

NOTICE OF MEETING

Cabinet

TUESDAY, 10TH FEBRUARY, 2015 at 18:30 HRS - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, WOOD GREEN, N22 8LE.

MEMBERS: Councillor Claire Kober (Chair), Councillor Jason Arthur, Councillor Ali Demirci, Councillor Joe Goldberg, Councillor Stuart McNamara, Councillor Peter Morton, Councillor Alan Strickland, Councillor Bernice Vanier, Councillor Ann Waters.

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of Urgent Business. (Late items of Urgent Business will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items of Urgent Business will be dealt with under Item 14 below. New items of exempt business will be dealt with at Item 18 below).

3. 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.

4. NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS

On occasions part of the Cabinet meeting will be held in private and will not be open to the public if an item is being considered that is likely to lead to the disclosure of exempt or confidential information. In accordance with the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 (the "Regulations"), members of the public can make representations about why that part of the meeting should be open to the public.

This agenda contains exempt items as set out at **Item [16 & 17]: Exclusion of the Press and Public**. No representations with regard to these have been received.

This is the formal 5 clear day notice under the Regulations to confirm that this Cabinet meeting will be partly held in private for the reasons set out in this Agenda.

5. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 18)

To confirm and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 20th January 2015 as a correct record.

6. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

To consider any requests received in accordance with Standing Orders.

7. CORPORATE PLANNING 2015-18 (PAGES 19 - 408)

(Report of the Chief Executive - To be introduced by the Leader of the Council)
Cabinet will be asked to note the summary of the consultation feedback, agree the Corporate Plan, and consider the Council's finalised Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for the period 2015-2018 with approval sought of the following constituent elements of the strategy to be put forward to Council on 23rd February 2015:-

- Proposed summary revenue Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2015-2018 (Annex 1);
- Proposed General Fund Capital Programme 2015-2018 (Annex 2);
- Proposed HRA Capital Programme 2015-2018 (Annex 3);
- Proposed HRA Medium Term Financial Plan 2015-2018 (Annex 4);
- Proposed Dedicated Schools Budget 2015-16 (Annex 5); and,
- Overview and Scrutiny Committee Recommendations and Cabinet Responses (Annex 6).

8. PLANNING SERVICE REVIEW OF PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE SERVICES AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES AND ASSOCIATED CHARGES (PAGES 409 - 446)

(Report of the Assistant Director for Planning. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Planning) The report will seek to obtain approval from Cabinet of the review of, and proposed changes to, the Council's pre-application planning advice services reported to Regulatory Committee on 15 January 2015. The review has been undertaken in the context of the priorities set out in the Corporate Plan 2015-2018 and the Development Management Improvement Plan as set out in the annexed "Supporting high quality development in Haringey – Our pre-application advice services at Appendix and new charges for Building Control Services.

9. REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES 2015-16 (PAGES 447 - 482)

(Report of the Assistant Director for Finance. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture). This report considers the relevant factors affecting the review of fees and charges, identifies those services where an increase is being proposed and seeks:

Approval to increase the fee or charge rate to those services where an increase is proposed, subject to Equalities Impact Assessments being undertaken, as set out in paragraph 10; and,

Agreement to where an alternative approach is being proposed.

10. DEVELOPMENT VEHICLE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND BUSINESS CASE (PAGES 483 - 490)

(Report of the Director of Planning, Regeneration, and Development. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration.) This report seeks Cabinet approval for the proposal to tender for a feasibility study and business case including engagement with Members, staff and stakeholders for a Haringey development vehicle, and – if such an approach is recommended – support for the procurement of partners for that vehicle.

11. THE RED HOUSE, 423 WEST GREEN ROAD N15 (PAGES 491 - 498)

(Report of the Director of Planning, Regeneration, and Development. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration). To re- confirm disposal of this property.

12. LAND REAR OF 1-11 THE DRIVE, N11 (PAGES 499 - 504)

(Report of the Director for Planning, Regeneration and Development. To be introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration) The report will seek agreement for the Assistant Director of Property and Capital Projects to dispose of the Council's freehold interest in the land on the rear of 1-11 The Drive for best possible consideration reasonably obtainable.

13. SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS (PAGES 505 - 518)

To note the significant actions and delegated decisions taken in January.

14. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at Item 2 above.

15. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Note from the Head of Democratic Services

Items 16 17 and 18 allow for the consideration of exempt information in relation to Items 11, 12, and 2 respectively.

RESOLVED:

That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items below contain exempt information, as defined under paragraphs 3 and 5, Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

16. THE RED HOUSE, 423 WEST GREEN ROAD N15 (PAGES 519 - 520)

As per item 11.

17. LAND REAR OF 1-11 THE DRIVE, N11 (PAGES 521 - 522)

As per item 12.

18. NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at Item 2 above.

Bernie Ryan
Assistant Director – Corporate Governance
and Monitoring Officer
5th Floor
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Ayshe Simsek
Principal Committee Coordinator
Tel: 020 8489 2957
Email: ayshe.simsek@haringey.gov.uk
Published on 2 February 2015

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

Councillors Kober (Chair), Arthur, Demirci, Goldberg, McNamara, Morton, Strickland and Waters

Apologies Councillor Vanier

Also Present: Councillor Elliott, Councillor Bull

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTON BY
CAB788	APOLOGIES Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Bernice Vanier and apologies for lateness put forward for Cllr Stuart McNamara.	Clerk
CAB789	URGENT BUSINESS None	
CAB780	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no declarations of interest put forward.	
CAB781	NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS No representations were received.	
CAB782	MINUTES The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 17 th December 2014 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.	Clerk
CAB783	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS Deputation A deputation was received from Stephen Brice on behalf of the Pinkham Way Alliance regarding future plans for the site linked to agenda item 11, Local Plan Making – review of Haringey’s Local Plan. Mr Brice outlined the Alliance’s continued support for the Council’s statement about future decisions on Pinkham Way and the sustained application of proper planning principles. It was updated that a further ecological study had been undertaken covering invertebrates and which reaffirmed existing evidence of the site’s ecological importance in animal, bird and plant biodiversity.	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

The Alliance had drafted a 5 year management plan for the site to ensure the maintenance of its value, with a positive response from local people volunteering to play a role in implementation.

The long term benefits for future generations of retaining the site undeveloped were emphasised, or at the least, ensuring any disturbance from development was minimised or restricted to the least environmentally valuable areas of the site.

The Alliance reasserted their view that utilisation of the site as a waste centre would be contrary to both the borough's planning policies and the London Plan and reiterated the importance of retaining a focus on proper planning principles in determining the future of the site.

Mr Brice raised concern over the frequency of occurrence of waste site fires across the UK and the subsequent risk this could pose to local residents and transport links should the site be approved for waste use.

Cllr Demirci responded to the deputation as the Cabinet Member for Planning and thanked Mr Brice for his deputation and for the continued work of the Alliance. He reaffirmed the Council's commitment to an open and transparent process for determining the future of the site and continued dialogue with interested parties. Confirmation was provided on the application of proper planning principles in order to explore a range of options for the site. An evidenced approach had been used to determine the proposed allocation for the site under the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), with regard having been given to all relevant planning policy guidance, the ownership and current management of the site, its ecological designation and representations from relevant parties. The proposed allocation would be released for public consultation subject to Cabinet approval under agenda item 11.

Mr Brice responded on behalf of the Alliance in welcoming the continuation of a constructive relationship with the Council and the balance position regarding the site contained within the Site Allocations DPD.

Public Questions

A series of questions were received from Rachel Allison on behalf of the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum relating to agenda item 11, Local Plan Making, in particular the consultation undertaken with the public regarding sites to be included within the Site Allocations DPD. The responses provided by the Assistant Director Planning at the direction of the Cabinet Member were given as follows:

1. *The reason behind the inclusion of the Highgate Magistrates Court site within the Site Allocations DPD when the Forum were requested to remove this from their Neighbourhood Plan*
 - The site had been included within the draft policy due to delays in progression of the planning application for the site. Planning permission had subsequently been granted at Planning Committee on 19 January 2015. In light of this, the inclusion of the site within the policy would be reviewed and would likely be omitted from the next version of the plan going forward from the public consultation stage. Apologies were conveyed to the Forum for failing to keep them updated on changes to the timetable for the determination of the application for the site.
2. *The reason for the inclusion of the Tile Kiln Lane site following concerns that officers had not undertaken a site visit or consulted the Forum*
 - Confirmation was provided that a site visit had been undertaken but not a

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	rigorous assessment of the important issues of water levels or the envelope of available land and as such, an amendment was proposed to the policy to omit this site and any related allocation. Officers acknowledged that although the site had been discussed with the Highgate Society, improvements were required going forward to the engagement process with the community and community groups. 3. <i>Clarification was sought as to whether housing or employment was the priority for the Highgate Bowl application site in consideration that residential development was proposed in an area containing several existing small businesses.</i> - Confirmation was provided that a balanced, mixed use approach was sought for the site and that the results of the public consultation would inform where the land use emphasis fell. A specific development scheme was not in place for the site. 4. <i>Assurances were sought that the Council would engage with the Highgate Forum in a constructive manner going forward, within the spirit of the Localism Act.</i> - Whilst it was acknowledged there were opportunities to improve communication and coordination between the Council and the Forum, the Leader affirmed the Council's commitment to constructive engagement. The Cabinet Member for Planning would take this point forward to look at where improvements could be made in working with community groups in a more collaborative way.	
CAB784	ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER 2013/14 In introducing the report, the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture reported that Grant Thornton, the Council's external auditors, had signed-off the Council's Statement of Accounts 2013/14 within the statutory deadlines and without qualification. Furthermore, the auditors had issued an unqualified Value for Money (VFM) conclusion confirming that the Council has continued to ensure proper arrangements are in place to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of our resources. RESOLVED To receive the Annual Audit Letter for 2013/14 and note its contents. Alternative Options considered The nature of this report and recommendation is such that alternative options are not applicable. Reasons for Decision To receive the annual audit letter in accordance with statutory requirements.	
CAB785	THE COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT - QUARTER TWO , 2014/15 Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Leader which informed of progress against the Council's outcomes and strategic priorities during the second quarter of 2014/15. Cllr Elliott, referred to performance indicator HY110, number of people killed and seriously injured in road accidents and expressed concern about the higher number of incidents reported in the last two quarters of 2014 compared to earlier months in the year. The Leader agreed that one death was too many, no matter what the target for	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	this area. In the absence of the Cabinet Member for Environment, the Leader explained the range of activities and intervention taking place to limit road accidents including a focused approach to road safety in areas of high deprivation, targeting of accident hotspots and ensuring routes to schools were safe and slower speed levels implemented in the appropriate areas. The Leader proposed a short review of incidents is undertaken to understand what additional measures could have been put in place to prevent the accidents occurring and what actions can be taken further forward, above and beyond existing measures by the road safety teams. Agreed that Cllr Elliott is provided with a written update on the findings and actions of this review. RESOLVED To note the progress against the Council's Corporate Plan priorities in Q2 2014/15. Alternative options considered Not applicable as an information report. Reasons for Decision Not applicable	Chief Operating Officer
CAB786	BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2014/15 - DECEMBER 2014 Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture which set out the forecast financial revenue and capital outturns for 2014/15 based on actual performance to 31 December 2014 and that also sought approval of proposed management actions and budget adjustments (virements). In introducing the report, Councillor Arthur highlighted: a £400k underspend in the General Fund, the overall balanced position of the HRA, the current capital underspend and overspend in the Children's and Adults budget due to demographic pressures. The Cabinet Member had asked officer to remain vigilant on spend in the Children's and Adults service areas to ensure a balanced budget at the end of the financial year. In response to Cllr Elliott's question relating to the budget pressures on the New Build Programme indicated at paragraph 6.14; this was attributed to significantly increased construction costs. A Quality Surveyor was in the process of being enlisted to review the process. RESOLVED - That the progress being made against the Council's 2014/15 budget in respect of net revenue and capital expenditure be noted. - That the budget changes (virements be approved) - That the transfers to/ from reserves approved by the Chief Financial Officer, as set out in Appendix 3 be noted. Alternative options considered This report proposes that the Cabinet should consider the overall financial position for 2014/15 in line with existing procedures. A risk based approach to budget monitoring has been developed in order to manage	AD Finance

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	the Council's finances in a time of economic and financial uncertainty. Cabinet could choose to adopt a less rigorous regime and examine the financial position at a later stage. Projections could be marginally more accurate if a delayed approach was adopted, but there would be less time for robust development and consideration of management action and virements. Reasons for decision Members' involvement in financial monitoring is an essential part of delivering the Council's priorities. The Constitution requires Members to approve certain financial transactions such as virements according to approved limits.	
CAB787	SITE ACQUISITIONS FUND - APPROVAL FOR DECISIONS UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY Cabinet considered a report introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration which would provide the Director of Planning, Regeneration and Development extended delegated authority, in certain defined circumstances, to acquire land or properties to facilitate delivery of the Council's regeneration programmes. Cllr Strickland further explained that as the regeneration areas in the borough become attractive, it will be necessary for the Council to be a position to compete with potential property and land acquirers and be able to act swiftly in the market place to purchase land or properties for regeneration purposes. The purchases will be taken with due diligence and will be subject to consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration and the Assistant Director for Finance. Cllr Elliott sought assurance about the quality of the governance process around the decision making of these future delegated decisions given the extended delegated authority being agreed for the Director of Planning, Regeneration, and Development It was noted that there will be no fettering of the procedure required for decision making .The AD for Governance clarified that ,before any decision is taken, a full report will need to be compiled, in the same way as for Committee meetings, allowing legal, finance and procurement input . The decisions will also be recorded and published online. In agreeing the recommendations, the Cabinet noted that the extended delegated authority was limited to the lifespan of the Corporate Plan. RESOLVED I. That the Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration and the Chief Financial Officer be granted delegated authority to purchase land and properties within the Borough subject to the following criteria being satisfied: The land or property acquired must be for a purpose which is aimed at facilitating the delivery of projects within the approved Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework and Delivery Plan and be in accordance with the Council's statutory powers to acquire such property and geographically located in the 8 designated Tottenham wards, Northumberland Park, White Hart Lane, Bruce Grove, Tottenham Green, Tottenham Hale, Seven Sisters, West Green and St Ann's; or.	Dir Regeneration Planning and Development

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	• The land or property acquired must be demonstrably consistent with the Council's regeneration objectives for the Wood Green Investment Framework area, within the area defined in map shown at Appendix 1, meet at least one of the criteria set out in 5.6 and be in accordance with the Council's statutory powers to acquire such property; and, • The maximum value of any one purchase shall not exceed the sum of £2.5m (including all applicable fees and associated costs). • The delegation to the Director of Regeneration Planning and Development is limited to the lifespan of the Corporate Plan for 2015/18; namely until 31 March 2018 and will be reviewed at the end of that period. Alternative options considered Reliance upon the urgency procedures under Part Three Section E paragraph 5.01 and Part Four Section D paragraphs 16 and 17 of the Council's Constitution alone to authorise site purchases at short notice using this fund could prohibit the Council's ability to react to the short timescales for site acquisition. As the report sets out, the proposal to agree for Officers to make decisions under Delegated Powers (in defined circumstances) would allow for the most efficient use of the agreed funding. Reasons for decision This report will allow properties to be purchased in support of the Tottenham and Wood Green Regeneration schemes in a more timely and effective way than is currently possible and in doing so enable the objectives of the Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework and Wood Green Investment Framework to be met. In doing so the Council's and Communities aspirations for the areas can be achieved with the delivery of Regeneration schemes which maximise the number of jobs, homes and benefits for local people.	
CAB788	LOCAL PLAN MAKING - REVIEW OF HARINGEY'S LOCAL PLAN: STRATEGIC POLICIES, "PREFERRED OPTIONS" FOR TOTTENHAM AREA ACTION PLAN, "PREFERRED OPTIONS" FOR SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT, AND "PREFERRED OPTIONS" FOR DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT, AND THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME The Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Planning, which sought approval to consult upon four development plan documents (DPDs): proposed alterations to Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (LPSP) which was adopted in 2013 and the "preferred option" drafts of the Development Management Development Plan Document (DM DPD), the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Sites DPD) and the Tottenham Area Action Plan Development Plan Document (Tottenham AAP). Members were asked to note the Draft Interim Sustainability Appraisal Reports used as a technical evidence base to inform decision making in the preparation of the above documents. The approval of Cabinet was also sought to adopt the revised and updated Local Development Scheme (LDS) for 2015-2018. The attention of Cabinet was drawn to a tabled addendum setting out the comments and resolutions of the Regulatory Committee which considered the proposed suite of development plan documents at their meeting on 15th January 2015. The Committee had resolved to recommend that Cabinet approve the documents listed above for public consultation subject to the noting of two alternative amendments relating to	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

affordable housing targets:

1. The first amendment proposed to retain the current 50% borough wide affordable housing target for larger development sites against the proposed reduction to 40%, reflecting the concern of the Committee that this change would reduce the quantum of affordable homes built in the borough. The addendum to the report outlined the implications of the Committee's proposed amendment, including the evidence base in place to support the officer recommended reduction to a 40% target. There was also a strong likelihood that the plan would be rendered 'unsound' on the grounds of deliverability should the 50% target remain on the application of tests applied under the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 against which local plans were assessed. The recommendation therefore put before Cabinet was to retain the officer proposed amendment to a 40% target to permit the change to the current policy position to be subject to public consultation.
2. The second amendment proposed by Regulatory Committee was to reject the proposed amendment to Housing Policy SP2 (7) withdrawing the requirement for schemes below the 10 unit threshold to provide 20% affordable housing on site or financial contributions towards affordable housing provision. The addendum to the report outlined the implications of the Committee's proposed amendment, including it being at odds with the recent planning policy statement made by the Secretary of State with the consequence of rendering the plan non-conforming and thereby unsound. The recommendation therefore put before Cabinet was to retain Policy SP2(7), and agrees its inclusion in the schedule unaltered thereby allowing the proposed change to be subject to public consultation and allow the matter to be examined on appeal ahead of Regulation 19 stage, whilst not explicitly proposing the deletion of the policy at the current time.

