported by the other committee members.

CHAIR: Councillor Matt White

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank

## **MINUTES OF THE Overview and Scrutiny Committee HELD ON Thursday, 26th March, 2026, 7pm - 9.35pm**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Matt White (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair),  
Makbule Gunes, Anna Lawton and Adam Small**

**ALSO ATTENDING – Cllr Rossetti**

### **103. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair opened the meeting by referring attendees to the formal notice regarding filming and recording at meetings. Members and attendees were reminded that the meeting could be recorded in accordance with the Council's access to information and transparency requirements. The Chair briefly outlined the procedural format of the meeting, including how the call-in would be conducted, the order of representations, and how questions would be taken. This information was noted by those present

### **104. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **105. URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no urgent business raised for consideration. However, the Chair informed Members that a supplementary agenda pack had been circulated prior to the meeting. This supplementary documentation contained relevant background information and supporting material pertinent to the call-in under consideration. Members confirmed that they had received and noted the contents of the supplementary pack.

### **106. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

During discussion relating to murals within Muswell Hill, Councillor Connor declared an interest on the basis that she was a Councillor for Muswell Hill Ward. The declaration was noted.

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

None.

### **108. CALL IN OF CABINET DECISION ON NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (NCIL) SPENDING ROUND 2**

Councillor Rossetti presented the call-in and the following points were noted as part of her presentation:

- The absence of clear and demonstrable evidence of public support for certain projects approved for NCIL funding, specifically the mural proposals and the Civic Centre Woodland Garden. It was questioned how these projects had been identified and prioritised in the absence of explicit nominations or visible support within the consultation evidence.
- Reference was made to the Commonplace consultation, where it was noted that there were no clear references to the Woodland Garden proposal or associated elements such as information boards. While officers had indicated that some information was withheld on reasonable grounds, it was argued that this limited transparency and made it difficult for residents and Members to understand how particular projects had been weighted and selected.

Councillor Rossetti further stated that consultation results had shown residents prioritising practical infrastructure improvements, particularly street and kerbside enhancements such as better pavements, crossings, and accessibility measures. In contrast, murals had been categorised within the capital programme as cultural facilities rather than infrastructure improvements. It was noted that the Cabinet report included examples of street and kerbside improvements but did not explicitly reference murals within this category.

Additionally, the list of infrastructure priorities did not include cultural projects, leading to concerns about inconsistency in categorisation. It was also noted that there was no clear evidence of support from recognised stakeholder groups, including the Highgate and Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum.

Concerns were similarly raised regarding the Civic Centre Woodland Garden. Councillor Rossetti noted that a separate proposal for an indoor café at the Civic Centre had received no public support through consultation. However, more than 60 residents had supported a proposal to enclose Trinity Garden to improve safety for children. Despite this significant level of support, the Trinity Garden proposal had not been prioritised for funding, whereas the Woodland Garden, which lacked visible support, had been progressed.

Concerns were also expressed regarding the application of eligibility criteria, particularly in relation to funding availability. The Cabinet report stated that the Woodland Garden met the criterion of having no alternative funding sources. However, it was highlighted that officers had referenced a provisional allocation for the project, and that a call for expressions of interest for its design had already been issued. It was argued that this created an apparent contradiction: either funding had already been anticipated, or the criteria had not been applied correctly. This raised concerns about whether the decision-making process had been predetermined.

In addition, Councillor Rossetti contended that murals did not meet the definition of capital infrastructure, and that their classification had shifted between cultural infrastructure and street and kerbside improvements without clear justification. It was argued that this inconsistency further undermined confidence in the decision-making process.

A broader concern was raised regarding transparency, with particular reference to the absence of detailed information explaining how projects had been shortlisted, assessed, and scored. It was noted that, despite a large number of submissions being received, there was no accessible evidence showing how decisions had been reached or how competing projects had been comparatively evaluated.

In conclusion, Councillor Rossetti requested that the decision be reconsidered and not taken forward. It was further requested that a revised report be produced, including a comprehensive list of proposals, clear evidence of public support for each project, and a transparent assessment against the eligibility criteria. It was argued that this would enable more robust scrutiny and ensure public confidence in the process.

**The following was noted in the discussion between the Committee and Cllr Rossetti.**

- The distinction between nominated and funded projects was raised and it was clarified that the NCIL policy provides that funding decisions are made having regard to consultation results, rather than being limited solely to projects explicitly nominated. The consultation allowed for people to express their views, rather than a specific project, about the sort of area that they would like the council to consider funding and this could include cultural assets and a street and curbside improvement.
- It was noted that five out of the nine wards had indicated support for the murals. However, a concern was raised regarding the use of the term “public art” within the report, noting that it was not clear whether this specifically referred to murals. There were points raised on whether the consultation had explicitly identified murals as a priority.
- Further discussion took place regarding the apparent shift from cultural priorities to practical infrastructure improvements. It was contended that residents had consistently highlighted accessibility concerns, including the need for improved pavements, dropped kerbs, and tactile paving. It was suggested that some residents may have supported the category of “street and kerbside improvements” with the expectation that such accessibility improvements would be delivered.
- The consultation process was also examined, with questions raised and responded to as to why certain projects, such as the Civic Centre Woodland Garden, had not been explicitly included as options in the consultation.
- The Chair highlighted that consultation categories were intentionally broad and could overlap. For example, tree planting might reasonably fall within environmental improvements or street enhancements. It was therefore considered whether it was appropriate for consultation categories to be broader than specific project nominations.

Councillor Rossetti maintained that, notwithstanding this flexibility, there was insufficient evidence of direct support for the projects in question. It was reiterated that

deputations to Cabinet and expressed resident views should carry weight in the decision-making on NCIL funding allocation.

- Further points were raised regarding the lack of support for the Woodland Garden proposal and the absence of consideration for the Trinity Garden enclosure, which had received significant resident backing. It was questioned why a project without visible support had been prioritised over one with clear endorsement.
- The application of eligibility criteria was also discussed. Councillor Rossetti acknowledged that projects were not required to meet every criterion; however, it was emphasised that those meeting more criteria should be prioritised. Concerns were reiterated regarding the apparent contradiction in the funding assessment for the Woodland Garden.

**Councillor Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning ( Deputy Leader) responded to the call-in, and the following was noted:**

- Cllr Williams expressed disappointment at the call-in, noting that the NCIL programme represented a significant investment of £1.7 million across the borough, with further rounds of funding anticipated.
- It was highlighted that over 500 submissions for NCIL funding allocation had been received, requiring difficult decisions to be made. The projects being challenged, including tree planting and the Woodland Garden, were described as broadly aligned with resident priorities and beneficial to local communities.
- In relation to public art, it was stated that five out of nine NCIL areas had identified this as a priority. Concerns raised in the call-in were described as overly focused on terminology rather than the broader intent of enhancing the public realm.
- Officers were commended for their work in delivering engagement and developing the proposals. Reference was made to the Borough of Culture programme and the value of community-led public art in strengthening identity and cohesion. Examples were cited where murals had become valued and recognised local assets.
- It was also noted that, although the total funding appeared substantial, the amount available at local ward level was limited once distributed, making prioritisation necessary.

**The following was noted in response to questions from the Committee on the call-in response:**

- The consultation sought to understand both general public priorities and specific project preferences for funding. The top identified priority was tree planting and green spaces, which aligned strongly with proposals such as the Civic or Woodland Gardens projects, which met these aims effectively. Ideally, consultation would occur in two stages, first gathering priorities and then presenting detailed proposals; however, governance allowed only a single process. This approach collected broad feedback from many participants. The Committee further noted that decision-making did not rely solely on

consultation responses but also assessed how well projects met established criteria, supported by input from Council service experts who contributed to the report and its evaluation appendix.

- Understanding was sought on the connections between expressions of support for streets and curbside improvements leading to murals being taken forward as an action and why this support was not leading to actions for funding more accessibility requirements in the public realm. In response it was noted that a highly comprehensive process was taken forward that reviewed hundreds of projects, supported by extensive discussions with council officers across multiple departments. The approach was thorough and collaborative, with street and kerbside improvements considered as a broad, inclusive category. It was further noted that there were numerous potential street and kerbside projects that could fall within this broad category. While the OSC had previously referred to accessibility study, this was not familiar in this context, such proposals could be revisited and considered in future NCIL funding rounds, with openness to further review and inclusion.
- There was a query about whether it was necessary for a project to have public support in the area for it to be eligible for NCIL funding. Or whether there was just a need to demonstrate engagement and have regard to this on funding allocations. It was noted that NCIL funding followed government policy requiring community consultation, reflected in Haringey's governance. A comprehensive process included 2,700 responses, generating project priorities and suggestions. These were refined through internal review and expert input, with final recommendations selected based on strong alignment with consultation feedback and NCIL criteria.
- There was a further discussion on whether public art met the criteria for public realm improvements. In response it was noted that murals helped foster community connection, engagement, and lasting benefits. Collaborative art projects could help address youth disengagement, antisocial behaviour, and safety concerns, especially in neglected spaces. It was contended by the Cabinet Member that strong resident support existed for this with past consultations highlighting demand for accessible, inclusive art that brings people together and enhances local environments. The positive aspects of having murals in the community was accepted but there were further queries on the priority given to these above all other public realm improvements such as for example SUDS which could benefit areas prone to flooding or funding better walking paths and benches to help elderly and parents with young children. In response there was information shared on this being a infrastructure issue and that Neighbourhood CIL should be viewed alongside the larger Strategic CIL, which provided significantly more funding for major infrastructure. It was noted that while NCIL's £1.7 million could deliver local

impact, broader “nuts and bolts” projects like streetscape improvements were often funded through the wider strategic programme, offering greater overall investment in residents’ priorities. Officers added that there would always be competing views on how best to spend funding on infrastructure, and they had based recommendations on legal requirements, consultation feedback, NCIL governance, and equalities considerations. While views on priorities differed, decisions followed the adopted framework. There was a commitment to review governance within one to two years, allowing future public input, but current proposals reflected existing rules and constraints.

- Concerns were also raised that the issuing of a design tender prior to funding approval for project could give the impression that the outcome had been predetermined. In response, it was explained that preliminary design work was often undertaken in advance to ensure projects could proceed efficiently if funding was secured.
- Officers clarified that the criterion relating to “no alternative funding” was used as guidance rather than a strict rule. While borrowing was theoretically possible, it was stated that the Council’s capital programme was fully committed, and no viable alternative funding sources were available. It was confirmed that none of the recommended projects were already funded through other means.
- In response to a question about the consultation process and how robust it had been, Officers advised that there had been a strong, well-resourced consultation process which ensured broad engagement, clear accessibility, and there had been a thorough analysis of responses. Additional staffing supported the review of responses and engagement work. Outcomes combined consultation feedback with governance and guiding criteria, giving confidence in the robustness of the process and the professional advice informing decision-making.

-

Responding to a follow up question on this, officers advised that a thorough internal process was undertaken, involving extensive team collaboration, senior oversight, and formal approvals. Reports were reviewed by leadership, including the corporate director, and subjected to legal and financial scrutiny. These checks and balances ensure confidence that robust internal consultation and governance standards were fully met.

In answer to a further follow up query on how the public can correlate the headline findings of the consultation with the allocated NCIL funding, officers advised that the Cabinet report included detailed appendices analysing projects against criteria, equality considerations, and key themes. It clearly reflected community priorities identified through consultation, ensuring the Cabinet report communicated a strong and transparent message about what matters most to residents.

#### **Head of Legal Services:**

The Head of Legal Services referred members to paragraph 6.8 of the report, which explained that the policy framework provided the general context for decision-making. It was noted that, provided decisions were consistent with the plans listed in paragraph 6.6, they were deemed to fall within the policy and budget framework.

The assessment, set out in paragraph 8, confirmed that the Cabinet decision of 10 March was within the policy framework. The Section 151 Officer also confirmed, in paragraph 10.1, that the decision was within the Council's budget framework.

At 8:23 pm, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee AGREED to pause the meeting to deliberate further on the call-in.

The meeting was reopened at 9.20pm.

Following consideration of all relevant information, the Committee reached its decision.

### **RESOLVED**

1. In accordance with the Council Constitution, Part 4 Section H, paragraph 10, and further to considering the report of the Deputy Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer, as well as the evidence at the meeting, to agree that the Neighbourhood Community Infrastructure Levy Spending Round 2 decisions set out at attachment C in the supplementary pack and at page 48 were within the Budget and Policy Framework.
2. In accordance Council Constitution, Part 4 Section H, paragraph 10a, to agree to not take any further action, and the key decisions set out at attachment C in the supplementary pack and at page 48 be implemented immediately.

### **Reasons for decision.**

In relation to Resolution 2, the Chair of the Committee outlined, that in relation to all four points of the Call in submission, the Committee considered that the Call in was focusing on two projects out of a large number of projects, receiving NCIL funding and none of the evidence considered indicated that the projects were not eligible for funding. Even with the issues of classification of the projects discussed, there was not enough evidence to suggest unreasonable decisions on project allocations made and the need to refer this decision back to Cabinet.

There was no suggestion in the Call in that the consultation was not conducted properly and the Committee noted that the public consultation role was informing the

decision, but the Committee were satisfied that Cabinet gave due regard to the consultation results.

*The meeting noted that Councillor Connor was not in agreement with resolution 2 and the Chair invited her to set out her comments.*

*Cllr Connor confirmed that she was not in agreement with Resolution 2 and advised the meeting that she had not heard enough evidence at the meeting and within the reports to justify the proposals around the public support for the projects relating to ward murals and the Civic Centre garden and particularly the funding status of these proposed projects. Cllr Connor expressed that these were the two areas that she felt the reports were particularly weak on.*

*Cllr Connor advised that it was for these reasons that she supported the option set out at Council Constitution, Part 4 Section H, paragraph 10b to refer the decision back to the decision maker.*

**109. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

CHAIR: Councillor Matt White

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

## **MINUTES OF THE Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Thursday, 26th February, 2026, 6.30 pm**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Anna Lawton (Chair), Anna Abela, Kaushika Amin**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Amanda Bernard**

### **52. 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'.

### **53. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Grosskopf and Cllr Dunstall. Apologies for absence were also received from Camilla Borwick-Fox.

### **54. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **55. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

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

None.

### **57. MINUTES**

#### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the previous meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2026 were agreed as a correct record.

### **58. HARINGEY AUTISM STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE**

The Panel received a report which provided an update on the implementation of Haringey's Autism strategy, which was a 10-year, all age strategy to improve outcomes, experience and inclusion for autistic people, and was agreed in 2021. The

report outlined the area of improvement to date and future improvement plans. The report was introduced by Tim Miller, Assistant Director of Place, Integration, Transformation and Delivery (Haringey), North Central London ICB, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 7-16. Ann Graham, Corporate Director of Children's Services, Jackie Difolco, Director Early Help, Prevention and SEND and Cllr Zena Brabazon were also present for this item. The following arose during the discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel welcomed the work that was being done to support young people in this cohort into paid employment, including supported internships. The Panel queried whether there was any data on the number of people in supported internships that go into employment. In response, the Panel noted that officers had supplied this information via email in January. In 2023/24 there were 34 people in supported internships, 12 of which ended up in employment. In 2024/25 there were 45 supported internships, 6 of which ended up with an employment outcome. The Chair sought clarification about the drop in the number of employment outcomes over the two years. In response officers commented that there had been a pre supported internship programme introduced in recognition that many of the young people were not quite ready to go on to employment., and that that this likely accounted for part of the reduction. Officers agreed to look into the reasons and provide a more detailed response in writing. **(Action: Jackie Difolco).**
- b. The Panel queried the extent to which the Council was able to offer supported internships in the employment pathway that the young person was interested in. It was suggested that this could be a contributing factor to the reduction in the number of employment outcomes. In response, officers acknowledged the importance of being able to offer the types of internships that young people wanted and that they had received specific feedback on this point from young people. Officers set out that a lot of work had already been done to offer internships in non-traditional sectors, such as the Youth Justice Service, at the local airport and placements in the arts. Officers commented that work would continue to expand on the type of internships available.
- c. The Panel sought clarification about the type of disparities identified at page 16 of the report, and the targeted interventions that were used to improve equity oversight. In response, Mr Miller set out that NCL had looked at ethnicity and deprivation groups and that some of the work done was to improve drop-in services and to develop different ways to access support. Mr Miller agreed to go back to colleagues and provide a more detailed response via email. **(Action: Tim Miller).**
- d. The Chair sought clarification about the report referencing the launch of a support line, querying who would be staffing the support line and what their level of expertise would be. In response, the Panel was advised that the line would be staffed by NHS providers' therapy teams that provided diagnostic services in NCL.

**RESOLVED**

Noted.

**59. SEND AND ALTERNATIVE PROVISION STRATEGY 2026 - 2029: UPDATE ON CONSULTATION FEEDBACK**

The Panel received a verbal update on consultation feedback for the SEND and Alternative Provision Strategy. The update was given by Jackie Difulco, Director of Early Help, Prevention and SEND. The consultation period for the strategy had recently closed, hence the verbal update. The Panel was advised that a full strategy and consultation report would be present to the next meeting of the Panel. A summary of the key points presented to the Panel is set out below:

- The SEND Executive agreed 5 priority areas to consult on: Early Intervention/ High quality Local Provision/ Responsive Local Offer/ Authentic coproduction/ Preparation for Adulthood
- Consultation ran from 8 Dec – 31 Jan, short extension on request of parent carers
- 1,400 unique visits to consultation pages on the website
- Approx 150 responses, 35% increase on 2021
- 193 new subscribers to the SEND newsletter, now approx. 4,000
- The Service are still going through printed responses from libraries
- Elevated Youth, SEND Power Steering Group, Parent Carers session, SENDIASS
- 45% Parent/Carers = 44% Professionals, 64% lived in Haringey
- Strong agreement across all 5 priority areas, most important 1 and 2, Early Intervention and High quality local provision, most valued was no 4 authentic co-production
- Summary of views:
  - more staff training, particularly in schools
  - more local provision
  - earlier support more support within mainstream schools
  - Inclusive practice within mainstream schools
  - specialist skilled staff
  - training
  - more waiting well services
  - reduce waiting times to access assessments and timelier access to therapies
  - clearer information and support on transitions and more respite
  - schools to do more co-production with children and parent carers
  - parent carers to be involved more in decisions, strategy and co-design of services across all services
  - more supportive pathways post 16 and focus on independence
  - need for clearer accountability, transparency, and follow-through
  - need for better coordination with Health services.
  - interest in movement-based, outdoor and activity-based support.
- Specific feedback from young people
  - earlier disability education in primary schools, improved teacher training on recognising SEND needs, and more specialist support within classrooms
  - ensuring EHCPs are followed in schools and clearer information *before* annual reviews so they know what will happen and when, and they want better guidance to ensure families are aware of the support that is available
  - help to understand and communicate their needs, clearer SEND pathways in schools, and more representative youth participation structures in their school councils.