The addendum report also sought Cabinet approval for an additional recommendation to omit proposed site allocation SA49: Tile Kiln Lane Reservoir from consultation on the site allocations DPD following officer review of the site.

The Leader sought clarification from the Monitoring Officer on any potential legal ramifications of the Cabinet running counter to the two additional recommendations made by the Regulatory Committee. The Monitoring Officer and his representative identified that the Committee were designated as consultees with regards to the plans and reiterated the evidence provided within the addendum on the grounds set out for the officer recommendations. The significant risks were outlined of the plans not meeting the four tests of soundness under the National Planning Policy Framework should the Regulatory Committee amendments be supported by Cabinet. The result would be that the Council would be rendered unable to take forward a rigorous policy within which to deliver the borough's new housing, affordable housing and employment targets.

In response to a question regarding the rationale behind the setting of the current 50% target for borough wide affordable housing for larger development sites given the deliverability evidence, officers confirmed that the existing policy position was justifiable and met the required standards at the time of adoption. The subsequent removal of the government's affordable housing grant had been a key factor impacting on deliverability against this target and thereby the proposed reduction. The Leader identified that concerns had been raised by the Haringey Association of Warehouse Communities regarding the allocation of commercial space and employment land in the borough against that for residential development. She confirmed an undertaking that the Council would work, via the consultation process,

towards reaching an acceptable end point for both communities and the Council with regards to this issue. The Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Social Inclusion and Sustainability reiterated this commitment and identified that the economic development and growth programme would start to lay the groundwork for supporting integrated living and working within the borough.	
The Leader requested that a Plain English version of the plans and the rationale behind Cabinet being unable to endorse the recommendations made by Regulatory Committee be circulated to all Members within the week.	AD Planning
RESOLVED	
i. Having had regard to the Regulatory Committee recommendation 1, the most up to date viability evidence, and to the risk posed to the soundness of the suite of local plan documents before it, that approval be granted for the retention of Alteration 49 in the Schedule attached at Appendix A to the Cabinet report for consultation with the amended 40% Borough-wide affordable housing target retained.	
ii. To acknowledge recommendation 2 of the Regulatory Committee above to reject Alteration 51 and to retain Policy SP2(7), but approve that Policy SP2(7) be included in the Schedule unaltered.	AD Planning
iii. To further approve consequential textual amendments to Section 1.5 of the draft document to make clear that the Council is inviting comment on Policy SP2(7), enabling comment to be invited on its proposed retention.	AD Planning
iv. That the recommendation to approve consultation on the “preferred option” draft of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Sites DPD) (Appendix C) be subject to the deletion of SA49 and all associated references to this policy from the document and all other documents, together with the renumbering of the other sites in the document as appropriate.	AD Planning
v. To approve the following annexed documents for consultation, subject in the case of the Tottenham AAP to any modifications and in respect of all four documents subject to any corrections or presentational improvements made by the Director of Planning, Regeneration and Development in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, during a six week period currently scheduled for February to March 2015: • The Proposed Alterations to Haringey’s Local Plan: Strategic Policies (LPSP) which was adopted in 2013 (Appendix A); • The “preferred option” draft of the Development Management Development Plan Document (DM DPD) (Appendix B); • The “preferred option” draft of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Sites DPD) (Appendix C); • The “preferred option” draft of the Tottenham Area Action Plan Development Plan Document (Tottenham AAP) (Appendix D).	AD Planning
vi. To adopt the revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) (Appendix F) for 2015-2018.	AD Planning
vii. To note the draft Consultation Programme (Appendix G).	
viii. To note the Draft Interim Sustainability Appraisals.	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

Alternative options considered

Alterations to Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies, Development Management DPD, Sites DPD and Tottenham AAP

The Council could choose not to review the LPSP. In light of emerging regional policy and new evidence, the proposed alterations are necessary to ensure the plan appropriately reflects the revised growth figures and evidence. The National Planning Policy Framework and evidence underpinning the further alterations to the London Plan and the Local plan also demonstrate a need to revisit the housing assumptions in this document, if the DPD's are to be progressed further. Therefore not undertaking the alterations would undermine delivery of the statutory "Development Plan" documents and compromise the Council ability to make high quality local planning decisions. Accordingly, not reviewing the document is not recommended as a viable alternative.

The DM DPD, Sites DPD and Tottenham AAP, will significantly improve the Council's ability to manage and promote high quality sustainable development (and resist unsustainable development) across the borough, so not producing these documents is not considered to be an appropriate or viable alternative.

For the four development plan documents this stage of consultation represents a statutory requirement for preparing Haringey's Local Plan. There is no alternative to consulting in line with the Regulations. The Development Plan Documents have been developed in accordance with planning regulations and the Council is required to consult on them prior to the formal submission stages.

Local Development Scheme

The LDS is important in communicating the Council's programme for preparing the statutory planning framework. It is a requirement that the LDS is kept up-to-date to provide certainty for investors and communities seeking to engage in the process, and as a means to ensure that the Council can be held accountable for the delivery of the planning framework.

Modest changes to the development plan programme could be signposted through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). However given that the proposed changes to the LDS are material, this route is not considered appropriate.

Alternatively, the Council could choose not to revise its LDS. The changes set out in the appended documents outline changes to the timing, format and delivery of most of the planned DPDs such that the current LDS would provide very little assistance to anyone seeking to engage with the Council on the emerging planning policy framework.

Reasons for Decision

The Alterations to Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies, the DM DPD, Sites DPD, the Tottenham AAP

The DPDs are an essential component of Haringey's Local Plan. Without these documents it will be challenging for the Council to deliver the borough wide aspirations to manage change and growth for the benefit of existing and future residents and businesses. It would also become increasingly challenging to determine and influence development proposals which fail to deliver sustainable development outcomes in Haringey. The DPDs will be more up to date and consistent with the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework than the current version of the Local Plan: Strategic Policies and Haringey's Saved UDP policies.

Public consultation is an important statutory requirement in the preparation of the Local Plan and the documents cannot progress to submission stage of the process (submitting to the Secretary of State for public examination) without carrying out this round of consultation. It is important the Council consults on these documents at the earliest opportunity to avoid delaying the adoption of the DPDs.

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

CAB789	HARINGEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH STRATEGY Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Social Inclusion and Sustainability which sought approval to the Economic Development and Growth Strategy. In introducing the report, Councillor Goldberg, expressed the council's seriousness about leading on economic development and growth in the borough and using the platform of regeneration for change. This included addressing the skills shortage, ensuring young people have the skills to compete in the future jobs market, creating more jobs in the borough but also ensuring skills for jobs outside of the borough are obtained, taking forward an innovation economy with businesses attracted to the borough. This strategy was the first of its kind, produced by a London borough, and set out the council's strong intent for economic development and growth. In response to a question from Cllr Arthur about encouraging creative industries in the borough, Cllr Goldberg replied that it was important to lead the economy and provide the support for businesses to locate to the borough where there were affordable spaces and he provided an example of a creative business recently making use of warehouse space in South Tottenham. RESOLVED That the Economic Development and Growth Strategy be approved. Alternative options considered The option not to develop an Economic Development and Growth Strategy was considered. This was rejected because it would mean the Economic Development team continuing to work in an ad hoc way – responding to funding opportunities and making reactive interventions rather than shaping the agenda for the borough. The option to pursue a more cautious approach with less emphasis on securing new investment in the borough was also considered and rejected. This was because without a proactive approach to attracting new businesses the centralising trends which have seen Haringey's employment ratio decline would be likely to continue. The option of pursuing a more generalised 'Haringey open for business' strategy was considered and rejected because of the logistical and resource implications of attempting to market to businesses across all sectors, and because of the risk that such a diffuse message would be lost in the London economy. Reasons for Decision The council has identified economic growth and employment as a priority in its draft corporate plan for 2015-18. This strategy sets out the proposals for delivering against key elements of that plan, and if adopted its implementation will have a significant impact upon all wards in the borough.	Dir Regeneration, Planning and Development
CAB790	AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR CUSTOMER PLATFORM Cabinet considered a report introduced by the Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture which sought approval from the Cabinet to award a contract for the provision of a Customer Platform in order to support delivery of the Customer Services Transformation Programme.	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	RESOLVED i. That, in principle, the contract for a Customer Platform be awarded to Agility's Limited in accordance with Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.06.1(d) , subject to confirmation of funding as part of agreeing the overall budget package (at the Cabinet meeting in February 2015). ii. That the contract is awarded for a period of 3 years with an option to extend for a further two periods of one year each. iii. That the total cost for the initial 3 year contract period is £1.735m with the additional year extensions priced at £424k per year. Alternative options considered An outline business case for the CST programme was developed in October 2013 and this was reviewed at Cabinet in November 2013 (v1.0). This set out four options for delivering a new operating model for Customer Services: • Option 1: Do nothing. • Option 2: Customer Service consolidation with stand-alone web based initiatives delivered on a department by department basis. • Option 3A: Transformation of Customer Services via corporate wide process and technology change (supported by a CRM type solution). • Option 3B: Transformation of Customer Services via corporate wide process and technology change (supported by a Digital Platform type solution). Following a further review at Cabinet in November 2013 it was recommended that both Options 3A and 3B were taken forward and subjected to a more detailed appraisal, and both the CST Programme Board and Senior Leadership Team agreed that the programme should progress accordingly to the next stage. An updated full Business Case is due to be completed by April 2015. Reasons for Decision The recommendation as outlined in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 are based on an evaluation of the tender received and the view that this offers value to the Council in terms of quality and price. As a result of the procurement exercise, which was carried out in accordance with the Procurement Code of Practice, it is now recommended that the successful tenderer be awarded the contract as outlined in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 in accordance with CSO 9.06.1(d).	Chief Operating Officer
CAB791	APPROVAL FOR COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACTION - EMPTY PROPERTIES Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration which set out the proposals to make Compulsory Purchase orders	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	in relation to 7 vacant properties in the borough. The report described the condition of the properties and actions previously taken by the council to bring the properties back into use. The Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration emphasised the undeniable need for housing in the borough and the need to take action to ensure empty properties were put back into use. In relation to the attached 7 properties, the council would have corresponded with the owners consistently and offered advice on grant aid application to bring the house back into use. The use of CPO powers would help induce the home owners to come forward to make decisions about the use of their property. Cllr McNamara welcomed the policy coming forward. In response to Cllr Bull's question, the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration would notify the relevant ward councillors of the proposed CPO actions. RESOLVED i. That the compulsory acquisition of and the submission of the 7 properties listed in Paragraph 5.5 to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for a confirmed Order, under Compulsory Purchase powers be authorised; ii. That the Assistant Director Corporate Governances be authorised to: (a) Make and seal the Orders for submission to the Secretary of State for consideration and approval (including the service of any requisition notices necessary to establish interests in each of the properties) and to carry out the statutory notification required; (b) Confirm the Compulsory Purchase Order in the event of the Secretary of State returning the Order authorising the Council to do so; (c) Prepare for, and represent the Council at, any public inquiry held following submission of the Order to the Secretary of State; (d) Upon confirmation of the Compulsory Purchase Order proceed with acquisition of each of the properties; (e) In the event that any of the owner(s) undertakes in the form of a legally enforceable cross undertaking to bring the relevant property back into residential occupation and use within a reasonable timescale, to authorise the Head of Legal Services in consultation with the Interim Chief Operating Officer to enter in to and enforce such an undertaking instead of proceeding with the CPO for the property in question; and (f) Act in relation to any other procedural matters that may arise in the normal course of the CPO process.	Chief Operating Officer AD Governance

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	iii. That (subject to the confirmation of the CPO by the Secretary of State) the disposal of each of the property to a Registered Provider where possible, or to an individual or private developer, with covenants to bring the relevant property back into use as soon as practicable be approved. iv. That the costs of the CPO to be met from the capital programme; and the recycling of the receipt from the disposal back to the capital programme budget for the continued private sector housing CPO programme be approved. Alternative options considered All options have been tried and exhausted. Letters have been sent to the owners of the empty properties offering advice and grant aid. Some of these properties have a debt outstanding to the Council which is being pursued under the Enforced Sale process. If the owner fails to pay, an Enforced Sale will be pursued and the property sold at auction. If they do pay but do not renovate the home and bring it back into use, the Council will proceed with CPO. Reasons for decision Every effort has been made to persuade the owners of the 7 properties in question to bring their properties back into use themselves including offering financial assistance in the form of a grant. CPO is very much a last resort and only used where the Council believe that there is no other way to ensure these properties are renovated and come back into use	
CAB792	WAIVER & AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE HEALTHY ALLIANCE PROGRAMME FOR SEXUAL HEALTH SERVICES IN HARINGEY 2015-17 Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing that set out the reasons for the waiver and award of contract for Sexual Health service in Haringey for the following two years. The award of the contract complies with the boroughs prevention agenda and allows for further expanded targeted sexual health promotion, HIV and STI testing, and contraception activities. RESOLVED i. That the requirement to tender in respect of the Healthy Alliance HIV Prevention programme for Sexual Health Services in Haringey in accordance with Contract Standing Orders (CSO) 10.01.2 (d) (that it is in the Council's overall interest) be waived. ii. That the contract be awarded to Embrace UK for a period of one year with an option to extend for a further 1 year. Alternative options considered The key findings of Haringey Council's system wide review of sexual health services in 2013-14, recommended that sexual health service provision and access be improved	Dir Public Health Dir Public Health