- Less waits for NHS CAMHS and SEND-friendly community health spaces in Haringey
- Clearer information about work experience opportunities, and better education on career paths.
- Next steps: detailed analysis of responses, going to our SEND Exec Board Away Day April, full report to Scrutiny in June for comment/ endorsement prior to publication.

**RESOLVED**

Noted.

**60. HEALTHY WEIGHT STRATEGY: PROGRESS ON TACKLING UNHEALTHY WEIGHT IN CHILDHOOD**

The Panel received a presentation and covering report which provided an update on the implementation of the Healthy Weight Strategy 2022-2025 and progress on tackling unhealthy weight in childhood. The presentation was introduced by Linda Edward, Senior Commissioner Public Health and Benjamin Seifert, Public Health Officer as set out in the agenda pack at pages 17-46. Maria Ahmed, Public Health Officer was present for this item. Ann Graham, Corporate Director of Children's Services was also present for this item along with Cllr Zena Brabazon, Cabinet Member for Children Families and Schools. The following arose as part of the discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel commented that listing the wards with children that were most unhealthy could lead to negative connotations and suggested that future reports should focus on characteristics rather than whole wards. In response, officer acknowledged this feedback and advised that there were trying to illustrate the areas that needed extra support.
- b. The Panel queried the impact that the introduction of free school meals had on healthy weights in children. In response, officers advised that no outcome change had been seen yet, but cautioned that they wouldn't have expected to have seen a difference for a number of years yet, given that the children in the first cohort would need to get to Year 6 before any comparison could be made.
- c. The Panel queried the extent to which healthy weight was being captured in the Council's licensing and planning policies and requested some examples of this. In response, officers advised that there was a team in the Council that worked to ensure that health was reflected in all policies across the Council. The team had been able to affect the new Local Plan for instance, including making amendments to allocations of fast food outlets in the borough. Officers acknowledged that licensing policy could be tricky as it was set by national government and that there was a 'duty to permit' in the legislation. It was also commented that the community impact policy had a very high evidence threshold. Officers also set out that part of the solution was to lobby for national change to things like labelling of food and nutrition standards.
- d. The Panel commented about the role played by ultra processed foods and the fact that less people cooked at home. The Panel also commented on the lack of affordable high quality/fresh food and the fact that unhealthy foods tended to be cheaper and more prevalent in deprived areas. The Panel also referred to cultural factors in relation to food and the fact that some traditional foods could

- be high in carbohydrates but not necessarily unhealthy. In response, officers acknowledged these comments and advised that BMI was a useful measure for looking at broad trends. However, officers set out that they were aware that it was not a perfect measure and that children's weights could fluctuate. Officers provided assurances that they tried to be careful and measured in the language that was used in letters sent out to parents and carers.
- e. The Chair queried the provision of fresh fruit and vegetables at KS1 and whether there was a conversation to be had about rolling this out to younger children. The Chair commented that in her experience younger children tended to be more likely to eat what they were given. In response, officers commented that the [provision of free fresh fruit tended to be a school led approach, but that the general position was that it was available at KS1 but not KS2.
  - f. The Chair queried whether it was known what proportion of children abstained from involvement in the healthy weight programme and whether this was more prevalent in certain parts of the borough. The Chair commented that in general, she found that the breakdown by wards to be useful in relation to the correlation with deprivation levels. In response, officers advised that they would come back with further information in writing. Officers commented that it tended to be schools rather than individuals that opted out and that currently there were currently two primary schools that had opted out. **(Action: Benjamin Seifert).**
  - g. The Chair emphasised the importance of coproduction with young people and the fact that there was a significant fitness trend on social media. The Chair suggested that the Council should be doing more to utilise the general fitness trend among young people, including using older teenagers to influence younger children. In response, officers acknowledged that they would like to see more coproduction with young people. The Corporate Director highlighted the fact that there was also a Leisure Strategy and that this worked in tandem with the Healthy Weight Strategy. It was suggested that the links could be signposted more clearly in the Healthy Weight Strategy.
  - h. The Panel requested that they receive an update on leisure provision for young people at a future meeting. **(Action: Philip).**
  - i. The Chair welcomed the strategy and commended the aims behind it. However, the Chair raised concerns that for all of the good work that had been done, the numbers had not improved and the three year trend was essentially flat. The Chair sought assurances about what could be done to prevent a similar outcome happening in three years' time. In response, officers from Public Health advised that they had been evaluating the figures as part of the review of the strategy and that it was recognised that that the figures had plateaued for not just the three years of the strategy, but over the last ten years. Officers set out that there was a recognition that there needed to be a more concerted effort to try and strengthen the partnership approach and to try to tackle the issue from a variety of different service areas and partners. Officers acknowledged that there was a significant space for lobbying and national legislative changes in relation to tackling unhealthy weight in childhood, given that this was a national/international issue.

- j. The Corporate Director cautioned that there was a degree of likelihood that the figures would not change significantly in three years' time. It was suggested that many of the contributing factors were outside of Haringey's direct control. Haringey could set the conditions, raise awareness and engage with young people and with schools, but that change needed to happen at the national level in order to improve the availability of healthy food.
- k. The Panel emphasised the potential impact on young people's mental health from being considered overweight and stressed the importance of listening to young people themselves about what works for them. Officers acknowledged this and stressed the impact mental health could have on physical health.

**RESOLVED**

That the report was noted.

**61. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS: CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN, SCHOOLS & FAMILIES**

The Panel received an update from the Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Families on developments within her portfolio, which was followed by questions from the Panel. As part of this item, the Panel received a tabled set of slides which provided an update on the outcome of a recent Ofsted inspection of local authority children's services (ILACS) which took place between 12-16<sup>th</sup> January. The slides were introduced by Cllr Brabazon, Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Schools and are published on the website as part of the agenda papers for this meeting. Ann Graham, Corporate Director of Children's Services was also present for this item.

- The Panel was advised that Children's Services had achieved an Outstanding rating from Ofsted for the first time. The authority had gone from a 2017 Joint Targeted Area Inspection which had resulted in the award of a 'Requires Improvement' rating, through the 2023 rating of 'Good' to achieving an Outstanding rating in January.
- During the inspection in January, Ofsted reviewed the experiences of children and young people across Children's Services. The Ofsted inspectors commented on several areas of excellence, including:
  - Skilled and dedicated social workers who benefited from strong training and support, helping them stay focused on the lived experiences of children.
  - Effective early help services that ensured families could access the right support quickly.
  - Outstanding support for care leavers from highly experienced and committed practitioners.
  - Robust safeguarding arrangements, including a highly effective multi-agency safeguarding hub (MASH).
  - Strong strategic leadership that drove consistently good or outstanding practice across services, supported by political leaders who prioritised children's social care despite financial pressures.

- The Cabinet Member commended the dedication and hard work of staff across Children's Services and highlighted the consistent and outstanding leadership of the Corporate Director and her team.
- Officers advised the Panel that the framework was changing and that from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2026, authorities would no longer receive a single word judgement, instead there would be five criteria. Haringey would retain its one word judgement until another full inspection was carried out. It was suggested that this would likely be in three to four years.
- The inspection raised one area for improvement around the assessments carried out by the disabled children's team; 'management oversight was not always clearly recorded, and for a small number of children, safety planning and partner communication is not always sufficiently timely when significant harm is suspected'.
- Officers set out that the Youth Justice Service had a good with outstanding award, the SEND service had been awarded outstanding and now Children's Services had been awarded an outstanding rating.

The following arose as part of the discussion of this item:

- a. Panel members paid tribute to officers across the service and to the Cabinet Member for achieving an award of outstanding. The Panel commented on the quality of leadership shown by senior managers.
- b. The Panel highlighted the inspection outcome's emphasis on Haringey's organisational culture within Children's Services and the skills of the staff that work there.
- c. In response to a question around what some of the key factors were from the Corporate Director's perspective, the Panel was advised that a key part of this was around having the support of the Council's political leadership, as well as corporate support from across the Council. The Corporate Director highlighted the financial challenges facing the service when she joined the organisation and the strong financial support she received corporately in terms of funding the service.
- d. Officers acknowledged that they didn't get it right every time and that there were children who the service hadn't gotten it right for. Officers highlighted another example of the corporate support they received around the provision of housing units for care leavers and the fact that when they wanted more they received them.
- e. Officers highlighted the fact that the service worked well and the fact that the staff were trusted to carry out their roles. Similarly, it was felt that the leaders of the service were trusted by corporate leadership. Officer commented on the fact that there was a high accountability culture within the service and that staff were also encouraged to come forward with ideas.
- f. The Cabinet Member emphasised the need for to have strong systems in place, strong leadership, but also the need for imagination and the need to be creative.
- g. On behalf of the Members who were unable to be at the meeting, as well as herself, the Chair passed on her thanks and appreciation to everyone in the service for their hard work.

**RESOLVED**

Noted.

**62. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

**RESOLVED**

The Panel noted the work programme.

**63. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

N/A

**64. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

N/A

CHAIR: Councillor Anna Lawton

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

## **MINUTES OF THE Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel HELD ON Monday, 9th March, 2026, 6.40 pm**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Adam Small (Chair), Dawn Barnes, John Bevan, Lester Buxton and Isidoros Diakides**

### **ALSO ATTENDING:**

#### **287. 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'.

#### **288. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Small.

#### **289. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

#### **290. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

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

None.

#### **292. MINUTES**

##### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2025 were agreed as a correct record.

#### **293. KPI UPDATE**

The Panel received a set of slides which provide an update on a range of Key Performance Indicators in relation to the Housing Service. The slides were included in the agenda pack at pages 15-42 and there were additional slides included in the

addendum report pack at pages 1-4, which gave an update on voids and damp and mould, as requested by the Panel at the previous meeting. The following arose during the discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Panel sought clarification about whether the information pertaining to repairs completed first time, included appointments that the Council didn't attend i.e. if there was a cancellation or the contractor was unable to attend. Officers advised that they believed it was only repairs that were completed, but that they would confirm this in writing. **(Action: Scott Kay)**.
- b. The Chair noted that it would be useful to know information around the number of appointments that were upheld and conversely, cancelled. The Chair commented that he assumed that a repair wouldn't be listed as completed first time, if it had been cancelled or rescheduled prior to being completed.
- c. The Panel queried how satisfaction with repairs was tracked, and whether a repair would be marked as completed if the resident wasn't happy with the repairs that had been carried out. In response, officers advised that there was an indicator in the slide deck relating to satisfaction with previous repair. Officers set out that if a repair had been completed to the contractors satisfaction it would be listed as completed. If the resident wasn't happy with the repair, then it would be followed up as either a complaint or a separate job would be raised.
- d. In response to a request for clarification, officers advised that tenancy activity related to the range of interactions the Tenancy team could have with tenants, covering things like a visit to a property, initial tenancy visits and a one year review. It was also clarified that the indicator on support plans, related to sheltered housing or good neighbour schemes and there is a one year review that takes place. The support planning is profiled 12 months ahead and a meeting is scheduled. All residents in these schemes have a support plan and this is what is being monitored and tracked.
- e. The Panel sought questioned what happened if the Council did not meet its target on tenancy audits, given current performance levels were quite far off. In response, officers advised that the aim was to cover 20% of all tenancies within social housing stock on an annual basis and that this figures was profiled and reported on through this indicator. Officers commented that they would be looking at how best to report on the management of stock going forwards. The Chair sought clarification about what Members could expect to see by the end of the year in relation to performance on tenancy audits. Officers agreed to provide a written response on this. **(Action: Neehara)**.
- f. The Panel queried what 'out of scope' referred to in relation to damp and mould. Officers advised that this related to where a resident had reported damp and mould but on inspection, it was found to be something else.
- g. In relation to a score of 63% of emergency treatments for damp and mould, officers advised that this score related to the number of cases completed in time and that those that were not completed in time tended to be due to problems with gaining access to the property, for example. Officers provided assurances that they would continue to look at how they could improve their policies and processes in relation to this work.

## RESOLVED

The KPI update was noted.

**294. MANAGEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF COUNCIL HOUSING ESTATES**

The Panel received a report which set out the overarching picture of how housing estates are managed and maintained across Housing Services. The report provided an overview of the service offer, what teams were responsible for, and how this linked to larger programmes of work. The report was introduced by Neehara Wijeyesekera, Assistant Director for Housing Management as set out in the addendum report pack at pages 5-16. The following arose as part of the discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel commented that in the past there was one named person who was responsible for a particular estate. It was contended that this was no longer the case, and that this had resulted in a lack of accountability for the upkeep and management of estates. In response, officers advised that a model of having one person accountable was not seen to be effective, given the complexities involved. It was suggested that the likelihood of anyone person being able to understand where all of the budgets relating to all the different aspects of managing estates, including long-term agreements versus contractors, was less likely in modern environments. Officers advised that there weren't a lot of neighbourhood managers in any case (four).
- b. The Panel raised concerns around estate inspections, commenting that these tended to be under-resourced and underrepresented. Panel Members suggested that they rarely seemed to receive feedback on the outcomes of these inspections. The Chair gave an anecdotal account of having not received feedback from an inspection that was carried out five months ago. In response, officers advised that there was currently a reorganisation taking place in tenancy services, which would lead to the estate inspection process being led by the Housing Officer directly. It was commented that additional resources had gone in to reduce patch sizes, in addition to retaining the Neighbourhood Improvement Officer role as-is. It was also commented that through better digital tracking of jobs, it would be easier to disseminate information, but this would require a neighbourhood plan model. The Panel were advised that this would take time to establish.
- c. The Panel sought clarification about the difference between a Neighbourhood Improvement Officer and Neighbourhood Manager. The Panel queried who was responsible for the ownership of an estate. In response, officers advised that the Neighbourhood Manager was responsible for a particular location and all of the services in that location i.e. grounds maintenance, inspections, neighbourhood improvements, the ordering of works, and scheduling of inspections. Whereas the Neighbourhood Improvement Officers had the responsibility to track, report, and arrange with various service providers, including around who was able to provide what, and at what price, and whether that would move forward. In relation to communal items and repairs, officers advised that there would be so much investment over the coming ten years that it would be very difficult for one individual to track through all of the work being done.
- d. The Chair noted concerns with the capacity of housing officers to manage the estate inspection process, even with smaller patch sizes. Officers noted that the patch size would be reduced from 700 to 500. The Chair queried whether, as part of the consultation process, Housing Officers had given an indication that the reduction in patch size, would allow them to carry out the estate

- inspection process. In response, officers advised that the consultation process had been looking at the role and duties of housing officers. It was stated that to some extent, it would depend on the experience levels of individual staff members. There would be a process of training and shadowing introduced to facilitate this change. Furthermore, there would be a review of the restructure after six and then twelve months.
- e. The Panel commented that the budget for neighbourhood works seemed quite small. The Panel raised concerns about the standard of grounds maintenance carried out by the Parks service, and suggested that this should be benchmarked against the grounds maintenance carried out by housing associations like Berkley Homes. In response, officers acknowledged that there were ongoing challenges around grounds maintenance performance. The Panel was advised that there was an improvement plan being developed and that the Parks service were meeting residents through a task and finish group. Officers set out that they were looking to have a new model of service delivery in place, and that there was a commitment that the service offer would be transparent and deliverable. Officers cautioned that this was a big piece of work and it would take some time to implement.
  - f. The Panel sought clarification about transparency of grounds maintenance charges and whether residents could expect to see how many times the grass would be cut a year, for example. In response, officers advised that the charge was an annual figure at present, which is apportioned across tenants and leaseholders directly through a service charge. Officers advised that the transparency piece through the service provider is looking to model how many grass cuts and what the profile is across the year. In terms of timescales, officers commented that it would be six to eight weeks to conclude the task and finish group and the expectation of what residents/leaseholders could expect would become clearer after it had concluded. The service would then examine what the SLA would look like and what the monitoring arrangements would be.
  - g. The Panel sought further details behind the £2m ground maintenance budget being ringfenced within Parks. Officers agreed to provide a written response. **(Action: Neehara).**
  - h. The Panel cautioned about low turnout on estate walkabouts, given that those who attended got to set the rating for the estate inspection. The Panel suggested that that it would be useful to have a breakdown of the number of residents attending the inspections. In response, officers advised that they would provide a written answer to the Panel. **(Action: Neehara).**
  - i. The Panel sought assurances that the additional demands on housing officers arising from the Housebuilding Programme had been factored into the plans for the department. In response, officers advised that it was expected that additional stock levels would be a benefit as it would provide economies of scale, and that rents and income levels should be proportionally higher for new builds compared to existing stock. The Panel was advised that these assumptions were built into long-term HRA planning.
  - j. The Panel reiterated their belief that having a named officer who was responsible for a particular estate was something that the Council should be aspiring to. Concerns were raised about a level of duplication in the roles of Neighbourhood Manager and the Neighbourhood Engagement Officer, and the value for money considerations involved in having two different roles. The Panel set out that there were a range of different issues that often arose on

estates, such as ASB, parking, disruption caused by major works. It was suggested that having one designated point of contact was essential to engaging with residents around these issues. The Panel also commented that a number of the notice boards across estates that stated who to contact, were out of date. The Chair emphasised the fact that there was a strong local identity on many estates and that it was important that the people responsible for managing that estate understood this.

- k. The Panel queried at what point a repair became major works, and questioned the extent to which priority was given to high impact, low cost repairs such as painting railings or mending fences. In response, officers advised that this fell under the category of a planned reactive maintenance programme and that discussions were underway within the service to look at how a reactive maintenance programme could be set up. Officers also advised that they were looking at whether some of these works could be done as part of Decent Homes.
- l. The Panel resolved to receive further information at a future meeting around a detailed breakdown of the estate management budget, and whether this was sufficient. **(Action: Scrutiny Officer).**

## RESOLVED

- I. That the report was noted.
- II. The Panel welcomed the proposed adoption of a Neighbourhood Plan model and recommend that Cabinet consider adopting this model sooner, given the urgent need to improve the communal areas of the Council's estates.
- III. The Panel recommended that there should be a single person responsible for the management of a particular estate.
- IV. The Panel recommended that Cabinet give further consideration to whether Housing Officers were the most appropriate person for undertaking inspections of estates, given their current workloads and expressed concern this was not the appropriate solution.
- V. The Panel recommended that Cabinet consider undertaking a benchmarking exercise of its internal performance of grounds maintenance on estates with local Housing Associations.