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	in the community. Subsequent to this, the Council undertook a robust and rigorous tender exercise in the summer of 2014, in order to explore the potential options to strengthen targeted sexual health service provision in defined target groups in the community. However, after careful consideration, it became clear that the responses received were 'beyond the scope' (activity and cost) of the Council's original intentions for future community based services, bearing in mind the current strategic proposals to reshape community based sexual health services across London. Director approval has been given to discontinue forthwith the tender process for Lot 2 without awarding a contract. In view of this, and the ongoing development work with the current provider, Embrace UK, the Council considers it to be more cost effective to continue to build capacity in the current voluntary sector provider which would help them to progress from a purely HIV information, advice and guidance service for Africans to one which provides community based testing, advice and support for all at risk groups which is inclusive of all sexually-transmitted infections (STI). Embrace UK started piloting testing during HIV Testing Week in November 2014 and at its first faith based event, 11 people were tested for HIV. In tandem with this, a training programme has been put in place, (in the 3rd and 4th quarters of 2014-15) which will 'skill up' and enable Embrace UK to deliver STI and HIV testing across the community. Details of the comparative prices received from the tender process are set out below, together with the estimated savings which should accrue from the award of contract to Embrace UK. Reasons for Decision The recommendations as outlined in 3.1 and 3.2 are in accordance with Contract Standing Orders (CSO) 10.01.2 (d) being the best interest of the Council, to award a contract to Embrace UK for a period of one year with an option to extend for a further 1 year.	
CAB793	WAIVER AND AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR GUM(GENITO-URINARY MEDICINE)SERVICES FOR 2014/15 AND APPROVAL TO ENTER INTO FUTURE COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONTRACTED GUM SERVICES IN 2014 TO 2017 The Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing which set out how the borough will be working with 20 boroughs in commissioning collaborative arrangements in order to manage more effectively demand led sexual health treatment services with the intention of achieving increased value for money for Haringey residents. RESOLVED i. That the benefits that have been derived over the financial year 2013/14 to 2014/15 , set out in paragraph 7.4 in the attached report, from collaborating with other local authorities towards effectively commissioning open access GUM sexual health services and managing the Council's associated costs (see paragraph 6 of the attached report) be noted. ii. That subject to paragraph 3.4 of the attached report , the entry into formal collaboration agreement with 11 other local authorities(identified in paragraph 6.2 of the attached report and associated footnote for	Dir Public Health

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

commissioning GUM sexual health services in 2014-15 be approved.			Dir Public Health
iii. That the waiver, in accordance with CSO 10.01.2(d) (that it is in the Council's overall interest), of the requirement under CSO 9.01 for tendering in respect of the 4 contracts identified in paragraph 3.2(b) be approved; and			
iv. That in accordance with CSO 9.01.6(d), the following 4 contracts for GUM sexual health services provided to Haringey residents in the period April 2014 to 31 March 2015 be awarded to the 3 NHS Trusts as indicated below:			Dir Public Health
Contract	NHS Trusts	Contract values	
(1)	Barnet, Enfield & Haringey Mental Health NHS Trust	£82,000	
(2)	Central & North West London NHS Foundation Trust	£654,000	
(3)	Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust (Barnet & Chase Farm Hospitals)	£33,000	
(4)	Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust (Royal Free Hospital)	£156,00	
v. That the Council's continuing participation in the joint negotiation with an extended group of 19 other London boroughs [see paragraph 6.2 of this report and associated footnote] towards the award of GUM contracts for 2015-16 and 2016-17 and subject to paragraph 3.4 of the attached report, the entry into a formal collaboration agreement for this purpose to be achieved by March 2015 be approved.			Dir Public Health
vi. That delegated authority is provided to the Director of Public Health, acting in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, to finalise the terms of the formal collaboration agreements to be entered into in accordance with paragraphs 3.1(b) and 3.3 of the attached report.			Dir Public Health
vii. That waiver of the requirement to tender in respect of the commissioning, together with 19 other London Boroughs, of GUM services for 2015-17, (paragraph 2 of the exempt information report provides further details - be approved.			Dir Public Health
viii. That the main findings of the 'case for change' (set out in section 5 of the attached report) developed by the Pan London Sexual Health Transformation Project and the next steps as the project seeks to develop a collaborative procurement plan across London for GUM services in 2017-18 be endorsed.			Dir Public Health
Alternative options considered			

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	The complexity of the current system of NHS provided GUM sexual health services, combined with the increased complexity of the commissioning environment means that Councils can be more effective when they work together. Haringey Public Health's experiences over the last two years have shown that it has insufficient leverage to either work independently or in smaller groups of commissioners (as was the case with the NHS North Central London GUM sexual health collaborative in 2013-14) when faced with negotiating costs and activity levels from the range of NHS 'open access' GUM services available to Haringey residents across London. Reasons for decision The recommendations as outlined in 3.2(a) and (b) are in accordance with Contract Standing Orders (CSO) 10.01.2 (d) (that it is in the Council's overall interest), of the requirement under CSO 9.01 for tendering in respect of the 4 contracts identified (in paragraph 3.2(b)); and CSO 9.01.6(d), for the award of the 4 contracts (in 3.2(b)) for GUM sexual health services provided to Haringey residents in 2014-15 to the 3 NHS Trusts indicated above. Haringey Council is a key member of the pan London Sexual Health Transformation project and of the GUM commissioning collaborative, (currently being extended to 20 boroughs), which will enable the Council's participation in future procurements, where appropriate, and in the negotiations towards the award of GUM sexual health services contracts for 2015-16 and 2016-17.	
CAB794	AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR STOP SMOKING SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY IN HARINGEY 2015-16 The Cabinet considered a report, introduced by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, which detailed the outcome of an open tender process for the award of a contract to provide Stop Smoking Services in the Community for adults. The report further recommends an award of a new contract in line with the contract Standing order 9.06 (d) following a robust tendering process. In introducing the report Cllr Morton spoke of the importance of the council's public health role in supporting initiatives to improve Health and Wellbeing of local residents and explained that the contract will target groups in the community where smoking prevalence is particularly high. RESOLVED - That the contract for stop smoking services be awarded to Solutions 4 Health in accordance with Contract Standing Order(CSO)9.6.1(d). - That the contract is awarded for a period of one year with an option to extend for a further period of up to two years, should that be necessary. Alternative options The Option to not re-tender this service was considered. However, given that smoking remains the main cause of preventable illness and early death , and is the primary reason for the life expectancy gap in Haringey , it was considered important that a new approach and service model be adopted. Having undertaken a rapid review of the evidence, it was decided to opt for the model of 'targeting key groups of smokers in the community' and to offer innovative harm reduction approaches in helping people	Dir Public Health Dir Public Health

MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015

	give up. This contract forms one of three newly commissioned stop smoking services in Haringey. While this contract will focus on the delivery of services for key groups in the community, the other two contracts will help people to give up smoking in GP practices and local Pharmacies. By adopting this 'new' approach to stop smoking services, the council aims to commission services where they are most needed in the community, and in a range of defined settings. Reasons for Decision The recommendations as outlined in 3.1 and 3.2 are based on those providers who scored the highest MEAT scores and therefore would offer the best value to council in terms of quality and price. As a result of the procurement exercise, which was carried out in accordance with the Procurement code of Practice, it is now recommended that the successful tenderer being awarded a contract as outlined in 3.1-3.2 in accordance with CSO 9.06.1(d)	
CAB795	MINUTES OF OTHER BODIES RESOLVED That the following minutes be noted: Cabinet Member Signing 11th December 2014 Leader Decision 16th December 2014 Cabinet Member signing 16th December 2014 Cabinet Member signing 19th December 2014 Cabinet Member Signing 5th January 2015 Leader Decision 9th January 2015	
CAB796	SIGNIFICANT AND DELEGATED ACTIONS RESOLVED That the delegated and significant actions taken during December by officers be noted.	
CAB797	NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS None	
CAB798	EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting as the items below contain exempt information, as defined under paragraph 3 , Part 1, schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.	
CAB799	AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR CUSTOMER PLATFORM	

**MINUTES OF THE CABINET
TUESDAY, 20 JANUARY 2015**

	As per item 13.	
CAB800	WAIVER AND AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR GUM SERVICES FOR 2014/15 AND APPROVAL TO ENTER INTO FUTURE COLLABORATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONTRACTED GUM SERVICES IN 2014 TO 2017 As per item 16.	
CAB801	AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR STOP SMOKING SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY IN HARINGEY 2015-16 As per item 17.	
CAB802	NEW ITEMS OF EXEMPT URGENT BUSINESS None	

Finish 8.00pm
Councillor Claire Kober
Chair



Haringey Council

Report for:	Cabinet	Item Number:	
Title:	Corporate Planning 2015-2018		
Report Authorised by:	Nick Walkley, Chief Executive		
Lead Officers:	Erica Ballmann, Head of Policy and Business Management, Kevin Bartle, Assistant Director for Finance, Simon Jones, Assistant Director for Communications		
Ward(s) affected: All	Report for Key/Non Key Decisions: Key		

1. Describe the issue under consideration:

- 1.1. On 16 December 2014, Cabinet agreed to begin a substantial consultation process with residents, businesses, partners on the Council's draft Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and draft Corporate Plan.
- 1.2. This consultation process closed on Sunday 18th January and a detailed report setting out the contributions received can be found at Appendix 1.
- 1.3. Our public engagement process was divided into two parts:
 - Pre-budget consultation which took place between September 29th and November 10th seeking feedback on emerging priorities;
 - MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation between December 17th and January 18th, seeking feedback the three-year vision and budget.
- 1.4 The purpose of the MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation was to involve residents and businesses in the budget making process and formulation of the Corporate Plan, inviting feedback before detailed plans and proposals are developed. Over 1000 comments have been received from residents, businesses and partners as part of the consultation process between 16th December 2014 and 18th January 2015. This does not include the public engagements events and meetings with particular groups that have taken place



Haringey Council

over the same period or the 1000 representations and comments received on our Investing in Our Tomorrow consultation last year.

- 1.5 This is not the end of our engagement process. Further consultation will be undertaken as detailed plans and proposals are drawn up and specific service changes and transformation takes place. The same applies to equalities impact assessments which will need to be finalised and considered before any final decisions are taken in respect of any individual proposals. As detailed proposals and changes take place, full impact assessments will be undertaken, consulted on and findings published.
- 1.6. Cabinet are now being asked to note the responses from residents, business and partners in the consultation report, agree a final version of the Corporate Plan 2015-18 and agree the final 2015-18 Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- 1.7. The MTFS report sets out the Council's General Fund revenue position, the Council's capital programme, the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) capital programme, the HRA revenue position and the position relating to the Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB). It also reflects any changes as a result of the Local Government Financial Settlement and any changes to the proposals published in December 2015.
- 1.8. Subject to Cabinet's approval on 10th February, these proposals will then be considered by all Members at full meeting of the Council on 23 February.



Haringey Council

2 Cabinet Member introduction from the Leader of the Council:

This report, our final Corporate Plan and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), set out an ambitious, long-term vision for Haringey that focuses on improving the place and outcomes for all who live and work here. Setting short-term goals or just managing decline provides neither the stability our partners need nor the improvements we all want to see for the borough. We want to work with communities to make Haringey an even better place to live and intend to encourage investment and create opportunities for all to share in.

In December 2014, we published a draft Corporate Plan and MTFS. Since then, we have been consulting on those plans and have talked to hundreds of residents, businesses and partners. You have told us the things that are important to you: a consistently high quality of education and more support for younger people, stronger networks of support for older and more vulnerable people, cleaner and safer streets, more affordable housing, a healthier Haringey and greater investment in our town centres.

Some people have, quite understandably, expressed concerns about the reduction in council funding and believe that many of these things will be difficult to achieve. In no way do we underestimate the challenges ahead. Since 2011/12, our budget has reduced by £117 million, and over the next 3 years we must reduce it by a further £69 million. This means a 60 per cent real terms reduction in core funding by 2018-19. This is a common national picture and in the context of increasing demand, particularly in terms of school places, housing, health and social care, local authorities are faced with making some very difficult decisions.

Haringey Councillors have, since December, been reviewing the savings proposals and taken into consideration the outcomes from public consultation and the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. As a result, some changes have been made, including in particular, the removal of £5.7m of saving proposals relating to adult social care packages. However, these changes mean that over the lifetime of the MTFS, there is a need to use £4.3m of our reserves. We will, nevertheless, still reach a sustainable budget position by 2017/18.

We are committed to supporting local people, not least by continuing to freeze council tax, ensuring that every child and young person is able to attend a good or outstanding school or early years setting, and delivering £1bn of inward investment to create more jobs and new homes. The job of a council has changed in recent years beyond all recognition. We cannot continue to be an organisation that simply focuses on delivering services for people in the way we think best. Our focus must be on securing better outcomes for our communities through partnership working, co-production and a focus on positive economic growth which brings investment and opportunities for local people.



Haringey Council

3 Recommendations:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

3.1 Consultation Feedback – attached at Appendix 1

3.1.1 Note the summary of the consultation feedback.

3.2 Corporate Plan – attached at Appendix 2

3.2.1 Agree the final version of the corporate plan *Building a Stronger Haringey Together* as the blueprint for the Council's vision and outcomes from 2015-2018;

3.3 Medium Term Financial Strategy – attached at Appendix 3

- 3.3.1 propose approval to the Council of the 2015/16 revenue budget and the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2015-2018, pending final inflation allocation to priority budgets as set out in Annex 1;
- 3.3.2 propose approval to the Council of a General Fund budget requirement of £277.034m as set out in Annex 1 but subject to the final decisions of the levying and precepting bodies and the final local government finance settlement;
- 3.3.3 propose approval to the Council of the General Fund capital programme 2015-2018 detailed in Annex 2;
- 3.3.4 propose approval to the Council of the HRA capital programme 2015-2018 detailed in Annex 3;
- 3.3.5 propose approval to the Council of the HRA Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015-2018 detailed in Annex 4;
- 3.3.6 approve the housing tenants' service charges set out in Table 5;
- 3.3.7 note the proposal to introduce additional service charges for tenants in Supported Housing Schemes as set out in Table 6 such proposals to be subject to consultation and equality impact assessments and final decision by the Cabinet or Cabinet Member if they are to proceed;
- 3.3.8 approve the housing rent increase, of on average, £2.36 (2.2%), as set out in paragraphs 14.5 and 14.6;
- 3.3.9 propose a Dedicated Schools Budget for 2015/16 of £236.477m as set out in Annex 5;
- 3.3.10 approve the change to the value of the Secondary Schools lump sum element within Haringey Schools Funding Formula, endorsed by the Schools Forum and set out in paragraph 17.12;
- 3.3.11 approve the responses made to the Overview and Scrutiny committee recommendations following their consideration of the draft budget proposals contained within the MTFS 2015-2018 (Annex 6);
- 3.3.12 note that this report will be considered by the Council at its meeting on 23 February 2015 to inform their decisions on the 2015/16 budget and the associated Council Tax for that year;



Haringey Council

- 3.3.13 delegate to the Chief Financial Officer any minor adjustments, individually up to £250k, that may be necessary to finalise the 2015/16 budget as a result of the final Local Government Finance Settlement being announced by the government and / final grant figures notified by other bodies. This would impact on the recommendations set out above.

4 Alternative options considered:

- 4.1 There is a need to identify £69m of savings from the Council's budget over the next three years. This is in addition to savings of £117 million identified over the previous three years. As we approach the 2015 General Election, it is clear that all of the major national political parties remain committed to reducing the deficit and that the public sector will need to bear its share of the funding reductions needed to achieve this aim.
- 4.2 Key principles which have informed our overall approach are:
- 4.2.1 That our focus should be on outcomes, not services, to ensure the Council's budget is most effectively spent, on the things that really matter to residents;
 - 4.2.2 We must have a long term view on delivery of outcomes and resources, both budget and staff, to ensure the most effective approach and best value for money.
 - 4.2.3 Residents should be at the heart of all our plans.
- 4.3 Alternative options considered included a traditional corporate plan, not clearly related to budget; a budget focussed in detail on only 2015/16 and publishing simple proposals for consultation with staff on budget proposals rather than a joined up approach setting out a three year strategy. However, the scale of change required mean that this approach would risk a misalignment between the priorities set out in the corporate plan and the budget, and therefore poor value for money and risk to the achievement of objectives.
- 4.4 The Administration made a clear commitment to freezing Council Tax for the duration of the current electoral term in their 2014 manifesto. Consideration has also been given to increasing the Council Tax to contribute to the estimated budget shortfall. If a rise in Council Tax above 2% were proposed, this would require a referendum. Additionally, given that any increase would result in the loss of Council Tax Freeze Grant the benefit of raising Council Tax against the loss of that grant is not considered worthwhile.
- 4.5 A 2% Council Tax rise, which is the maximum that could be implemented without requiring a referendum, would generate c£1.6m additional income but would result in the loss of c£1m CT freeze grant, resulting in only a net £0.6m benefit. In addition, over one third of respondents to the consultation also said



Haringey Council

that they either strongly supported or supported a council tax freeze. This brings in to question the worth of such an increase and therefore the proposal is not being taken forward.