## 295. LEGAL DISREPAIR

The Panel received a report which provided an update in Legal Disrepair cases. The report set out the current status of legal disrepair claims, as well as the work being undertaken to meet the strategic objective of reducing open case levels to a business-as-usual scenario. The report was introduced by Scott Kay, Assistant Director for Repairs and Compliance, as set out in the addendum report pack at pages 17-26. Richard Purvis, Senior Disrepair Manager was present for this item, along with the Interim Director for Housing and Cllr Sarah Williams, Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning. The following arose as part of the discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel sought clarification around how long officers anticipated it would be before maintenance was of a standard that the number of claims would be significantly reduced. In response, officers stated that the report set out a trajectory of caseloads at paragraph 4.11. The Panel was advised that, in essence, the length of time would depend on how much the Major Works

- programme was scaled up, as well as the number of claims that the Council received.
- b. The Panel queried the extent to which an increase in the number of damp and mould cases was anticipated following the introduction of Awaab's Law. In response, officers advised that the organisation did see a bit of spike following the introduction of the legislation, but that the increase was not as large as it might have been. It was suggested that the change had been widely publicised in the media in the run up to it being enacted. Officers set out that they were comfortable that the Council had adequate resources in place to deal with claims at the level they are at present. The service was also working to increase supply chains in order to deal with any future spike in claims as-and-when that might happen.
  - c. The Panel raised concerns around a failure to deal with regular repairs and these ending up being escalated into legal disrepair claims. In response, officers acknowledged that there had been some issues with the volume of calls into the call centre and the ability to handle all of those calls. In response to this, additional routes for reporting repairs directly through to the repairs team had been established, to sit alongside the call centre. It was commented that improvements to customer satisfaction scores had started to happen. The Corporate Director advised that additional resources had been put into customer services and that there was ongoing transformation work to improve digital contact with the Council.
  - d. The Panel queried the report's assertion that part of the solution was that sector reform was needed, in order to prevent the incentive for volume-based litigation firms. The Chair suggested that the claims were a problem only if they were legitimate claims. In response, officers agreed that claims needed to be valid, but cautioned that the legal standard was very low. The Panel was advised that even in cases that could be defended through the legal process, the claim still had to be treated as a disrepair claim - which took up additional resources to resolve that claim. Officers clarified that the salient point was that the resolution process under the protocol was not very cost effective. The legal costs in defending these claims were high, especially given the low legal standard. Furthermore, repairs were delayed by the legal process, which often made the repair more expensive to resolve.
  - e. The Panel welcomed the progress that had been made overall on the issue of legal disrepair. The Panel advocated that the Council should be doing all it could to clear the backlog and to pre-empt cases from going to court in the first place given the costs involved, rather than challenging claims and effectively seeking to prevent people from claiming their rightful compensation. The Panel commented that the Council's expectation should be that there are zero cases of legal disrepair.
  - f. The Chair requested that in future, graphs in reports show the figures on the axes rather than just the trend. **(Action: Officers to note).**

**RESOLVED**

Noted.

**296. NEIGHBOURHOOD MOVES SCHEME**

The Panel received a report on the Neighbourhood Moves Scheme. The report set out the background to the Neighbourhood Moves Scheme (NMS) including its introduction and the results of the scheme on the Council's allocation and letting of homes. The report also set out the existing proposed changes as part of the Allocations Policy consultation that was authorised by Cabinet. The Consultation questions were appended to the report (Appendix 1). The report was introduced by Rachel Sharpe, Interim Director of Housing, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 43-51. Appendix 1 was included in the addendum report pack at pages 27-28. Maddie Watkins, AD for Housing Demand and Cherie Lee-Hemley, Neighbourhood Moves Scheme Manager were present for this agenda item. The Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning was also present. The following arose as part of the discussion of this report:

- a. The Panel sought clarification about whether the Council had any leverage over housing associations to make them deal with under-occupancy. Officers replied that, in general the Council did not have any powers with housing associations in this regard. Housing associations have a general duty to meet housing need and to cooperate with local councils. Housing associations have their own allocations policies and the authority does not have any control over that. Officers referred Members to paragraph 5.3 of the report which set out that one possible inclusion for a future Neighbourhood Moves scheme was to include housing association tenants that we nominated, as being eligible for the Neighbourhood Moves scheme.
- b. The Chair queried why the percentage of eligible residents who applied for NMS was quite low at 18% and what reason people gave for wanting to move. In response, officers advised that the most common reason was overcrowding, with under-occupiers next. Officers noted that there were other people who were adequately housed in terms of the number of bedrooms, but they had other problems such as disrepair or level access requirements. The Neighbourhood Moves Scheme Manager set out that she had been in the organisation since 2023 and that it was only now that the scheme was getting going, with the scheme being spread by word of mouth from residents who had used it. Officers set out that under-occupiers tended to be difficult to relocate due to modern developments having smaller gardens and lack of available parking.
- c. The Cabinet Member advised the Panel that there was a report going to Cabinet on 10<sup>th</sup> March on the Council's downsizing policy. The Cabinet Member commented that there was more that the organisation could do to incentivise under-occupiers to downsize. The Chair noted that this was something that should be looked at in a future scrutiny meeting.
- d. The Panel queried whether there was any information available around the cost of overcrowding to the Council. In response, officers advised that it was not possible to accurately determine the cost due to the multiple variables involved, including the number of non-dependant adults living at home and the extent to which this could be mitigated through things like employment support. Information was available from the housing register that set out the extent and scale of overcrowding, as well the reasons that people gave for applying to the NMS. Officers agreed to supply this information to the Panel. **(Action: Maddie Watkins).**
- e. The Chair clarified whether the report identified that around one-third of moves under the NMS were in situations that there was no net-gain to housing needs

- on the housing register. Officers confirmed that the figure was 36%, which meant that in 64% of cases there was a net-gain.
- f. The Panel queried what was being done to look at families who in four or five years' time might have a change in circumstance and may want to downsize. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that the organisation was making a start through various policies and procedures, such as the downsizing strategy, but that the organisation hadn't done this for a long time. The Cabinet Member commented that she thought that it would come down to being able to provide enough capacity to properly support people through the process, rather than money. The Corporate Director of Adults, Housing and Health set out that the Older Person's Housing Strategy was also being considered at the next Cabinet meeting. The report was due to go out to consultation on a 15 year strategy. It was stated that the Council needed to have a strategic package of appropriate housing for people as they go older.
  - g. The Panel raised concerns about the levels of severe overcrowding in the borough and suggested that tackling this issue should be a priority for the authority. In response, officers advised that in the proposed changes to the scheme, as set out in the report, there was an option to utilise the NMS to respond to overcrowding and under-occupying in a more specific way. It was noted that the NMS was part of the allocations policy, which is out to consultation in the summer. One of the options put forward in the report was to continue with the NMS, but limit it to instances of severe overcrowding and under-occupiers. Officers emphasised that there was a spectrum of ways that the NMS could be used to meet housing needs in the borough.
  - h. The Chair queried the presence of a catchment area of 250m, suggesting that there was an imbalance in the west to the east of the borough in terms of the number of Council homes. The Chair suggested that he would like to see a degree of flexibility in the catchment area to reflect the fact that most schemes are in the east of the borough. Similarly, the Chair suggested that only applying it to schemes of ten or more properties disproportionately impacted the west of the borough. In response, officers advised that they were happy to take this feedback on board as part of the consultation process.
  - i. The Panel commented that allowing another move under the NMS within five years seemed very generous. In response, officers clarified that there wasn't any limit in the scheme at the minute and that the proposal sought to introduce a time limit. Officers clarified that in general, a move under the scheme would not be considered at present if you had been living in your property for less than one year.

## **RESOLVED**

- I. That the report was noted.
- II. That Cabinet should consider revising the future Neighbourhood Moves Scheme so that a portion of the properties available through the scheme are reserved for households outside of the designated area experiencing severe overcrowding. Priority for these homes would be given to families living in severe overcrowding, based on the length of time they have been affected.
- III. That Cabinet consider how the current Neighbourhood Moves Scheme may inadvertently deprioritise families in areas of the Borough where fewer properties are being built. Consideration should be given to an amendment to

- the area of households within scope for a NMS property could be flexible to reflect the number of new builds or prospective builds in an area so that all residents can see the benefit of the Council's housebuilding programme.
- IV. That Cabinet should also consider introducing a minimum period since a household's last move before they are eligible to move again under the scheme, and that this period should exceed five years. The Panel recognises, however, that an exception should apply where a family is willing to downsize, given that the needs of families with teenage children can change significantly over time. The Panel further believes that priority within the scheme should be given to families who have experienced a change in circumstances, such as the onset of significant health issues, a disability, or children with SEND.

**297. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

Noted.

**298. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

N/A

**299. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Adam Small

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report for:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 22 June 2026

**Title:** Appointment of Parent Governor representatives

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

**Lead Officer:** Philip Slawther, Principal Scrutiny Officer, 020 8489 2957  
[philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk)

**Ward(s) affected:** All

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

## 1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 The report advises Members of the appointment of two Parent Governor representatives as voting co-opted members to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee when educational matters are being considered and appointment to the Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel which has responsibility for considering educational matters.
- 1.2 The two Parent Governor representatives were appointed by Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2025. The representatives serve a two year term. This report is for information only.