5 Background information:

- 5.1 Over the three years from 2015/16 to 2017/18 the Council must reduce its budget by £69 million as a result of reductions in central Government grant. The scale of reduction, on top of previous savings, means the Council must fundamentally transform what it does in order that it can continue to support residents. The previous approach to budgeting taken by many local authorities of year-on-year changes and reductions in services cannot support savings of this scale and does not provide residents, businesses and partners with the same level of confidence and assurance as a three year plan.
- 5.2 Around 258,900 people live in Haringey (an increase of 3,300 since the 2011 census). By 2021, it is projected that the population will rise by a further 30,000.
- 5.3 Haringey has a diverse population, and many assets, including that diversity. We are also committed to ensuring a fair and equal borough to help all our residents thrive and achieve.
- 5.4 **The final version of the Corporate Plan 2015-18** (see Appendix 2) sets out a three year vision to make Haringey one of London's greatest boroughs where families can thrive and succeed. We will put growth at the heart of our priorities, supporting economic growth that everyone can benefit from, with access to the skills that will secure good, sustainable employment. We will work to make sure every child has the best start in life, and benefits from an outstanding education, and we will work with all our communities to ensure everyone can keep themselves healthy. We will work to create homes and communities in which everyone can thrive, and neighbourhoods that are clean and safe, where people feel proud to live.
- 5.5 We will support Haringey's residents to build a stronger future through 5 priorities:
 - Enable every child and young person to have the best start in life, with high quality education;
 - Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives;
 - A clean and safe borough where people are proud to live;
 - Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit;
 - Create homes and communities where people choose to live and are able to thrive.



These are underpinned by 6 cross-cutting principles:

- Prevention and early intervention – preventing poor outcomes for children, young people and adults and intervening early when help and support is needed;
- A fair and equal borough – tackling the barriers facing the most disadvantaged and enabling them to reach their potential;
- Working together with our communities – building resilient communities where people are able to help themselves and support each other;
- Value for money – achieving the best outcome from the investment made;
- Customer focus – placing our customers needs at the centre of what we do;
- Working in partnership – delivering with and through others.

5.6 **The final version of the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015 to 2018** (see Appendix 3) sets out a three year plan for the Council and the financial issues that have been taken into consideration.

5.7 The proposals in the final version of the MTFS contain some important changes reflecting what we have heard from residents as part of the consultation process and other adjustments following confirmation of the level of Central Government funding. Details of these changes are set out in full in the MTFS section of this report.

5.8 The consultation process with residents and businesses was extensively publicised in the local media and online, signposting people to an online survey or local library where consultation packs were available;

- 975 consultation packs were sent out to community groups using HAVCO's database;
- Businesses and trader groups were written to for their specific feedback;
- 150 letters from the Leader were sent to stakeholders and partner organisations.

5.9 In addition, Cabinet Members have also:

- visited a number of residential, day and drop-in care centres across the borough;
- attended all Area Forums and some local neighbourhood forums;
- visited a number of schools;
- organised meetings with various partner and voluntary organisations in the borough and hosted an event for partners that was attended by over 50 organisations and local stakeholders.



6 Consultation Feedback:

- 6.1 This section provides a brief summary of consultation responses to the 2015-2018 MTFS and Corporate Plan. A response to the key issues raised can be found at paragraph 7 of this report. The full report of all consultation feedback received can be found at Appendix 1.
- 6.2 The consultation was divided into two parts:
- Pre-budget consultation which took place between September 29th and November 10th seeking feedback on emerging priorities;
 - MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation between December 17th and January 18th, seeking feedback on the three-year vision and budget.
- 6.3 The purpose of the MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation was to involve residents and businesses in the budget making process, inviting feedback before detailed plans and proposals are developed.
- 6.4 Both the pre-budget and MTFS/Corporate Plan Consultation was organised around 7 key themes:
- Young people and families
 - Adults and healthy living
 - The environment and community safety
 - Economic growth and employment
 - Housing
 - Other budget proposals
 - Equality Impact Assessment
- 6.5 As set out in the full report, the Council held around 25 separate meetings during the MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation period. More than 450 representations were made to the Council through a survey or through letters and emails.



6.6 A brief summary of significant themes that were raised during the consultation is set out below. A much more detailed summary looking at individual issues raised across each of the areas is included in the full report.

6.6.1 **Council tax:** respondents to the online and postal survey were asked to what extent do you support the proposal to freeze council tax?

To what extent do you support our proposal?	Number	%
Total responses	305	82%
Strongly support	81	22%
Support	53	14%
Neither support nor do not support	63	17%
Do not support	50	13%
Strongly do not support	58	16%
Did not answer	67	18%
Total	372	100%

6.7 The consultation:

6.7.1 A number of people criticised the consultation process, saying that the period for consultation was too short, that there was insufficient details in many of the proposals and there were too few options. Some people felt that the title of the Corporate Plan “Building a Stronger Haringey Together” was misleading and at odds with the reduction in budgets and there were “too many mission statements” and “not enough tangible proposals.”

6.8 Budget making:

6.8.1 It was felt that the Council should be doing more to challenge the Government and fight for more resources rather than implementing cuts. Questions were also asked about why the Council is setting a three-year budget rather than one-year- budget. Some expressed the view that the Council should consider increasing council tax.

6.8.2 Many people also expressed the belief that reductions in Children’s and Adult budgets were being unfairly apportioned which meant that vulnerable people were being hit the hardest by the savings that are proposed.



Haringey Council

6.9 Young people and families:

Youth Services:

- 6.9.1 Respondents questioned the statement that only a small number of people use council youth services and that Bruce Grove is a valuable hub for young people in Tottenham and a safe haven where people come together and learn from each other. Some people expressed the point that youth centres play a valuable role around skills and employment and more should be done to find alternative sources of funding. It was clearly felt that the future of Bruce Grove youth centre was under threat from the savings that have been proposed.

Childcare:

- 6.9.2 Affordable childcare is seen as a must across the borough and it was felt that children's centres play a strong role in providing high quality affordable childcare.

Children's Centres:

- 6.9.3 It was felt that there was a misunderstanding about the services that are provided, all of which play a major role in helping families and signposting services. Some people said that children's centres are crucial to integration and are non-stigmatising, where as it was felt that visiting people in their homes can be stigmatising with people more reluctant to engage.
- 6.9.4 A petition of 103 signatures was received in support of Pembury House Nursery School and Children's Centre.

Young people with complex needs:

- 6.9.5 It was felt that the budget reductions would undermine the quality of life of vulnerable young people. A number of people expressed the same point that people with autism need to have routines and people around them. Withdrawing services would reduce independence and impact on their physical and mental health. It was strongly felt that services for disabled people should not be withdrawn.

Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre:

- 6.9.6 A number of people, including past and present Head Teachers, highlighted the importance of the centre in developing team work, positive thinking, confidence and social skills. Overall it was felt that Pendarren is a great educational resource, providing young people across the borough with an equal opportunity for an educational



Haringey Council

vocation which would potentially be lost is the centre moved towards a more commercial operating mode.

Schools:

- 6.9.7 It was stated that the quality of education across the borough should be of a consistent standard.

6.10 Adults and healthy living

- 6.10.1 The vast majority of comments centred on the impact the budget reductions would have on vulnerable people. These have been categorised across different themes as set out below.

Complex needs – general comments:

- 6.10.2 It was suggested strongly that it would be wrong to consider reducing services that would impact on the most vulnerable. Reducing services would impact on their quality of life and may cause deteriorating health. It was suggested that people with complex needs, such as autism, require structure and a loss of service would potentially leave people isolated and anxious. Many were concerned that a loss of service would also increase the burden on carers and families with people worried that they will not be able to cope.

Reablement:

- 6.10.3 Some respondents said that a reablement approach is ill-suited for people with very complex needs. It was also suggested that reablement services are poorly co-ordinated across the local NHS and particularly with acute hospital providers. It was stated that changes in day centres and residential care when reablement and preventative to maintain independence have been shown to work.

Day centres and residential care:

- 6.10.4 It was felt that the closure of day centres were at odds with the stated aims in the Corporate Plan. Many respondents expressed the view that day centres provide valuable support to elderly and vulnerable people, particularly around providing a structure and providing social engagement. Closure would also place an extra burden on carers and may lead to increased social isolation and deteriorating health which potentially could place an extra cost burden on other parts of social care and the NHS. Many people said that day centres connected people and provided structure.



Haringey Council

The Haven:

6.10.5 Multiple letters were received from fourteen service users of The Haven and their carers/family. Service users, through advocates, spoke of the fear that they will have no-where to go and become isolated should it close. They felt that their health, quality of life and independence had improved since going to The Haven. Family members and carers spoke of visible improvements in health and wellbeing, with increased social interaction. They also said that The Haven provides valuable respite.

6.10.6 In addition a petition containing 102 signatures was received which said "This day centre is an important part of community life for older people with disabilities and mental health issues and should remain so."

Care packages:

6.10.7 It was expressed that a reduction in care packages would increase the burden on carers and family members in a way that would mean that many would struggle to cope to look after their loved ones.

Voluntary sector:

6.10.8 Some respondents said that the Council was increasing expectations on voluntary sector services while reducing its effectiveness through a proposed £1.6 million reduction in core funding.

Social care:

6.10.9 Some Concerns were expressed that a reduction in social care workers would impact on safeguarding and potentially put more people at risk of abuse.

6.11 Environment and community safety:

Streetscene and street cleaning:

6.11.1 Some respondents felt that street cleaning should be a major priority and were concerned that reductions in budget may lead to a reduction in service. While some people said that the service had improved it was felt that further improvements were needed. It was expressed that the service was still too reactive to problems such as fly-tipping, incurring greater cost.

Recycling and refuse:



Haringey Council

- 6.11.2 Concern was expressed that the closure of the Park View Road recycling would increase fly-tipping. While there was general support for the proposal to remove street-side recycling points, a point was made that it would make it harder for people to recycle who did not have cars.

Roads and parking:

- 6.11.3 Mixed views were expressed about the introduction of a 20mph zone, with some respondents saying that it would be hard to enforce.

Community safety:

- 6.11.4 Some people stated that they would like to see more CCTV and that more work is needed generally to improve community safety, particularly around reducing gang activity.

Parks:

- 6.11.5 A number of people expressed concerns around proposals to increase income from events in parks which could bring unreasonable levels of disruption for local people, particularly around Finsbury Park.

6.12 Economic growth and employment:

Regeneration:

- 6.12.1 Some concerns were raised that regeneration in Tottenham may result in some residents and businesses being priced out of the area. Some felt there should be a stronger investment focus on other parts of the borough, particularly Wood Green.

Employment and skills:

- 6.12.2 The living wage was highlighted as being important, while concerns were raised about the impact of job reductions at the Council and partner organisations.

Business support and growth:

- 6.12.3 Views were expressed that the Council should focus on supporting business forums and improving shopping areas. A point was made that the Council should identify priority sectors and help more companies relocate to Haringey.



Haringey Council

6.13 Housing and communities:

6.13.1 A number of people raised issues around the need for more affordable housing in the borough, with the need to bring more empty homes back into use. Many people expressed support for a Landlord Registration Scheme. Some concerns were expressed about the impact of regeneration schemes on existing affordable housing.

6.14 Other budget proposals:

6.14.1 A number of people raised issues around the need for more affordable housing in the borough, with the need to bring more empty homes back into use. Many people expressed support for a Landlord Registration Scheme. Some concerns were expressed about the impact of regeneration schemes on existing affordable housing.

Muswell Hill Library:

6.14.2 Views on the library's future were mixed, with some opposing any relocation while others believe a more accessible building is needed. Some people expressed the desire to see more detail before commenting.

Marcus Garvey Library:

6.14.3 All respondents who commented on the proposal felt that the current library space should be preserved and it was an important asset for people of Tottenham, particularly for younger people who may struggle to find sufficient to complete homework within their home.

Equality Impact Assessments:

6.14.4 A number of people commented that they felt that the current EQIA lacked sufficient detail. General points were expressed that the budget proposals would create greater inequality, resulting in the poorest and most vulnerable being worst hit.



Haringey Council

7 Responding to the issues raised

The Budget Process:

- 7.1.1 The questions and comments raised around the budget process are noted. Three issues about the overall budget process were prominent – the setting of a three-year-budget, the proposal to freeze rather than raise Council Tax and the overall consultation process. All the available evidence points to a continued challenging financial environment for local government, and all local authorities including Haringey, regardless of the result of the General Election with all major parties committed to deficit reduction. Labour's Shadow Chancellor Ed Ball noted on January 5th that he does not foresee changes to current spending plans for local government.
- 7.1.2 The Council has to plan strategically over the next three years with many of the savings proposed requiring significant long-term changes in the way services are delivered. A single year budget would involve significant uncertainty for staff, stakeholders and residents, and put at significantly great risk the long term delivery of services and service improvements.
- 7.1.3 Haringey already has relatively high level of council tax compared with most London councils. The Government provides councils with an incentive to freeze council tax rates, which means that if we had increased levels to the maximum allowed before a referendum (2%) we would have only received an extra £600,000 in revenue once the loss of the incentive is taken into account.

The consultation process:

- 7.1.4 In response to comments around the consultation process, it must be emphasised that there will be no significant changes in services based on this consultation alone. Where major changes to service users are proposed after budget setting, detailed plans will come forward and decisions will only be made after much more detailed consultation which will take into account all the options available to the Council, including Equality Impact Assessments. The current process allow us to consider whether plans should be developed, and if they are, allow us to take on board feedback and where possible ensure that future proposals are co-designed with the community.

Young people and families:



Haringey Council

Youth services:

- 7.1.5 Concerns were raised during the consultation process about the future of Bruce Grove Youth Centre. No proposal in the draft MTFS or Corporate Plan requires the closure of the centre. Bruce Grove Youth Centre will remain open. The Council will work with young people to develop the strategy for youth services and Young People in future. A draft strategy will be issued for consultation in March.

Children's Centres:

- 7.1.6 In response to concerns raised about the proposed reduction in the number of Children's Centres, it is proposed to allow for a longer period of consultation and engagement with users, stakeholders and parents who do not currently use centres to further develop the proposals on Children's Centres. This will also enable the Council to continue to work with the community in co-designing any proposed changes to the future operating model. Formal consultation proposals will be issued following that further engagement. However, the budget envelope is recommended to remain as set in the MTFS.

Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre:

- 7.1.7 The Council agrees with the views expressed that Pendarren is a valuable educational resource. While the Council has no desire to see this diluted, we do need to consider how we can reduce operating costs.

Children with complex needs:

- 7.1.8 The Council is proposing changes to services for children with complex needs, which will reflect the wider policy changes in the reforms under the Children and Families Act. We will conclude our options appraisal of respite services, including the residential respite offered through our in-house provision at Haslemere, and review our passenger transport policy. Detailed proposals will come forward for any changes that are made.

Adults and healthy living:



Haringey Council

Adults with complex needs:

- 7.1.9 Having regard to the responses set out in the consultation, the Council has a responsibility to embed the changes set out nationally through the advent of the Better Care Fund, the Care Act and the SEND reforms of the Children and Families Act. This puts an increasing emphasis on early intervention, integration and joining up services around residents. In addition, the pressures on the public purse mean that we cannot continue to do things the way we have previously we need to promote health in all our policies, work with communities and transform our services.
- 7.1.10 Our experience in Haringey has demonstrated that people prefer to live ordinary lives in the community where they have the opportunity to have control over their lives. This includes people with complex needs.
- 7.1.11 We believe that the current model is not sustainable. In developing a three year plan we have been able to set out our vision, moving away from incremental budget cuts, to considering the changes that need to take place to deliver, within reducing budgets, equitable, inclusive support, for those who need services.
- 7.1.12 Haringey is committed to supporting the most vulnerable people in the Borough but difficult decisions have to be made because of the scale of the budget challenge.
- 7.1.13 People who are in receipt of adult social care, or who may need adult social care, have an assessment of need and the Council has a duty to meet assessed need. There is nothing in the medium term financial plan which changes that position. Everyone has the right to respect and dignity, and care packages that support this.
- 7.1.14 However, we have listened to what people have had to say and are now recommending that, on the basis of the consultation feedback, the proposal to make savings of £5.7m on care packages is removed. The Council will however, look to make changes to our reablement approach.
- 7.1.15 Promoting independence is a principle underpinning many of the proposals, as is the belief that vulnerable adults should not be segregated from the rest of society, but welcomed into and supported by it. Prevention and early intervention are central to this vision.
- 7.1.16 The Council needs to work with partners to intervene earlier but also understand the need to step care up and down as needs and the



ability of individuals, carers and families to cope also changes.

- 7.1.17 The Council needs to make money go as far as possible in supporting older and more vulnerable adults. When there is such pressure on the budget, to spend money on day centres that support only a small number of people with such needs is untenable and does not deliver equity and fairness. Our aim is to ensure that as many people as possible are supported to have social opportunities and support, but also that we use the money we have as wisely as possible.
- 7.1.18 The Council has said throughout the engagement process of recent weeks that reablement is not the answer for everyone. Where it has the potential to enable people to regain, and/or maintain, their independence, we will apply it. We believe that everyone has the right to choice and independence and it is right and proper that we support people to achieve that. We currently support younger adults with complex needs through enablement, which is a pathway which is about developing life skills so that people can engage safely in aspects of community life, and to develop goals to improve health and quality of life.
- 7.1.19 There is no suggestion that we will move away from assessing people's needs and ensuring that they receive services in accordance with those needs, but believe our assessment is as much about understanding people's strengths and potential and enabling people to realise that. We need to focus on early help and prevention to ensure people can live as independently as possible for as long as possible.

The Voluntary Sector:

- 7.1.20 We recognise the important role of a vibrant and diverse voluntary and community sector in the borough - and indeed, we commission numerous voluntary services across the council. Feedback has confirmed this understanding that local voluntary organisations are often well placed to deliver prevention and early intervention and to build individual and community capacity in line with our core objectives and across the reach of the Corporate Plan. We are keen to develop further our partnership with the sector, many elements of which are not funded by the Council, to strengthen our approach and to build on the many assets in the community. We believe the Corporate Plan offers a number of opportunities for further commissioning of the voluntary sector as we continue to move towards prevention and early intervention; we will continue to work with the sector to foster innovative approaches which are sustainable and draw in new investment to the borough.



Haringey Council

Environment and community safety:

7.1.21 Points were raised about the future performance of the street cleaning service which will be taken on board in any future redesign of the service. It is also recommended that a review is carried out on the future of the Park View Road Reuse and Recycling Centre before any changes are made, which would enable us to give consideration to concerns raised about the impact any closure would have on fly-tipping.

7.1.22 The Council will also continue to engage with the community around park events and ensure that, where events are organised, they are done so with the minimum of disruption.

Growth and employment:

7.1.23 The consultation responses on Corporate Plan Priority 4 (Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit) were wide-ranging, reflecting the different strands of work that come together in this Priority. The council was particularly pleased to receive feedback from some of individuals and groups who are centrally involved in the borough's economic life, including the Muswell Hill Traders Group, and to receive constructive suggestions on how the overall vision for this Priority can be achieved.

7.1.24 Some respondents raised concerns about a range of issues including the impacts of regeneration on existing residents and businesses; the quality and salaries of new jobs being created; and the importance of tailoring support to town centres and both existing and prospective businesses. These issues are important to the council and will be at the heart of our plans as we implement this. Unsurprisingly, other proposals were raised which are not currently part of our plans; some have already been considered and not pursued for a variety of reasons, but others have clear potential merit and will be considered further.

7.1.25 Overall, while there were questions about the detail of implementation, the majority of feedback gave support to the broad approach the council has proposed for this priority. The council has therefore made only minor changes to the wording of the Corporate Plan itself – to ensure consistency with the recently published Economic Development and Growth Strategy – and will address many of the issues raised in the consultation feedback as it develops its plans for implementation.

Housing and communities:



Haringey Council

- 7.1.26 The consultation responses on housing and communities demonstrated how passionately residents feel about access to high-quality housing and what the council can do to improve standards across Haringey.
- 7.1.27 In general, respondents supported the council's ambitions to build its own homes and for more shared ownership options to be among those. There was also support for the council's proposals for a private landlord licensing scheme and for getting empty homes back into use.
- 7.1.28 Common issues raised by respondents included a concern about the level of affordable housing in the borough, a need for more social housing and repairs to existing council housing, and concern that regeneration would price people out of the area.
- 7.1.29 At the heart of the council's proposed Housing Strategy is a focus on providing more high-quality affordable homes, with a mix of ownerships and tenures to support balanced and diverse communities. The council is committed to building more than 100 social rent and shared ownership properties in the next three years on small plots of underused land, as well as exploring options with communities at larger sites, through our Housing Investment and Estate Renewal Strategy, to see what the options are to bring long-term improvements. We are also investing money into the Decent Homes programme to improve existing council homes. Housing management is important to us too, and we maintain high standards for our own Council tenants and leaseholders, and set that expectation for local Housing Associations and landlords.
- 7.1.30 The Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework sets out our commitment to improving existing homes and building thousands of new high-quality homes – both to support existing communities' right to a modern home and to meet housing demand.

Muswell Hill Library

- 7.1.31 The range of views expressed are noted and The Council will ensure, should proposals be developed, that the community are involved in decisions around potential re-location and the future use of the site itself.
- 7.1.32 On wider issues, the budget recommendations set out a commitment to retain library services across the borough.

Marcus Garvey Library/Customer Services:



Haringey Council

7.1.33 Concerns are noted. Through proposals coming forward we will give an assurance that any additional services that are delivered to improve customer access will not reduce current library space and we would ensure that any reconfiguration improves and modernises the space for young learners.

Equality Impact Assessments (EQIAs):

7.1.34 Every effort has been made to ensure that the draft EQIAs developed for the savings proposals were as complete as possible at this stage. EQIAs will be developed further as new operating models, service and policy changes are considered, consulted on and implemented over the lifetime of the three year MTFS.

Changes to the Corporate Plan:

7.1.35 These are set out in full within the Consultation report.

8 Comments of the Section 151 Officer and financial implications:

- 8.1 The robustness of the Council's 2015/16 budget and its Medium Term Financial Strategy is a critical role for the Council's Section 151 Officer. Ensuring that the budget proposals are realistic will be achieved in a number of ways including consideration of the budget setting process itself, the quality and extent of both statutory and non statutory consultation, the assessment and management of risks and the coherence of the working papers supporting budget proposals.
- 8.2 The basis for the £70m indicative budget gap was set out clearly in the December Cabinet report and is explained further in this report. The gap results largely from the 2014 Local Government Finance Settlement, analysis of the effect of on-going reductions in public sector expenditure produced by the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) and now the confirmation of our forecasts from the provisional Local Government Finance settlement, along with other independent sources.
- 8.3 Whilst the size of the budget shortfall remains, of necessity, an estimate, it is clear that it is a robust assessment of the extent of the challenge facing the Council.
- 8.4 It is appropriate, in the view of the S151 officer, to tackle the estimated shortfall over the three year period rather than over a single year given that: -
 - The Council needs to have clarity over the medium term on its direction of travel and what it is intending to achieve; this is set out in its Corporate Plan,



Haringey Council

and the Medium Term Financial Strategy is an integral part of that service planning.

- Service improvements often take longer than a single year to implement and thus the Council needs a three year service and financial plan over that period so that we are transparent about the challenges we face and how the Council is tackling them.
- Members need to be given real choices and options about where to make service changes and the bringing together of service and financial planning enables this to take place over a realistic timeframe.

8.5 Whichever party wins the next election, they will need to pursue austerity measures of at least the same order as over the last 4 years; whilst there will be choices about how the overall resources are distributed between the government's priorities there is no evidence to indicate a 'softening' of the position in relation to Local Government.

8.6 The proposals in this report, as revised since the December report, now rely on the strategic use of reserves over the three year period 2015 – 2018. A sustainable budget position is however forecast for 2017/18 which will start to allow the replenishment of the reserves which have been used to balance the budget in 2015/16 and 2016/17. However, there remain significant uncertainties, particularly in the later years of the MTFS and so it is imperative that Members acknowledge and take action to manage identified and emerging risks.

8.7 The MTFS at Appendix 3 is primarily financial in its nature; comments of the Chief Financial Officer are, therefore, essentially contained throughout the report.

9 Comments of the Assistant Director of Governance and legal implications:

9.1 The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Regulations) 2001 and the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules at Part 4 Section E of the Constitution, set out the process that must be followed when the Council sets its budget. It is for the Cabinet to approve the proposals and submit the same to the Full Council for adoption in order to set the budget. However the setting of rents and service charges for Council properties is an executive function to be determined by the Cabinet.

9.2 The Cabinet will need to ensure that where necessary, consultation is carried out and equalities impact assessments are undertaken and the outcomes of these exercises inform any final decisions.

10 Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments:



Haringey Council

- 10.1 Ensuring a fair and equal borough is a priority for the council and this is reflected in the objectives and performance targets we have set out in the Corporate Plan 2015-18.
- 10.2 Draft Equality Impact Assessments (EQIAs) were developed for the savings identified against each of the five priorities in the corporate plan and can be found [here](#) . Local resident and stakeholder feedback was sought on the EQIAs as part of the consultation process.
- 10.3 As the MTFS is a three year plan some of the proposals are still in their infancy as important decisions are still to be taken based on further analysis. Therefore they have not been worked up in sufficient detail to produce full EQIAs. Such EQIAs will be developed further as new operating models, service and policy changes are considered and developed over the lifetime of the three year MTFS.
- 10.4 Any individual proposals in the MTFS that will go to Cabinet for decision will each have a completed EQIA which will be published on the Council's EQIA webpage and these will be taken into account by the Cabinet before making any decision.
- 10.5 We will report on the cumulative equalities impact of the savings proposals as part of the Council's annual performance assessment report as well as progress against the success measures outlined in the fair and equal borough delivery plan.

11 Policy Implication:

- 11.1 The corporate plan and medium term financial strategy both contain within them policy implications. Where these are key decisions they will be subject to separate Cabinet reports.

12 Reasons for Decision:

- 12.1 The Council has a legal duty to set a balanced budget. This report sets out the strategic financial issues for the three year financial planning period to 2017/18, and updates on the process for setting the Council's 2015/16 Budget.

13 Use of Appendices:

Appendix 1:	Consultation Feedback Report
Appendix 2:	Corporate Plan 2015-18
Appendix 3:	Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015-18



Haringey Council

14 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

The Corporate Planning 2015-18 Cabinet report of 16th December 2014 can be found [here](#).

http://applications.haringey.gov.uk/index/council/how_the_council_works/equalities/eia/eqia-dec14.htm



Haringey Council

Appendix 1

Annex A:	Responses from community groups and partner organisations
Annex B:	Consultation response document
Annex C:	Learning Disability Experience Independent Advocacy Support and Facilitation
Annex D:	Summary from Investing in Our Tomorrow pre-budget consultation

1. Consultation response to 2015-2018 Budget and Corporate Plan

- 1.1. This report sets out responses to the 2015-2018 MTFS and Corporate Plan.
- 1.2. The consultation was divided into two parts:
 - Pre-budget consultation which took place between September 29th and November 10th seeking feedback on emerging priorities
 - MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation between December 17th and January 18th, seeking feedback on the three-year vision and budget
- 1.3. The purpose of the MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation was to involve residents and businesses in the budget-making process, inviting feedback before detailed plans and proposals are developed.
- 1.4. Both the pre-budget and MTFS/Corporate Plan consultation was organised around five key themes:
 - Young people and families
 - Adults and healthy living
 - The environment and community safety
 - Economic growth and employment
 - Housing

2. Consultation activity

- 2.1. The tables below sets out consultation activity covering both the pre-budget period and the MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation period.

Pre-budget consultation with HAVCO, September 29th to November 10th			
Activity		Areas	Participation levels
Council online survey with questions under every theme		All	766



Haringey Council

Roadshows		Priory Park, Middle Lane, Hornsey N8	190
		Marcus Garvey Library, Tottenham Green N15	
		Albert Road Recreation Group, Bowes Park, N22	
		Chestnuts Park, St Ann's N15	
		Lordship Recreation Ground, N17	
		Alexandra Palace Market, N10	
		Wood Green Library, N22	
		Finsbury Park, N4	
		Sainsbury's Green Lanes Retail Park, N4	
		Bruce Castle Museum, Bruce Grove, N17	
Focus Groups		11 focus groups and 1 workshop	130
Health Watch Workshop			32
TOTAL			1,118

MTFS and Corporate Plan Consultation, December 17th – January 18th			
Publicity			
Item	Dates	Actions	Quantity
Consultation packs with survey	December 18 th	Consultation packs summarising proposals and signposting information sent to community groups and partner organisations	1120



Haringey Council

		Leaflet drops to libraries and Citizens Advice Bureau	
Media	December 18th	Press release issued to local media	N/A
Haringey People	December 18th	Stories on Corporate Plan and budget consultation	
Letters to service users and their families	December 17 th	Letters in an accessible format promoting the consultation and engagement events sent to: adults with a learning disability that: 1) Receive residential or residential nursing care directly from the Council, 2) Reside within the shared lives scheme (internal to Haringey Council) 3) Reside with supported living schemes internal to Haringey Council	700
Engagement activity			
Event	Date	Audience	Participants
Ermine Road Day Opportunities drop-in (two sessions)	January 6th	Service users, families/carers	44 and 10



Haringey Council

Haven Day centre drop-in	January 9th	Service users and their families/carers	62
Osborne Grove drop-in	January 9th	Service users, families and carers	28
The Roundway	January 9 th	Engagement between service users of The Roundway Day Centre and independent advocates	30
The Haven	January 9 th	Engagement between service users of The Haven and independent advocates	12
Ermine Road Day Centre	January 12th	Engagement between service users of Ermine Road Day Centre and independent advocates	29
Linden House	January 12th	Engagement between service users of Linden House residential home and independent advocates	13
Voluntary Sector	January 12th	Voluntary sector organisations	10
West Green & Bruce Grove Area Forum (January 12 th)	January 12th	Residents	25
The Triangle Centre – drop-in	January 13th	Young People	30
Osborne Grove	January 13th	Service users and carers	15
Osborne Grove	January 14th	Engagement between service users of Osborne Grove Nursing	12



Haringey Council

		Home and independent advocates	
Birbeck Centre	January 14th	Engagement between service users of the Birkbeck Centre and Allways Centre with independent advocates	42
Haringey Youth Council	January 14th	Young people	20*
Children's Centres Cluster Chairs	January 14th	Cluster governors	10
Children's Centres, Noel Park	January 14th	Staff	24
Children's Centres (Civic Centre)	January 15th	Staff	24
Children's Centres, Professional Development Centre	January 15th	Nursery school governors	12
Bruce Grove Youth Centre	January 15th	10 Bruce Grove N17 6RA	45*
Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches, Civic Centre	January 15th	Neighbourhood Watch members	35*
Children's Centres, Professional Development Centre	January 15 th	Staff	35
Children's Centres, Professional Development Centre	January 16 th	Headteachers	6
Children's Centres, Professional	January 16th	Private, independent and voluntary childcare	19



Haringey Council

Development Centre		providers	
Events in parks	January 17th	Albert Recreation Ground, Finsbury Park, Queens Wood, Markfield Park	43
			*Approx

3. Pre-budget consultation feedback

- 3.1. The information below is a summary of responses made. A full summary version of the report is available in Appendix A

Theme	Issues raised
Supporting Children and Families to Thrive	
Improve the early help offer	Children's centres should be strengthened and expanded with a greater focus on early help. Improvements should be made in the way people can access the services.
Improve education	Improve the early learning offer for young people and ensure a consistent standard of education across Haringey's schools. Improve the quality of library facilities and learning resources for children and young people of all ages.
Young people	Provide more recreational support for young people, particularly during holidays. Support the development of more apprentices and better career advice.
Support parents	Provide more parenting classes for new parents and expand healthy eating programmes. Improve training and advice for parents returning to work. Provide ESOL classes for parents with language barriers. Improve access to affordable and subsidised childcare.
Reduce the fear of crime	Increase the visibility of community policing in parks. Deal with anti-social behaviour and provide anti-gang and anti-bullying support. .
Enabling adults to live longer and healthier lives	
Promote available support for healthy ageing	Ensure that people of all ages and abilities have information on help available to them,
Joined up	NHS, Public Health and social care should work closer



services	together.
Improve access to GPs	The Council should work with the NHS to try and resolve problems with access.
Improve prevention	Roll out health checks at places where people go (i.e. supermarkets).
Reduce social isolation	Improve the availability of befriending opportunities for older people.
Improve mental health	Improve mental health advocacy and support.
Reduce obesity	Use children's centres as a hub for every programme, provide more affordable sports facilities and provide a greater range of healthy school meals. Ensure that there is support tailored for people with learning disabilities.
Ensure that Haringey is cleaner, greener with safer public spaces and streets	
Create a cleaner environment	Revise refuse collections and improve enforcement.
Improve community safety	More visibility of community policing in parks and open spaces. Promote Neighbourhood Watch to increase community involvement. Improve lighting in streets and parks, deal with drug and alcohol use in parks.
Provide more family-friendly places	Increase the availability of safe spaces for children of all ages to play.
Support community gardening	Provide more communal gardening spaces to bring people together.
Improve reuse and recycling	Provide adequate bins and promote recycling to residents.
Support and promote active travel	Promote the benefits of walking and cycling. Improve dangerous junctions and accident hot spots. Improve road safety and awareness among residents.
Improve public transport	Work with Transport for London on better bus routes connecting east with west.
Building better housing and stronger communities and streets	
Ensure housing is affordable	Provide more affordable social housing.
Improve the quality of private rented sector accommodation	Introduce a landlord registration scheme to ensure that appropriate standards are met. Work to bring empty properties back into use.
Increase community cohesion	Promote community support, activities, events and groups more strongly. Provide more community spaces. Improve the way we keep people informed.
Promoting Economic Growth	
Improve business support	Increase the amount of support and advice available to start-up businesses and improve communication with



Haringey Council

	businesses.
Employment advice and opportunities	Improve career advice and secure more apprenticeship opportunities for younger people. Provide affordable childcare.
Utilising vacant premises	Work with landlords to utilise empty space and create more pop-up shops.

4. MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation - overview

4.1. Open responses were invited to Corporate Plan and MTFS proposals across the following areas:

- Young people and families
- Adults and healthy living
- The environment and community safety
- Economic growth and employment
- Housing and communities
- Other proposals
- Equality Impact Assessment

4.2. In addition respondents to the online and postal survey were asked the following question: To what extent do you support our proposal to freeze council tax?

4.3. Responses were received through the following means:

- Online and postal survey
- Letters and emails
- Engagement events

4.3.1. The table below sets out the number of responses made to the consultation:

Format	Number
Survey – website	322
Survey – postal	50
Emails/Letters	90
Petition signatures (from The Haven)	113
Petition signatures (from Pembury House Nursery School and Children's Centres)	103
Total	678

4.3.2. The table below sets out the number of responses made per individual against each category in the online and postal survey:



Category	%
Children and families	60
Adults and healthy living	79
Environment and community safety	43
Economic Growth and Employment	38
Housing and communities	42
Other	36
EQIA	15

4.3.3. About the people who responded to the online and postal survey:

Do you have any children in your household?	Number	%
No	178	48
Yes	138	37
Did not answer	55	15
Total	372	100
What is your age?	Number	%
Under 16	13	3
16-24	8	2
25-44	99	27
45-64	126	34
65+	60	16
Did not answer	66	18
	372	100
What is your sex?	Number	%
Male	114	30
Female	177	48
Did not answer	81	22
	372	100
Do you have any physical or mental health conditions or illness?	Number	%
Yes	62	17
No	208	56
Did not answer	102	27
	372	100



Haringey Council


What is your ethnic group?	Number	%
White	237	61
Mixed	8	2
Black	22	6
Asian	9	2
Other	11	3
Did not answer	100	26
Total	372	100

If you live in Haringey are you	Number	%
A Haringey leaseholder	7	2
A Haringey tenant	22	6
A housing association tenant	19	5
A private rented tenant	31	8
An owner occupier	217	58
Did not answer	76	21
Total	372	100

4.4. The information below sets out where people responded from

Stronger Haringey Survey Respondents 2014

In total 387 responses were received but only 247 had a full postcode and live in Haringey.



Produced by Business Intelligence, Haringey Council
© Crown copyright. All rights reserved 100019199 (2015)



Haringey Council

5. MTFS and Corporate Plan consultation – overview

- 5.1. The information provides a brief summary of significant themes that were raised during the consultation period through the survey, emails and letters. A much more detailed summary looking at individual issues raised across each of the areas is included later in the report, along with detailed responses from partners and direct engagement with service users at events.

Council tax: survey responses

To what extent do you support our proposal to freeze council tax?

To what extent do you support our proposal?	Number	%
Total responses	305	82%
Strongly support	81	22%
Support	53	14%
Neither support nor do not support	63	17%
Do not support	50	13%
Strongly do not support	58	16%
Did not answer	67	18%
Total	372	100%

The consultation

A number of people criticised the consultation process, saying that the period for consultation was too short, there were insufficient details in many of the proposals and there were too few options. Some people felt that the title of the Corporate Plan, “Building a Stronger Haringey Together”, was misleading and at odds with the reduction in budgets and there were “too many mission statements” and “not enough tangible proposals.”

Budget making

It was felt that the Council should be doing more to challenge the Government and fight for more resources rather than implementing cuts. Questions were also asked about why the Council is setting a three-year budget rather than one-year-budget, especially given the belief that the funding envelope may change should there be a change of government at the general election. Some expressed the view that the Council should consider increasing council tax.



Haringey Council

Many people also expressed the belief that reductions in Children's and Adult budgets were being unfairly apportioned which meant that vulnerable people were being hit the hardest by the savings that are proposed.

Some felt that alternative savings could be found if expenditure on council consultants was reduced.

5.2. Priority 1: Young People and Families

Youth services

Respondents questioned the statement that only a small number of people use council youth services and that Bruce Grove is a valuable hub for young people in Tottenham and a safe haven where people come together and learn from each other. Some people expressed the point that youth centres play a valuable role around skills and employment and more should be done to find alternative sources of funding. It was clearly felt that the future of Bruce Grove youth centre was under threat from the savings that have been proposed.

Childcare

Affordable childcare is seen as a must across the borough and it was felt that children's centres play a strong role in providing high quality affordable childcare.

Children's Centres

Children's Centres play a major role in prevention and reducing the number would impact on the most vulnerable the hardest It was felt that there was a misunderstanding about the services that are provided, all of which play a major role in helping families and signposting services. Some people said that children's centres are crucial to integration and are non-stigmatising, where as it was felt that visiting people in their homes can be stigmatising with people more reluctant to engage.

A petition of 103 signatures was received in support of Pembury House Nursery School and Children's Centre).

Young people with complex needs

It was felt that the budget reductions would undermine the quality of life of vulnerable young people. A number of people expressed the same point that people with autism need to have routines and people around them. Withdrawing services would reduce independence and impact on their physical and mental health. It was strongly felt that services for disabled



Haringey Council

people should not be withdrawn.

Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre

A number of people, including past and present headteachers, highlighted the importance of the centre in developing team work, positive thinking, confidence and social skills. Overall it was felt that Pendarren is a great educational resource, providing young people across the borough with an equal opportunity for an educational vocation which would potentially be lost if the centre moved towards a more commercial operating mode.

Schools

It was stated that the quality of education across the borough should be of a consistent standard.

5.3. Priority 2: Adults and healthy living

- 5.3.1. The vast majority of comments centred on the impact the budget reductions would have on vulnerable people. These have been categorised across different themes as shown below.

Complex needs – general comments

It was suggested strongly that it was wrong to consider reducing services that would impact on the most vulnerable. Reducing services would impact on their quality of life and may cause deteriorating health. It was suggested that people with complex needs, such as autism, require structure and a loss of service would potentially leave people isolated and anxious. Many were concerned that a loss of service would also increase the burden on carers and families with people worried that they will not be able to cope.

Reablement

Some respondents said that a reablement approach is ill-suited for people with very complex needs. It was also suggested that reablement services are poorly co-ordinated across the local NHS and particularly with acute hospital providers. It was stated that changes should not occur until reablement measures have been proved to have been effective.

Day centres and residential care

It was felt that the closure of day centres were at odds with the stated aims in the Corporate Plan. Many respondents expressed the view that day centres provide valuable support to elderly and vulnerable people, particularly around providing a structure and providing social engagement. . Closure would also place an extra burden on carers and may lead to increased social isolation



Haringey Council

and deteriorating health, which potentially could place an extra cost burden on other parts of social care and the NHS. Many people said that day centres connected people and provided structure.

The Haven

Multiple letters were received from 14 service users of The Haven and their carers/family. Service users, through advocates, spoke of the fear that they will have nowhere to go and become isolated should it close. They felt that their health, quality of life and independence had improved since going to The Haven. Family members and carers spoke of visible improvements in health and wellbeing, with increased social interaction. They also said that The Haven provides valuable respite.

In addition a petition containing 102 signatures was received which said: "This day centre is an important part of community life for older people with disabilities and mental health issues and should remain so."

Linden House

A letter was received signed by seven people on behalf of the Friends of Linden House residents saying that closure would be detrimental for the health, quality of life and mental well-being of the residents.

Care packages

It was expressed that a reduction in care packages would increase the burden on carers and family members in a way that would mean that many would struggle to cope to look after their loved ones.

Voluntary sector

Some respondents said that the Council was increasing expectations on voluntary sector services while reducing its effectiveness through a proposed £1.6 million reduction in core funding.

Social Care

Concerns were expressed that a reduction in social care staff would impact on safeguarding and potentially put more people at risk of abuse.

5.4. Priority 3: Environment and community safety

Streetscene and street cleaning

Some respondents felt that street cleaning should be a major priority and were concerned that reductions in budget may lead to a reduction in service.



Haringey Council

While some people said that the service had improved it was felt that further improvements were needed. It was expressed that the service was still too reactive to problems such as fly-tipping, incurring greater cost.

Recycling and refuse

Concern was expressed that the closure of the Park View Road Reuse and Recycling Centre would increase fly-tipping. While there was general support for the proposal to remove street-side recycling points, a point was made that it would make it harder for people to recycle who did not have cars.

Roads and parking

Mixed views were expressed about the introduction of a 20mph zone, with some respondents saying that it would be hard to enforce.

Community safety

Some people stated that they would like to see more CCTV, more work is needed generally to improve community safety, particularly around reducing gang activity.

Parks

A number of people expressed concerns around proposals to increase income from events in parks which could bring unreasonable levels of disruption for local people, particularly around Finsbury Park.

5.5. Priority 4: Economic Growth and employment

Regeneration

Some concerns were raised that regeneration in Tottenham may result in some residents and businesses being priced out of the area. Some felt there should be a stronger investment focus on other parts of the borough, particularly Wood Green.

Employment and skills

The living wage was highlighted as being important, while concerns were raised about the impact of job reductions at the Council and partner organisations.

Business support and growth

Views were expressed that the Council should focus on supporting business forums and improving shopping areas. A point was made that the Council



Haringey Council

should identify priority sectors and help more companies relocate to Haringey.

5.6. Priority 5: Housing and communities

- 5.6.1. A number of people raised issues around the need for more affordable housing in the borough, with the need to bring more empty homes back into use. Many people expressed support for a Landlord Registration Scheme. Some concerns were expressed about the impact of regeneration schemes on existing affordable housing.

5.7. Other budget proposals

Muswell Hill Library

Views on the library's future were mixed, with some opposing any relocation while others believe a more accessible building is needed. Some people expressed the desire to see more detail before commenting.

Marcus Garvey Library

All respondents who commented on the proposal felt that the current library space should be preserved and it was an important asset for people of Tottenham, particularly for younger people who may struggle to find sufficient to complete homework within their home.

5.8. EQIAs

- 5.8.1. A number of people commented that they felt that the current EQIA lacked sufficient detail. General points were expressed that the budget proposals would reduce inequality, resulting in the poorest and most vulnerable being worst hit.

6. Consultation – specific points raised

- 6.1.1. The table below summarise key points made through the survey and via emails and letters.

General issues cutting across all priorities	
Consultation	The restricted survey and questionnaire is a farce as is the ridiculously short period here allowed for 'consultation'. The consultation period for review of the plans is far too short - an insult.



Haringey Council

	A consultation must involve full transparency and clear facts as well as fully worked out details of options and alternatives. This council has again not complied with these requirements. The consultation period should be at least 3 months How you can use the language you do: "A Stronger Haringey"? You are proposing to slice millions from the services for the most vulnerable people in the borough. How will this make it stronger? For whom? The consultation period is too short and there are too few options available to choose from
The Budget	There are no alternatives set out on cuts, one being to first construct a budget for one year instead of three. A change of government the financial situation may change significantly If you can do so much with less, why have you not done it before? There is a lack of analysis and review in the documents The Council is decimating services against the wishes of residents Council tax should be increased by 1 or 2% so that more services can be retained - children and young adults will be less likely to benefit from the timely interventions and appropriate facilities needed to help them develop into responsible and happy adults It is unnecessary to push through a 3 year budget plan. Given the possible change in central government from May 2015 it would be better to formulate budget plans for further years after the May election Too much money is spent on consultants – one fee could keep a school based Children's Centre open for a year The Council should stand up against the Government. The Council should consider how it can increase its reach and influence on national Government to increase financial resources.