## 2. Cabinet Member Introduction

N/A

## 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That the Committee notes that Camilla Borthwick-Fox and Christine Cordon were appointed as voting co-opted members to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, participating at meetings when educational matters are being considered, in June 2025.
- 3.2 That the Committee notes that Camilla Borthwick-Fox and Christine Cordon were appointed to the Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel as Panel Members which has responsibility for considering educational matters

## 4. Reasons for decision

- 4.1 There are a number of different models used by Councils for how Overview and Scrutiny works. Committees often shadow Cabinet portfolios or corporate priorities of Councils. Many Councils have an overarching co-ordinating committee, with scrutiny panels reporting to it. This is the model currently used in Haringey.

4.2 Parent Governor representative are required to be appointed as members to all scrutiny committees responsible for education matters. This means that in Haringey they are members of both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel. The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel specifically includes education within its terms of reference, but its recommendations need to be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. As this gives the Committee ultimate responsibility for scrutiny of education issues, Parent Governor Representatives also need to be listed as members of it. In light of the focus on Budget Monitoring by the Overview and Scrutiny, the Parent Governors would only be required to attend meetings where there are educational matters for decision – making such as reviews from the Children and Young People's Panel and Call in of decisions relating to educational matters or strategic and cross cutting issues, which may include consideration of education matters

## **5. Alternative options considered**

5.1 Parent Governor Representatives (England) Regulations 2001 require parent governor representatives to be elected to serve on education overview and scrutiny committees. Therefore, no alternatives were considered.

## **6. Background information**

6.1 Parent Governor representatives (PGRs) were introduced in the School Standards and Framework Act 1998 so that parents of children at schools had an apolitical voice on local education matters. Although elected by parent governors, the role of Parent Governor representatives is to represent parents and not governors.

6.2 The Act provided for “local authority education committees or sub-committees to include one or more elected representatives of parent governors at maintained schools in relation to which the committee or sub committee acts.”

6.3 This was changed under the Local Government Act 2000 to reflect the new political arrangements that were introduced for local authorities in England. Those operating the new ‘executive arrangements’ were required to appoint at least two but not more than five parent governor representatives to each of their education overview and scrutiny committees. Haringey has decided that there should be two Parent Governor representatives appointed to its scrutiny committees and this is reflected under Paragraph 4.1 of Part 4, Section G of the Council's constitution: 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).

6.4 These voting representatives will be entitled to attend a meeting and 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.

6.5.1 The statutory education co-optees will also be invited to attend the Overview & Scrutiny Committee meetings, when it is considering an agenda item relating to education matters as set out at paragraph 4.2 and will be provided with support and briefings to participate in these meetings when required by Democratic Services and Scrutiny Team. They will attend the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel which has responsibility for educational matters.

6.5.2 Within the current structure of scrutiny in Haringey, there is one overarching Overview and Scrutiny Committee and four advisory panels, these being:

- Adults and Health
- Children and Young People
- Culture, Community Safety & Environment
- Housing, Planning & Development

6.6 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee consists of 5 non executive members.

6.7 Scrutiny panels are chaired by a Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The membership of each panel consists of between 3 and 7 non executive members and is politically proportional as far as possible. The membership of the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel also includes the statutory education representatives and also has a non-voting co-opted Members who is a representative from a Haringey SEND parent/carer forum.

6.8 The terms of reference/arrangements for Overview and Scrutiny are set out in Part 2 (Article 6), Part 3 (Section B) and Part 4 (Section G) of the Council's Constitution. Further information can be found via the link below:

<https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=873&MId=7972&info=1&MD=Constitution>

6.9 By bringing an educational expertise and adding a different perspective to the business of the panel, non voting co-optees are expected to add value to scrutiny by performing the following roles:

- To bring specialist knowledge and/or skills to the Overview and Scrutiny process and to bring an element of external challenge by representing maintained schools.
- To act in a non party political manner
- To establish good relations with members, officers and co-optees.

- To abide by the relevant sections of the Council's Constitution in terms of the rules and procedures for Overview and Scrutiny.

6.10 It is expected that statutory education 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 work programme.
- Keep abreast of key issues for the authority and bear these in mind when scrutinising services and making recommendations for improvement.

6.11 In March and April 2025, nominations were sought from all eligible parent governors. Two nominations were received, so no formal election was required. The people nominated were: Camilla Borthwick-Fox, Parent Governor at Ferry Lane Primary School; and Christine Cordon, Parent Governor at North Harringay Primary.

## **7 Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Assistant Director of Corporate Governance, Equalities)**

### **Finance**

7.1 Statutory Education Representatives are entitled to an allowance of £154 per meeting, upto a maximum of £616.

### **Legal**

7.2 The Assistant Director of Corporate Governance has been consulted in the preparation of this report. Part 4 Section G (4.1) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules

7.3 The Parent Governor representatives is entitled to vote on recommendations considered at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on educational matters and will participate at the Panel where there specifically related to education matters. Therefore, the Parent Governor representatives is bound by the Council's Code

of Conduct (in Part 5 Section A of the Constitution) that includes the registration and declaration of interest. However, the co-optee is also required to comply with relevant parts of the General Obligations of the Code (in Paragraph 3) when attending the meetings and conducting the business of the Panel.

## **Equality**

- 7.4 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.
- 7.5 The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.
- 7.6 Although it is not enforced in legislation as a protected characteristic, Haringey Council treats socioeconomic status as a local protected characteristic.

## **8 Use of Appendices**

None.

## **9 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

Local Government Act 2000 (LGA 2000)

This page is intentionally left blank

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

**Title:** Appointment of non-voting co-opted Members

**Report authorised by:** Fiona Alderman, Director of Legal and Governance

**Lead Officer:** Ayshe Simsek, Democratic Services and Scrutiny Manager

**Ward(s) affected:** All

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

## 1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 The report seeks formal approval of the appointment of two non – voting co-opted members to the Scrutiny Panels as required by the Constitution and the non – voting co-optee protocol agreed by Standards Committee in March 2025.
- 1.2 The Committee is asked to appoint Amanda Bernard, Chair of SENDPower, a parent carer forum which represents the voices of SEND families in the borough to the Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel. SendPower is a community organisation with an established contact with the Council and co -production partner. This appointment is endorsed by the Corporate Director for Children’s Services.
- 1.3 The Committee is further asked to appoint Helena Kania to the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel as a non-voting co-opted member. Helena has served as a scrutiny co-optee since 2003 and has expertise in the health sector, both public health and NHS. Helena represents Disability Action Haringey and Public Voice. This appointment is endorsed by the Director for Adult Social Care.

## 2. Cabinet Member Introduction

N/A

## 3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That Amanda Bernard be appointed to the Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel as a non voting co-opteed member for the municipal year 2026/2027.
- 3.2 That Helena Kania be appointed to the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel as a non – voting co-opted member for the municipal year 2026/27.

## 4. Reasons for decision

- 4.1 As required by the Council’s Constitution.

**5. Alternative options considered**

5.1 No alternative options

**6. Background information**

6.1 In relation to scrutiny, the Local Government Act 2000 made provision for the co-option of non-elected members to Overview and Scrutiny Committees in order to bring additional expertise and skills to scrutiny work and to increase public engagement with scrutiny.

6.2 In January 2021 the Standards Committee agreed a protocol on non – voting co-opted members which put in place the process for recruitment, completion of register of interest form and made clear, adherence to the Member Code of Conduct.

6.3 The Standards Committee considered and agreed an updated protocol on non voting co-opted member appointments at their meeting in March 2025. This was in accordance with their responsibilities for maintaining high standards of conduct and considering amendments to the Constitution and recommending proposals to full Council for approval.

6.2 The updated and agreed the protocol, attached at Appendix 1, responded to observations and comments made by the Constitution Working Group.

6.3 There was a need to update the protocol to ensure that it was as robust as possible and given that the last update was completed in 2021. The decision making for appointments of non – voting members was previously assigned, in the Constitution, to the scrutiny panels. This was felt to be an anomaly as the Panels do not have decision making powers. This responsibility has been added to the terms of reference for Overview and Scrutiny Committee and updates to the Constitution agreed by Full Council on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2025.

6.4 The Panels can appoint up to 3 non-voting members and nominations can come forward from established community groups or be individuals that provide additional expertise and skills.

6.5 The applications have been considered against the protocol as well as the endorsements of senior officers.

**7 Statutory Officers comments (Chief Finance Officer (including procurement), Director of Legal & Governance, Equalities)**

**Finance**

7.1 There is no payments for non - voting co-opted members and no financial implications.

**Legal**

7.2 The Director of Corporate Governance has been consulted in the preparation of this report. Section 9FA Local Government Act 2000 provides that an Overview

and Scrutiny committee of a local council may include persons who are not members of the Council. Part 4 Section G (3.1) of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, as set out in the Council's Constitution, applies.

## **Equality**

- 7.3 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.
- 7.4 The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.
- 7.5 Although it is not enforced in legislation as a protected characteristic, Haringey Council treats socioeconomic status as a local protected characteristic.

## **6 Use of Appendices**

Non – Voting Member Protocol.