Haringey Council

Corporate Plan	The title “Building a Stronger Haringey Together” is misleading when there are significant reductions in budget. There is no ‘investment’ in younger people. The statements are vague, unambiguous and subjective with few tangible proposals. It give the impression that there will be additional services rather than cuts There is insufficient detail in the Corporate Plan and MFTS about plans and proposals The document suggests that the borough will be more effective and efficient following the cuts and this does not sit well The Corporate Plan had too many mission statements, is vague and does not enough substance or proper analysis of the issues
Young people and families	
General	The cuts have a big impact on vulnerable people and people with autism without any review of need The objectives are at odds with what is being delivered by way of reductions in services The Council should be fighting for more resources rather than implementing cuts Support for the voluntary sector is at odds with the reduction in budgets Early investment for children and families is essential to get better outcomes and reduce pressure on more expensive services longer term The vision laid out is unrealistic – even if there was unlimited resources it would not be possible to give ‘all’ children the best start in life and to safeguard ‘all’ children from abuse Support for principles around early intervention and prevention The proposals seem well thought through given reductions in Government expenditure



	We need to ensure all children are given the best opportunities, including those with special educational needs Improving early help is commendable but actions rely too much on voluntary and private organisations. Private organisations make a profit or go under. Voluntary groups are experiencing the same problems as LAs I understand that cuts will have to be made but I expect Labour Council to protest to Government more To have preventive services investment needs to be made in education, youth services and child protection The proposals will not be possible with the level of cuts proposed. The proposals are not detailed enough to give a proper response and there is no evidence for what you are suggesting Has thought be given to the impact of the cuts in the longer term? There is only need to agree a one year budget as there is a General Election in May. Could reserves not be used in order to prevent such cuts? Once gone staff, facilities and expertise cannot be brought back These objectives will set young people up for a better future in life. Child care should be more affordable and moulded by council and the voluntary sector. Children's centres should be located centrally to reach more parents, more emphasis should be placed on improving school results standards and preparing young people for the world of work in the 21st century
Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre	As a past Headteacher for 8 years, I know the benefit of Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre in developing team work, positive thinking, confidence and social skills The proposals for Pendarren put at risk a facility which is instrumental in Haringey's current success, and continuing ambition, to improve standards in all schools Pendarren House and its facilities are an amazing privilege for the children of Haringey - do not reduce access to the best asset the schools have. Every child in Haringey has the opportunity to experience an unforgettable educational vacation



Haringey Council

	Pendarren is a fantastic educational resource, giving pupils in our community opportunities that they wouldn't get from some of the other more commercial school journey centres
Youth Centres	Claims that a small number of people use youth centres is subjective and not based on evidence. A FOI in November and December revealed that no monitoring data is collected. The Council is either withholding information on its future plans, only making people aware once the budget has been agreed or it is stating that there are no proposals at the moment, in which case we cannot be expected to respond Bruce Grove is a valuable hub for young people in Tottenham If youth centres are not working the Council should be trying to change the model, not getting rid of them altogether. Youth clubs are vital and should offer a full provision, including physical fitness activity, nutritional advice, discussion groups around relationships, friendships, self esteem, sexual health etc To stop funding Bruce Grove Centre would create more problems than it would save solve money Youth centres should be kept open as they are places where young people can come together and learn from each other Youth services really help young people with skills and reduce gang activities Youth centres provide great support Do not agree with the cutting of young people's services. You should be fighting for more resources and refusing to implement cuts. Otherwise your promises are just a lot of hot air and empty rhetoric. The Council should not be cutting funding to Youth Services even further



	Youth clubs provide a safe haven for young people Every effort should be made to look at alternative funding sources and models of provision keep youth services open It is a lame excuse to say that youth clubs don't provide the support young people need. All age groups need somewhere to go to go and continued reduction of places to go to will be counter-productive to your stated aims There is little to do for young people in Tottenham already and in the light of the riots a few years ago, is it wise to deprive young people of a tiny corner of Tottenham that they can call their own?
Childcare	Affordable childcare is a must for families There should be a cap on the cost of childcare in Haringey provided by private entities such as nurseries childminders, to a maximum of £40 per day The council should continue to provide childcare. Some of the children's centres provide affordable childcare that is second to none. The new Asquith nursery in Crouch Hill charges £83 a day, and some private nurseries don't offer 3 year old their free 15 hours a week. This is not affordable and will price ordinary parents out of the workplace The market does not work in providing childcare and Haringey should intervene, making sure that there is excellent childcare provided in the east of the borough with a range of specialist child-minders Council should be supporting existing childcare providers, rather than replacing it
Children's Centres	Reducing children's centres and childcare will hit the most vulnerable parents the hardest Saving money by closing children's centres is wrong because families rely on the support that is provided Children's centres are a support hub, if you take them away the level of support will be reduced There is insufficient detail in the proposals as to how more support will be given to people in their own homes



	Children's centres provide a good service and it is wrong to consider closing them Reducing the number of Children's Centres will surely mean that it is more difficult for families to access them. I know that I only really used my local Children's Centres as it was the easiest to get to with the buggy. Restricting access doesn't make sense Opposition to fewer sites - full day sessions should happen at local pre schools, i.e. for 3 year olds at school nurseries. The uptake would be better and help working families Having designated communal places with organised activities for children and carers is important – many people with children living in cramped private rented accommodation need to get out Children's centres are a vital link to the community and a major prevention strategy enabler, reducing poverty and improving access to services and wider community links How can cutting children's centres achieve more 'early help' and give more children the best start in life? The centres are crucial for the integration of a very diverse community. Many activities are oversubscribed. For bilingual or trilingual families, home visits can never replace the vital encounters that take place at the centres and the confidence this brings For some families, home visits can be quite judgemental, intrusive and even threatening. Our centres deal with children on the child protection register, children in need and in poverty, families facing issues of domestic violence and housing crises, children with special needs, health issues, bereavement, and other things. They also offer a chance to access health services, ante and postnatal, and baby feeding support Please ensure continued or improved support for established and thriving children centres such as the Broadwater Farm children's centre. Ensuring better reach is important, but please not not take resources away from children's centres



	To say that children's centres could offer employment support and ESOL shows that whoever produced this plan is not aware of the services currently on offer. Children's Centres already work with the whole family by default. Parents, mainly but not exclusively mothers, who do not have a good command of English lack the confidence to attend ESOL classes at venues other than the Children's Centres where they have told their story and feel at home in All sorts of agencies work from children's centres including Job Centre Plus, the Citizens' Advice Bureau, ESOL teachers, adult and family learning. Ante natal and post natal care is provided. Services are universal and non-stigmatising It's counter-productive to close children's centres They are at the heart of the early help strategy You are doing the absolute opposite of what you should be doing to support families. The Children's Centres focus on outreach as well as providing a safe and supportive environment close to home to come to for support It's counter-productive to close children's centres They are at the heart of the early help strategy. It is better to pay for high quality early intervention than spend more money later on. Plans make the objectives impossible to meet. Children's Centres provide outreach as well as a safe and supportive environment. Instead of building partnerships between all support agencies you will be destroying them. The most vulnerable will be at much greater risk than now, as Children's Centres do the preventative child protection work.
Complex needs	The cuts will bear very severely on young people with autism and complex needs and have been announced without any review of need and going against national research around identifying the complexity of needs, putting adequate provision in place and supporting the transition between youth and adult life Services for young people with disabilities and especially high functioning teens with autism are already threadbare.



	The Council should be challenging Government. Services for disabled children should be maintained. We should be giving children the best start in life, therefore improving their quality of life and reducing the need for resources in adulthood The Council should do more to raise awareness of Special Educational Needs, increase access to information and respite for carers. Children with Special Educational Needs need inclusion and activities yet there is very little provision These proposed cuts will undermine the quality of life of our most vulnerable. If the cuts go ahead, the independence and safety of already vulnerable people will be endangered
Day care	Services for young people with disabilities and especially high functioning teens with autism are already threadbare
Parental support	More emphasis should be put on good parenting to alleviate the responsibility of the local authority to spend so much on younger people Parents do not have sufficient support. The council should encourage the voluntary sectors in the borough to support children at all levels
Looked after children	Budget cuts appear to be driven by assumptions which are unproven. Is there evidence, for example, that you will be able to effectively and safely reduce the number of children who come into care? Or that you will be able to recruit at least 30 foster carers per annum?
Schools	It is important to ensure not only a consistent standard of education across the borough's schools, but also to ensure that education is provided at a high quality in terms of teaching and inspiring the young. Financial constraints cannot be an excuse for poor educational provisions The Council should focus on raising achievement, public and personal behaviours and reduce social inequality by raising high school standards, including citizenship, and improving emotional intelligence and resilience The ambition should be to provide kindergarten places for all 3 year olds; class sizes under 30; and proper education for all 16 - 18 year olds, vocational & otherwise.



	Budgetary cuts will not allow for this Schools will be left no option but to focus on educating children and families on emotional health and wellbeing, obesity and healthy relationships, emotional health and wellbeing and obesity as well as gang crime etc. How are we to do that effectively when our core purpose is raising standards educationally to reach national standards in Reading, Writing and Maths? What do you propose we 'drop'?
Voluntary Sector	Do not like the idea of over-reliance on the voluntary sector. Knowledge of volunteer-led activity suggests this is not a good solution Putting more emphasis on the voluntary sector to supply services whilst cutting financial support will lead to a reduction of service providers
Adults and healthy living	
General	Budget cuts 'are immoral' and fall disproportionately on services for children and vulnerable adults Regardless of financial pressures it is wrong to consider withdrawing services that protect our most vulnerable Budget reduction should come from other areas of the Council The proposals would increase social isolation and alienation Reductions in number of social workers would remove protection for people who are vulnerable to abuse and exploitation The vision to "Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives" is at odds with the plan to cut £30m and 283 staff Community support is very important given the financial challenges The plan puts considerable emphasis on reactive options (health care for the elderly and people with complex needs) It would be good to include other options around investing in healthy lifestyle for younger people- for example improving cycling and making it cheaper to use



	sports facilities. The Council is not in a strong position to facilitate community support and does not have the systems and solutions in place to help people live healthier lives in which they exercise autonomy. The Council is making these cuts is a false economy as more and more people will go into crisis and require expensive statutory services. The Council has produced a very clear vision with a particular focus on early intervention and working with the voluntary sector. More support will be needed from GPs to identify people most at need. The consultation came out just before Christmas and the Council is giving people insufficient time to respond. Many adults with complex needs will not understand the implication of cuts and will not be able to respond. The cuts will also contribute to increasing isolation; poorer quality of life; and greater possibility of abuse as monitoring of family's and individuals' situation decreases. Volunteering schemes to reduce isolation and loneliness for the elderly need to be advertised. Other London councils are seeking to lessen the impact of social care cuts by raising council tax and see notes re other options in question above. To focus on learning disabilities, the closure of three day centres and one residential home, the reduction of care packages by £10m, of social workers by 25%, and funding for daytime activities for people living in residential homes and supported housing can only undermine the little quality of life they enjoy and place more pressure on already over-worked parents and carers, leading to increasing numbers of adults with learning disabilities becoming the council's responsibility at considerable additional expense. Cutting social work staff is short-sighted and will create more problems and put more vulnerable adults and



Haringey Council

	children at risk. The cuts in social care will increase the burden on our NHS services in the borough. Objectives are at odds with your proposals. Communities will live healthily for less time and will not feel supported to live independently. Proposals will exacerbate mental health issues and increase the burden on our NHS services in the borough. There is an assumed reliance on the voluntary sector yet you are slashing the voluntary sector funding by 50%. Utterly incompatible.
Reablement	The council has produced no evidence that a reablement approach is appropriate to any of the groups currently using these services (including people with autism, learning disabilities, dementia). Agreement with the objectives, but concern that the services are not there to support reablement. Current services to enable people to stay or return to their home are weak and poorly co-ordinated with hospitals such as North Middlesex and The Whittington. Closing day centres and reducing residential care homes should only happen after alternatives have been put into place and preventative measures have been shown to work. Cuts in established services are to be supplanted by new untested approaches, with no independent evidence that they will improve the outcomes of these people. The rationale is that it is better for people to be in their own homes or to “reable” them. That is impossible for people with Alzheimer’s, with Severe Autism, or with severe learning difficulties. Promoting independent living for elderly is admirable but there has been a reluctance within the NHS to support home care and many elderly people, with health problems, are forced into care homes at considerable financial cost to themselves because they are viewed as unsuitable for home care. Haringey should recognise this problem and actively support home care initiatives. Reablement/neighbourhood connects might work for some relatively fit 60-somethings. Even if they do not have any serious health problems, most 80-somethings



	are not physically and mentally agile,. They need regular, structured support. Day centres stop them becoming house-bound.
Day centres and residential care	Closure of day centres and other services to the health and wellbeing of service users and their families is at odd with the Council's vision to ensure that 'all residents will be as healthy as possible for as long as possible'. Adults denied access to day centres will place an extra burden on family resources. There is a risk of increased anxiety and challenging behaviour, greater social isolation and deteriorating mental health (for both individuals and family carers. It will also increase pressures on the NHS. Stated aims around independent living are valid but for some people it isn't suitable, achievable or preferable. More provision for sufferers of dementia, not less. Closing the Haven could impact on mental health and increase admissions to psychiatric hospitals. The Haven Day Centre, Hayes and Grange provide an opportunity for people to meet with each other and provide respite for carers. Day centres support the most vulnerable in society and it is wrong to consider closing them. Closing day centres is a false economy because care packages will need to be renegotiated. More people will require care homes. There may be increased pressure on public spending because families may have to leave jobs and claim benefits to look after loved ones. Without support from day care people with complex needs will not be able to live independently. People with autism need the sort of consistent and structured service currently provided in a secure and familiar place with staff who have relevant training and experience. There is limited scope for community-based activities. On Osborne Grove information is inadequate to understand the implications and logic of the proposals.



	What does running down OG mean? What alternative facilities will be available to those not suitable for "reablement" How will dementia sufferers be cared for in the proposed "running down/reablement" environment? The severity of the residents' conditions renders them ineligible for participation in any 'Shared Lives Plus' service. The Shared Lives Plus' service is a thoroughly inadequate alternative care model for the residents. Care Homes and Day Centres provide obvious savings against the cost of home care services provision. These can be extended to include Health checks, library services of Benefit Advice and Guidance, Food Banks and IT services to counteract isolation and also allow more independence choices. Voluntary and Community groups already offer many of these services and should be commissioned to run services within the Centres. I am a client of The Haven and believe to close it would be a very wrong decision. I live above the centre and it gives me support and people to talk to. I am very lucky to attend now and hope that you will not close the Haven. There is not much left in life for older people who cannot get out and about. I have worked all my life and should be entitled to care and support which I am lucky to have now. Thank you for your consideration. These day centres provide such people with a good quality of life in a safe environment providing activities and exercises that are proven to slow the deterioration of dementia patients at fraction of cost of full-time care. "Close Linden residential home which supports people with complex needs" The explanation does not acknowledge that there are some people who unfortunately are unable to live independently. There is a risk of exacerbating pressures on the health service if these Council facilities are always being withdrawn. There should be more centres for adults and not close centres. My centre is like a second home I have paid my taxes when I was younger so when I became ill I thought I would get the help I needed. My sons feel at ease knowing that I am comfortable and happy at the centre



Haringey Council

	and that I am being well cared for.. If my centre did close down I would deteriorate and go back to being a cabbage. The Haven centre has changed my life. The recommendations from Investing in our Tomorrow consultation clearly says that "improve the availability of day centres" but you are proposing to close them - what is the logic? Justification? Explanation? The recommendation to close Lindon House and make £400k savings is totally uncaring and unfeeling and with little consideration for a very vulnerable client group that are unable to function and live in their community on their own.
The Haven – specific correspondence	Representations from service users, dictated by an advocate: We do not want The Haven to close – where are people going to go, what are we going to do, where are staff going to go? If it closes I will be lonely and isolated – the staff at The Haven look after me. I am on my own and dreading the future without The Haven. I had cancer last year and the staff attended my appointments – without them I don't think I would be here now. The Haven is our refuge, our second home and family. Savings should be found in other areas – could the council's income from parking fines and CPZs not go towards services for older people? Without The Haven we will be in a much worse position at a crucial time of our lives. I am 78-years-old and live alone – the only time I manage to leave my house is when the staff at The Haven collect me three days a week. I am unable to cook and rely on takeaways – at the centre I have cooked meals and get to meet friends. Since coming to The Haven my health has improved immensely – if it closes I will go back to square one. I am



	very anxious and worried. If the Haven closes I cannot see an alternative where I could attend. The announcement of the proposal just before Christmas was heartless, people have been driven to a state of anxiety and panic. Staff are excellent and help reduce social isolation. Cannot see how the proposal will “empower adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives.” People who have lived and worked all their lives in Tottenham are not being treated fairly. Representations from carers and family members: Since my dad has been at The Haven he has become a changed man – he laughs and is able to have conversations at home. Before, after losing his wife, he was withdrawn. If the centre closes it will shut my dad down. The community and health services benefit in the long term when the community are cared for in the way that they are at The Haven. Our father suffers from a bipolar disorder – he used to spend most of his days indoor and in bed, The Haven provides him with stimulation and allows him to socialise. The Haven has helped my father socialise and, the time he spends there gives me the opportunity to rest and carry out other duties. The Haven has been a lifeline for my aunt – she is now interested in what is happening around her and has more self esteem. The centre provides respite for carers. The service users access physiotherapists and occupational therapists to achieve progress against their needs assessment - would you leave a child on their own to fend for themselves?
Complex needs	There is insufficient detail in budget papers about what resources will be devoted to ‘prevention’ and what ‘prevention’ means in relation to autism, learning disability, and dementia. People with learning disabilities and autism have been assessed as having very high care needs and are some



	of our most vulnerable people. Reducing care packages and closing day centres will undermine their quality of life. The proposed cut of 25% to people with learning disabilities is unjust as many people who suffer from these disabilities will also be affected by major cuts to care packages. People with autism need to have routines and people around them. Withdrawing services will reduce independence. The reductions would hurt our most vulnerable adults and out pressure on ageing parents and carers and is likely to result in increased costs around emergency care and within social care and mental health. It is irresponsible to cut services for people with autism or any mental health. The lives of people with complex needs will be impoverished and their mental and physical health will suffer. People will lose control of their lives and their lives will be less fulfilling. This is turning back the clock because people will be treated with less respect. It is essential for people with autism to have routines and consistent structures and people around them. If this is taken away, there is a huge risk that these clients will become isolated, anxious and that their mental health will suffer. Haringey, as a member of North London Waste Authority recently spent £5-6m as its portion of the costs on an aborted waste procurement plan. Majority of spending went on highly paid consultants. Financial blunders must be recouped by cutting vital services. If the council is serious about equality and meeting the individual need of children then it is vital that they take into account children with disabilities. Families who currently have support/respite caring for disabled adults would have to consider residential care because of the lack of support. Closing older people's day centres will increase mortality



	rates for the people who use these centres. Elderly people and those with disabilities should not be at the mercy of private providers whose interests are making profits rather than looking after people and treating them with the respect and care they deserve. Haringey council is supposedly about supporting a fair society, the rights of the disadvantaged, and social justice. However you are targeting the most vulnerable with huge cuts to their services and care packages. To close down and take away facilities that are lifelines for elderly people and others who need desperately stability and care in their lives is shameful.
Voluntary sector	Reducing the voluntary sector grant from £3m to £1.6m will not enable it to fill the void.
Care packages	A reduction in spend on care packages will result in pressure to transfer individuals to supported living projects run by the lowest cost providers – who rely on poorly paid staff, often lacking in relevant skills and experience, with limited training opportunities. This will lead to a high turnover of staff and a loss of continuity and quality of care. Care packages are already as low as they can safely be. Assessing with an eye to save money is illegal and all carers should sharply oppose this
Health and social care integration	It is important to ensure there are appropriate mechanisms at every stage of delivery of services to ensure objectives with in intended quality.
Environment and community safety	
General	Concern over proposals to implement a 20mpg zone given evidence suggests that it will be widely flouted. Proposals seem reasonable More should be asked of late-night businesses to financially support the activities. General agreement on the proposals