## **7 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Protocol for Non - Voting Co-opted Members – March 7, 2025

### 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 have up to three non-voting co-optees to assist Scrutiny with its work, who will be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on an annual basis. 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 Overview and Scrutiny to appoint up to three co-optees to 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 3.5 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.
- Contribute to the preparation of reviews 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.
- Attend training sessions conducive to their Scrutiny role

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

- Co-optees on Scrutiny Panels will have no voting rights.
- Each co-opted member will be appointed for a period of one year by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at their first meeting of the Municipal year. Subject to there being no issues regarding their membership, this will be reviewed on an annual basis by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- Employees and existing Councillors of Haringey Council are excluded from applying to be Co-optees.  
Co-optees are expected to act in accordance with the Member Code of Conduct.

2.5 Scrutiny involves working with councillors and officers as a critical friend in an unbiased and collaborative manner maintaining the shared focus of the Scrutiny Work Programme and the Panel's terms of reference. The expectation is that all participants in the panel meetings approach the agenda and work items with an open mind and avoid being influenced by party political or personal motivations.

2.6 The Overview and Scrutiny will have the authority to review and amend the criteria set out at paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4 to meet the needs of the Scrutiny work plan and ensure the Committee meets its statutory role and responsibilities, which may impact on the eligibility of non – voting co – optees to sit on the Panels.

### **3. Appointment process**

- 3.1 Primarily, Scrutiny will seek nominations from established community groups that have a working relationship with the Council 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.
- 3.2 To aid understanding of the requirements for this public facing role, community groups include constituted and un-constituted not-for-profit groups, community organisations and registered charities who provide support to local people in Haringey.

- 3.3 Alternatively, where 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.
- 3.4 Community organisations will be sent:
- Information on the role of Overview and Scrutiny non -voting co-opted members.
  - Protocol for co-opted 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.

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

### **Recruitment Process for Scrutiny Panel non – voting co-opted members**

- 3.5 The Scrutiny Panel Chair, in consultation with the Overview and Scrutiny Chair, along with relevant Scrutiny officer will shortlist suitable candidates that have been considered from community groups or who offer particular expertise and experience. This will include an assessment against the Scrutiny Work Plan, their role in the community and the criteria at section 2.3 above. Applicants will also be asked to attend a short interview with the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny and Panel Chair with officers present. Prior to the interview, they will need to provide two references, including one from the community organisation that they are representing to evidence participation with the community group. The reference checks will be completed by the Human Resources Compliance Team prior to the appointment report being considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- 3.6 Given that applicants will likely be living or working in the borough and in use of Council services, internal references may be sought and the stipulations listed below will apply, prior to appointment. This is to ensure that legal requirements and Member Code of Conduct can be adhered to.

Stipulations: applicants are to note that:

- Where they have been in contact with the Council and are subject to actions arising from the requirements of the Council's Unreasonable Behaviour Policy or are known to the Council as a Person of Concern, they will not be eligible to apply.
- Where they had contact with the Council services and are deemed vexatious, abusive, offensive, they will not be eligible to apply.
- Where they are involved in legal proceedings with the Council, they will not be eligible to apply for a position until completion of the proceeding

- Where the applicant has an ongoing dispute against the Council, they will not be eligible until resolution of the issue.

3.7 Further to the above requirements being met, there will be a discussion with the relevant Director of the service and Democratic Services Manager on the planned appointment to ensure there is no conflict of interest and that the due diligence has been completed on the appointment process as outlined above.

## **4. Term of office**

4.1 According to the recruitment process at section 3.5, non-voting co-opted members will be appointed for the duration of the Municipal year and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee will annually review their membership according to consideration of their work plan.

4.2 Any non-voting co-opted members shall be appointed at the first Overview and Scrutiny Committee 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, the specialist knowledge and/or skills that the proposed non-voting co-optees will provide; and the basis on which they can represent the local community and articulate their concerns.

4.3 Co-optees may terminate their membership by giving one month's notice to the Democratic and Scrutiny Team Manager.

4.4 If during the municipal year, a non-voting co-opted member is deemed by the Chair of the Scrutiny Panel (with advice from the Overview and Scrutiny Chair) to not be carrying out their role in accordance with the criteria set out at 2.3, the Panel can recommend to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that a decision report is taken forward to remove the non – voting member from the Panel membership. This is to maintain the integrity of the Scrutiny function of the Council. In making such a recommendation, consideration will be given to the extent to which the non-voting co-optee was unable or prevented from supporting the Panel's work.

4.5 A complaint about the procedure followed in 4.4 can be taken forward if required, which would be through the Council's Complaints Procedure and subsequently through the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman process.

## **5. Code of Conduct**

5.1 Non-voting co- opted members, are invited to sign the Council's code of conduct which sets out the standards of behaviour expected before the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that appoints them.

- 5.2 Non – voting 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.

### Induction, training and ongoing support

- 5.3 Non-voting co-optees will receive an individual induction prior to attending their first Scrutiny meeting.
- 5.4 The induction will involve meeting with the Chair of the Panel they are joining and the Scrutiny officer responsible for the Panel.
- 5.5 Non-voting co-optees are voluntary positions and there is no allowance provision for this role.

This page is intentionally left blank

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

**Title:** Consideration of ongoing issues arising from the 2025/26 Overview & Scrutiny Committee work plan

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

**Lead Officer:** Dominic O'Brien, Principal Scrutiny Officer  
Tel: 020 8489 5896, E-mail: [dominic.obrien@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:dominic.obrien@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 provides an overview of issues arising from the previous Overview & Scrutiny Committee's work plan for 2025-26 which the new Committee may wish to consider for further scrutiny work and/or monitoring in the work plan for 2026-27.
- 1.2 The report also provides details of regular standing items that were included in the previous Overview & Scrutiny Committee's work plan for 2025-26 which could be replicated or adjusted as required in the 2026-27 work plan.

### **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 To note the 2025-26 work programme from the previous Overview & Scrutiny Committee, including regular standing items.
- 2.2 That the Committee give consideration to the agenda items and reports required for its meetings in 2026-27.

### **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. The work plan typically includes a range of issues arising from priorities highlighted by the local community through consultation exercises, standing items (such as finance and performance monitoring), upcoming policy developments and other priorities suggested by Members. 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. Background

- 4.1 The previous Committee's work plan for 2025/26 is provided as **APPENDIX A** which sets out issues recently which the new Committee may wish to consider including in the work plan for 2026/27.
- 4.2 A community consultation event known as the 'Scrutiny Café' is scheduled to be held on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2026 to help gather local views on priorities that could also be included in the Committee's new work plan for 2026/27.
- 4.3 A function of the Committee is to support the delivery of the Council's strategic framework, known as the Corporate Delivery Plan (CDP). The objectives of the CDP should therefore usually be a consideration in the selection of items to scrutinise as part of the work programme. However, following the local elections, a new CDP is in development and is not expected to be published until later this year so it will not yet be possible to factor this into the Committee's work plan.

#### Standing item - Scrutiny of the Leader of the Council

- 4.4 Previous Overview & Scrutiny work plans have included an annual item question the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive of the Council on priorities for the year ahead. A date for the 2026/27 session is still to be determined.

#### In-year finance monitoring

- 4.5 Given the Council's ongoing difficult financial situation, the terms of reference for Overview and Scrutiny was updated under the previous administration to enable a more prominent focus on budget monitoring including in-year finance monitoring items on a quarterly basis. Quarterly finance updates are presented to Cabinet and the Overview & Scrutiny Committee meetings are then scheduled to enable the same reports to be considered a few days after the relevant Cabinet meeting. These reports are presented to the Committee by the Cabinet Member for Finance and the Corporate Director of Finance and Resources. Any questions arising that require the scrutiny of other Cabinet members can then be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Panel for consideration.
- 4.6 If the new Committee wishes to continue with a similar approach to quarterly finance monitoring, these agenda items would take place on:
- 21<sup>st</sup> July 2026 – Provisional Financial Outturn report (Q4)
  - 17<sup>th</sup> September 2026 – Q1
  - 10<sup>th</sup> December 2026 – Q2
  - 18<sup>th</sup> March 2027 – Q3

#### Performance monitoring

- 4.7 The Committee also considered regular performance reports which track the indicators relating to the priorities of the Corporate Delivery Plan (CDP). In

2025/26 there were two update reports provided to the Cabinet and then to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in September (Q1) and March (Q3).

- 4.8 Due to the current development of a new CDP, we are not anticipating that performance reports will be available this year until November/December 2026 at the earliest.
- 4.9 In addition to the forthcoming performance indicators relating to the CDP, we understand that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) are developing a set of local government performance metrics as part of a Local Outcomes Framework (LOF) which is expected to be launched in July 2026. We anticipate that details of the Haringey input to the LOF could be provided to the Committee in September or October 2026.

### Scrutiny of the draft Budget and MTFS

- 4.10 The Committee also has two meetings set aside for scrutiny of the draft 2027/28 Budget and the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2027-32.
- 30<sup>th</sup> November 2026
  - 18<sup>th</sup> January 2027
- 4.11 The approach to budget scrutiny in recent years has been for the draft Budget and MTFS, including any proposals for new savings and changes to the capital programme to be presented a meeting of the Committee for scrutiny at the November meeting. The Scrutiny Panels then also each meet to further scrutinise the specific proposals relevant to their remits. All recommendations arising from these meetings are then considered by the Committee at the January meeting with final recommendations then sent to Cabinet for a response in February.
- 4.12 During the 2024/25 and 2025/26 work plan periods, Overview & Scrutiny Committee members queried whether the practice of beginning the Budget scrutiny process in November meant that many decisions had effectively already been taken and suggested that scrutiny was required at an earlier stage in order to more effectively contribute to the budget-setting process. The main changes to the scrutiny approach were:
- The implementation of more frequent in-year finance monitoring, as outlined earlier in this section of the report.
  - A new agenda item scheduled earlier in the municipal year (July 2025) to scrutinise a report on the business planning process for the Budget and MTFS.
  - Committee Members also recommended closer monitoring in future of recommendations arising from in-year finance monitoring and the Budget/MTFS scrutiny process.

### 2025-26 Work Plan - Scrutiny Reviews

- 4.13 A total of four Scrutiny Review reports were considered by the previous Committee as its final meeting in March 2026. Of these four reports, two reports were fully completed and approved by the Committee, one was completed with

some minor checks required before approval and one was incomplete with an interim report provided.

- 4.14 **REPORT 1** - A Scrutiny Review on the **Prevention of Violence Against Women and Girls**, produced by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, was completed and approved. A full Cabinet response to the recommendations is anticipated in September.
- 4.15 **REPORT 2** – A Scrutiny Review on the **Provision of Services for Children Under One Year Old**, produced by the Children & Young People’s Scrutiny Panel, was completed and approved. A full Cabinet response to the recommendations is anticipated in September.
- 4.16 **REPORT 3** – A Scrutiny Review on **Communications with Residents (Adult Social Care)** produced by the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel, was completed but further time was required to carry out necessary checks with witnesses to the Review before the report was ready for approval. It is anticipated that the Review can be provided to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for final approval on 21<sup>st</sup> July before being sent to the Cabinet for a full response.
- 4.17 **REPORT 4** – The Culture, Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel presented an interim report on **Walking and Cycling Safety**.
- 4.18 The then Chair of the Panel, Cllr Makbule Gunes, reported to the Committee that the Walking and Cycling Safety Review examined the walking and cycling action plan with a particular focus on safe cycling and issues relating to e-bikes. The Panel held evidence sessions with relevant Cabinet members, Directors and stakeholder groups. Key findings included that there had been an unfortunate increase in the collision rate for both pedestrians and cyclists over the past couple of years.
- 4.19 Regarding next steps for the Review, Cllr Gunes said that further work was proposed for the next municipal year, including an analysis of best practice in other local authorities. However, it will be for the new Committee to determine whether it wishes to conduct further scrutiny work on this topic in 2026/27 or to conclude the Review with the interim report.

2025-26 Work Plan – Ongoing or outstanding items of business

- 4.20 **Group-based child sexual abuse** – During 2025/26, scrutiny Members expressed concern about recent national media reports alleging that ‘grooming gangs’ had been active in Haringey. Questions were raised by the Children and Young People’s Scrutiny panel in November 2025 as part of an agenda item on the Haringey Safeguarding Children Partnership (HCSP) Annual Report and also by the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel in December 2025 as part of an agenda item on the Haringey Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report.
- 4.21 Following these discussions, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee concluded that further information was required and requested a report from the Borough Commander on how group-based sexual exploitation crime was being recorded

and classified in Haringey and what the recent data showed. It was initially agreed that a report would be presented to the Committee at a meeting in March 2026. However, it subsequently emerged that it had not been feasible for the Metropolitan Police to provide the requested report in time for the meeting.

- 4.22 Members expressed dissatisfaction that this information had not been provided to the Committee and also highlighted the relevance of Baroness Casey's 2025 audit report on group-based child sexual exploitation and abuse which made recommendations on the recording and categorisation of police data in this area and on joint partnership working locally.
- 4.23 The Committee recommended that the successor 2026/27 Overview & Scrutiny Committee should consider conducting a Scrutiny Review on the subject of group-based child sexual abuse, specifically to consider the data available regarding relevant offences in Haringey and how the findings of Baroness Casey's recent audit report on this issue could be applied in Haringey.
- 4.24 **Parking debt** – During a finance monitoring agenda item at a meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in March 2026, Members queried the large write-off of parking debts. The Corporate Director for Finance explained that work had recently been carried out to address the high level of debt that went back a number of years. This had looked at outstanding debt and PCNs up to March 2025 and, as a consequence of this, the bad debt provision for parking had been increased by £9.9m. Bad debt provision involved an estimate of how much debt could be recovered, while the write-offs were a separate category as these were unrecoverable debts and had recently been approved by Cabinet.
- 4.25 The Chair of the Committee noted that there were significant sums of money involved and suggested that a future piece of scrutiny work could be to compare the Council's performance in this area to other Boroughs, including the collection rates, level of bad debt and write-offs.
- 4.26 **Other items** - During 2025/26, the previous Committee also received reports on the following issues which the new Committee may wish to monitor in 2026/27:
- Annual Feedback & Resolutions report
  - Customer Services & Experience of Residents in contacting the Council
  - Employment & Skills (including worklessness, insecurity of work and low pay)
  - Strategic Workforce Planning.

#### 2025/26 Scrutiny Panel Work Programmes

- 4.27 The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel completed its work programme for 2025/26. At the February meeting, the Panel received a verbal update on consultation feedback for the SEND and Alternative Provision Strategy. The reason for the verbal update was that the consultation period for the strategy had recently closed. The Panel agreed that a full strategy and consultation report would be present to the next meeting of the Panel, which

would be the first meeting in 2026/27. In previous years the Panel has also considered a performance report for the previous municipal year based on an agreed set of metrics relating to Looked After Children. This has tended to be considered at the first meeting of the year.

- 4.28 The Housing Planning & Development Scrutiny Panel also completed its work programme for 2025/26. The one area that the Panel rolled over to a future meeting was around the development of the Older People's Housing Strategy & the Rightsizing Strategy. Officers advised that these strategies were due to be redeveloped in the near future and the Panel expressed a wish to review these at an appropriate point in their development. For 2025/26, the Panel received a set of KPI's on the Housing Service at each meeting as a stranding item. The Panel may wish to continue receiving these updates for 2026/27.
- 4.29 The Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel scrutinised various issues in 2025/26 including dementia services, the Council's new Health & Wellbeing Strategy, the supply of community healthcare equipment to residents following the liquidation of a key provider and a high number of upheld complaints to the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman. The Panel also continued to monitor the implementation of its previous recommendations on the installation of aids and adaptations in people's homes following issues raised by residents regarding delays and lack of communication from the Council. A future iteration of the Panel may wish to continue to monitor these issues.
- 4.30 There were a number of key issues considered by the Culture, Community Safety and Environment Scrutiny Panel during 2025/26 including the Climate Change Action Plan Update and the panels more in depth Scrutiny Review of Cycling Safety. The Panel also considered the Anti-social Behaviour Policy, Good Neighbourhood Management Policy and Metropolitan Police Update Report as part of its remit addressing community safety. In December, the consultation which helped to inform the Draft Library Strategy was also considered by the Panel. As part of the Panel's 2026/27 work programme, it will be important to consider the aspirations and plans being put in place for Haringey as the London Borough of Culture 2027.
- 4.31 There are usually two standing items each year on safeguarding – the Haringey Safeguarding Children Partnership (HCSP) Annual Report is considered by the Children & Young People's Scrutiny Panel while the Haringey Safeguarding Adults Board (HSAB) Annual Report is considered by the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel.

## **5. Effective Scrutiny Work Programmes**

- 5.1 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.

5.2 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 Borough 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

5.3 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.

5.4 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.

5.5 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.

**6. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

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

**7. Statutory Officers comments**

**Finance and Procurement**

- 7.1 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**

- 7.2 There are no immediate legal implications arising from the report.
- 7.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the approval of the future scrutiny work programme falls within the remit of the OSC.
- 7.4 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.
- 7.5 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**

- 7.6 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.
- 7.7 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.

7.8 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.

## **8. Use of Appendices**

APPENDIX A – OSC Workplan 2025-26

This page is intentionally left blank

**Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**Draft Work Plan 2026-27** *(All items are provisional)*

<b>Date</b>	<b>Agenda Items</b>	<b>Lead Officer/Witnesses</b>
<b>22 Jun 2026</b>	Terms of Reference & Panel Portfolios	Principal Scrutiny Officers
	Overview and Scrutiny Work Plan	Principal Scrutiny Officers
<b>21 Jul 2026</b>	2025/26 Provisional Financial Outturn report (Q4)	Cabinet Member for Finance & Corporate Services, Director of Finance
	Cabinet Member Questions - Leader of the Council	Leader and Chief Executive
<b>17 Sep 2026</b>	Finance and Performance update – Q1	Cabinet Member for Finance & Corporate Services, Director of Finance
<b>26 Oct 2026</b>	TBC	
<b>30 Nov 2026</b>	Budget Scrutiny	Cabinet Members and Officers

<b>10 Dec 2026</b>	Finance update – Q2	Cabinet Member for Finance & Corporate Services Corporate Director of Finance
<b>18 Jan 2027 (Budget)</b>	Budget Scrutiny - Panel feedback and recommendations.  To consider panel’s draft recommendations and agree input into Cabinet’s final budget proposal discussions	Cabinet Members and Officers
	Treasury Management Strategy Statement	Corporate Director of Finance
<b>25 Feb 2027</b>	TBC	
<b>18 Mar 2027</b>	Finance and Performance update – Q3	Cabinet Member for Finance & Corporate Services Corporate Director of Finance