	Proposals sound like soundbites and are vague – lack of trust on delivery. Acknowledgement that the rubbish collection is very good, impressed with the new recycling centre but concerned about implications for residents in the East of the borough if a recycling centre closed. Proposals to increase parking fees remove street recycling points seem reasonable, but concern about reduction in budget for park maintenance and litter collection. Cut in youth services could increase crime. Concern about impact on heritage sites like Alexandra Palace and Bruce Castle but welcome 20mph speed limit. Reinstall twice annual free-pick up for large bulky items. Get people to clean in front of their house rather than cut services for the disabled. Proposal will be compromised by outsourcing which will mean that the lowest bidding provider is appointed. Improvements are needed around dog fouling, including raising awareness. It is not realistic to base proposals around use of volunteers. Applaud the aim of reducing violence against women and plans to make Haringey more cycling-friendly, but more work needs to happen on 40:20 policy. How will we know if the aims have been successful and what are the measures of success? This should be a priority. There is no other public body that is able to protect and improve quality of life for residents. Increase Council tax rather than parking charges. Increase on street recycling bins for litter as other Boroughs have.



Haringey Council

Streetscene and street cleaning	Street cleaning should be the number one priority Street cleaners should be merged with traffic wardens. Strong support for aims to improve cleanliness and the overall environment. Concern about impact of reducing street cleaning in favour of litter picking. More work is needed to improve cleanliness – with litter being a real problem. Closure of Park View Road recycling will reduce recycling. Remains to be seen whether goals can be met given current problems around fly-tipping, litter and dog fouling – not convinced. Council already does the minimum, community clean-ups are not realistic. We need to reduce littering and educate residents. Do not reduce budgets for litter collection. Proud to live in Tottenham. The council has worked to support effective and dedicated community groups and have begun to make great strides in improving the environment, but more need to be done The borough isn't clean now so how do you expect £70M funding cut to make it clean? Street cleaning has shown improvement over the last 10 years, the silent majority would consider that the level of street cleaning is a major part of the council's responsibility towards residents This not badly done at present and there is no need to promise more.. If street cleanliness uses resources better deployed elsewhere, it can be reduced somewhat without harm done. More money should be spent on cleaning services, not less. The street litter is a huge problem.. Very sceptical of these proposals - fly tipping is endemic in the area and outsourcing this to Veolia has made this



Haringey Council

	worse, but hopefully some changes may help this. To prevent fly tipping there should be more information and education and help to people for discussing bulk items. The community needs to work together to stop fly-tipping.
Recycling and refuse	Concern that closure of Park View Road recycling will increase dumping, particularly in the East. Western Road site is too far away- flytipping will increase at a time when we have only just started to get decent street cleaning. The blanket 2-week cycle rubbish collection was a mistake with no adequate waste storage in large parts of the borough – question over whether it has substantially eaten into contract savings. Small electrical recycling bins at streetside should be retained as items are not allowed for household collection. Carry on with fortnightly rubbish collection, neighbourhood watch schemes and surgeries with local police to keep people safe. The only reason Haringey's spending on waste management is out of line with neighbouring boroughs is the 'reactive' approach that is taken. Businesses and some homes do not have adequate waste facilities (commercial or appropriate bins), hence unofficial 'collection points' are set up. Back plans to remove all in street recycling points to reduce fly tipping – they are a real eyesore. You should also remove some bins. There should be a charge for collection of larger items, which cannot be collected by Veolia. This would offset some of the costs Appreciate the logic around removing street recycling points but would point out that there is no easy provision for people without cars. On-street collection may not be ideal but urge Council to look at making recycling of the sorts of items that go to the recycling centres easily available to those without their own cars.



	Closing Park View Road recycling centre seems short-sighted. Older People, those without transport, will find it difficult to recycle items such as small electrical goods. There will be more fly tipping, not less..
Roads and parking	Implementing 20mph zones will be expensive and hard to enforce. Plans sound fair – people should pay more for parking. Disappointment with proposed increase in car permits. It is vitally important that the clearing of broken glass and debris from cycle lanes (and cycle routes generally) is not reduced Less reactive maintenance to street lighting should be achieved by using more reliable lighting (eg LED), not by removing illumination from signs, which is essential for road safety. Cost of parking permit should not be linked to the size of car and or emission. 20mph speed limit is an excellent idea for the borough As if parking was not a rip off already! We pay our council tax so why pay to park on roads we already paid for!
Community safety	Reductions in support for vulnerable people may lead to higher costs for emergency services. Doubts Haringey can deliver with poor current response to community safety. More CCTV should be added. More work is needed to reduce gang activities. People in Haringey do not feel safe and people are treated like second class citizens. More visible police patrols are needed to enforce fly tipping and speeding.
Parks	Oppose the plan for large events in Finsbury Park and other parks. These parks are for local people.



	Expecting £600k income from parks event is either over-optimistic or will commercialise them too much and destroy them as quiet, accessible places. Very concerned about the proposal to increase income from events held in parks. Big concerts at Finsbury Park are unreasonable and bring unacceptable levels of disruption. Council Tax should cover looking after parks. Treating parks as money making venues for commercial events means that you are not protecting them. Please don't permit another concert on the scale of Wireless to take place. Ensure that if a concert takes place during the day as well as the evening, it only last for one day. Please ensure that evening concerts only run for 2 consecutive evenings. Reduce the permitted noise levels.
Economic Growth and employment	
General	Proposals are vague on how you will attract investment This should be best left to the private sector Given the Council's financial challenges, these aspirational objectives should not be a priority Reads well but can Haringey deliver? Agreement with the proposals These are the most important objectives given the value of employment. Proposals are sensible and very important. Plans are not well defined enough to comment. The focus should be on stable growth so that people are not pushed out of their homes, as has happened in Hackney. I applaud the encouragement of growth. Council should persuade Mayor to extend Zone 2 to



Haringey Council

	Wood Green and Tottenham Hale Haringey should lobby for more transport investment, much of the borough is isolated from central London and East/West links are not good. For 'everyone' to benefit from growth, there is a need for genuinely affordable housing, which your proposals do not offer, Objectives and plans in this section are the best so far. We need experienced speakers into schools who can promote different industries, in a positive way.
Regeneration	The proposals make no mention of demolition of thousands of council homes Concerns that regeneration will drive local people out of Tottenham Does Tottenham need all the money and could it not be shared with Wood Green? Fine proposals but how much redevelopment is appropriate? There is too little attention to West Green Road and Broad Lane shopping areas. Haringey should do for South Tottenham what Hackney has done for Dalston. Stop suggesting investment in Tottenham Hotspur will create jobs when it will allow a private company to make money. Tottenham regeneration plan is low on measures to ensure that current Tottenham residents aren't priced out Scant concern - if any - appears to be paid to businesses in N22 faced with closure and the loss of substantial skilled jobs in what has been a thriving area for business development – urge council to identify priority sectors and help firms in those sectors to locate, grow and create jobs in Haringey, recognising in particular the importance of small and medium-sized businesses to the borough's economy. Regeneration' plans for North Tottenham are destroying



Haringey Council

	small businesses Tottenham does not need to grow anymore, it is already grossly over- crowded. Money could be saved using the buildings that we have rather than rushing to turn Tottenham into a pale imitation of Crouch End.
Green economy and carbon emissions	Support for the council's proposals – council should encourage businesses to switch off lights when shut.
Employment and skills	Closing day care centres will result in job losses. Haringey Council is abolishing longstanding employment in Wood Green with no plan to replace employment or relocate local businesses. No evidence that Haringey understand its local economy. There is too much focus on creating demand for employment rather than addressing supply and transforming the local economy. Removing youth services will not help people find employment. Youth workers know how to support people. People should be provided with the living wage. It is important to help families and individuals who wish to start up their own business. Support plans to promote economic growth. More support is needed for the private sector, historical attempts to stimulate this directly (techno park) have been unsuccessful. All contracts for new build and maintenance of buildings in Haringey should include a commitment to employ Haringey residents. We want to know that there is something to motivate young people of our days. The Council could open some more day centres for the elderly to give some jobs for the younger people.
Business support and growth	Scant concern - if any - appears to be paid to businesses in N22 faced with closure and the loss of substantial skilled jobs in what has been a thriving area for business development – urge council to identify priority sectors and



	help firms in those sectors to locate, grow and create jobs in Haringey, recognising in particular the importance of small and medium-sized businesses to the borough's economy. Giving support to community business forums and improving shopping areas would help. Making the area more attractive to visit, more car free areas or car free days would help traders - there is ample evidence of how business benefits from better environments. The most effective way to boost growth and help local businesses would be to freeze or reduce the rates charged by the council. Would like to see more imaginative ways of leveraging the economic resources of the west to support the east. For example, could successful shops in the west of the borough be offered a rate reduction if they open a new branch in the east? What about better transport links across the borough? This section calls for tangible new ideas. Haringey needs to look attractive like other points of London to attract new businesses to the borough and create jobs. The Council should review all charity shop business rates discounts The current network of town centre trader groups should be strengthened by the Council providing more administrative and logistical support to promote the business sector, thereby increasing business rates. The Planning directorate should bring forward policies to actively promote the business sector.
Housing and communities	
General	There are too many buy-to-let houses being built More housing, schools, hospitals and GP surgeries are needed to meet the needs of the population Amenities need to be provided for new homes, such as doctors and dentists



	Housing for adults with additional needs should be a top priority More emphasis needs to be placed on support existing vulnerable adults before bringing new people into the borough. Little confidence in proposals given the Council's record on social housing over the last 20 years. General support for the proposals The objectives are sound. Consideration needs to be given into the needs of children with disabilities. Housing should not be a priority except for the most acutely vulnerable. Mixed housing and strong communities will help raise the aspiration for a wider section of Haringey residents. Buy-to-let speculators should be more heavily taxed. Accommodation for students should be included in new developments, along with housing for people who have difficulty with mobility. 'Housing is about people and communities' yet regeneration plans propose to demolish homes and tear apart communities. Need to crack down much harder on illegal and often unsafe rented accommodation in the borough - at present enforcement is not strong enough
Housing	Best use of the Council's money is to build considerably more Council Housing. If there was any way to introduce rent caps on the private sector that would be an improvement too. More social housing is very important but the rents must be affordable for people living on very low incomes.



	When increasing the number of council homes, follow the example of Enfield Council in retaining control of the land and therefore not allowing the right to buy Concern that plans to redevelop estates mean that affordable housing will be replaced by much more expensive housing Reducing poor management within the private rented sector is particularly important in this borough Repairing and maintaining existing council housing instead of moving people out through regeneration proposals. More affordable homes should be built There should be more investment into affordable housing. More work needs to happen to encourage development on areas where planning permission has already been granted, while empty council buildings and other empty properties should be considered for sites. The Council should guarantee loans to Housing Associations to develop new homes with homes coming back to the Council if they default. Action is needed on exploitative landlords. More decent homes are needed in Haringey Rents should be capped. Empty homes should be brought back into use. Landlord Register is a good idea. Aims to improve the quality of private rented sector homes are laudable. Landlord Registration Scheme have not been thought through and can only result in supply of available accomodation drying up/shrinking as landlords pull out There is no mention of plans to demolish council homes.



	There should be more housing available to people on low income as well as young people . Is this only for the council homes? What about the generation of people who want to be first time home owners? Will they be able to afford Haringey needs more affordable housing and shared ownership homes and reduce homelessness in the borough. The homes must be good quality and spacious to reduce overcrowding. Before more ghastly multi-colored monstrosities are imposed on the borough, more effort should be made to bring empty properties back into use. The council make things too easy for young people when it comes to housing, they should tell them to stay at home with their parents and go to college.
Other budget proposals	
Muswell Hill Library	Closing Muswell Hill library would be a crime – if you had proposed a new site before suggesting closure you would have more credibility Selling the building is a great idea – it has never functioned well as a library Not to selling the library – it serves the community Moving Muswell Hill library would be a waste of money Relocating Muswell Hill Library is a good idea but we cannot comment until there are plans Relocating the library is not needed – if you want to make libraries more accessible use the money on building council homes and building new libraries Muswell Hill Library is a local treasure and should be kept. As long as it is done the way you write Muswell Hill community will benefit. Not sure that selling Muswell Hill Library is a good idea and would benefit the community in the long term. It would bring in funds which would soon disappear in the overall plans.



	Come on! We can stand on the moon but can't make our library more accessible? Plans for Muswell Hill Library sound good as it is out of the way. If Muswell Hill Library is sold it must be to a responsible buyer and remain a community asset.
Customer services	Marcus Garvey library should be preserved as an important resource Preserve Marcus Garvey – many residents in Tottenham do not have space in their own homes and benefit from space to do their homework. People feel that in the west libraries are being refurbished while in the east where they are really needed they are being downsized. Plans to substantially reduce the size of Marcus Garvey library have been hidden and not explicitly referred to in this consultation. The children's library is a very important source of support for young people and their families and fosters a love of learning and imagination in our young people. Self-service can become a barrier to accessing services, we still need humans to speak to on the phone or meet The 'single point of contact' would replace face-to-face contact. The enquiries that I have made at Apex House and previously at 639 High Road have either involved the production of original documents, or have involved personal details that I would have not felt comfortable discussing with someone that I could not see. Not sure whether the new call centre is part of this but it is truly awful. Please make sure that you actually do make it easier and quicker to deal with the Council, not just take cost out with a reduction in service. We like to speak to people not computers. Automated services are insufficient. Happy with 'My Haringey Account' initiative. By all means provide online resources but do not forget that many people do not have a computer



Haringey Council

Equality Impact Assessment	
General	Proposals the harshest impact on the most vulnerable Difficult to see how the outcomes will be achieved when it is implementing rather than challenging the Government's austerity agenda. Cuts will impact on women in low pay. EQIAs are weak. Proposals do not promote equality. There is insufficient detail and data to comment Cuts are discriminatory, they will directly impact upon BME groups in Haringey, the elderly & vulnerable. Disability is a protected characteristic under the Equality Act. Disabled adult people's needs must not be ignored Vulnerable service users and workers will be most affected. Families in the east of the borough come from a different mix of ethnic groups than in Haringey generally and cuts in services for children and young people would therefore have a detrimental bias against those groups. People most at risk are the most poor and the most vulnerable - the worst hit will be those from ethnic minority backgrounds who are usually the poorest with greatest level of unemployment, disabled people and those with the least education. Proposals will increase inequality in the borough by removing services from the poorest and most vulnerable people.

7. Engagement events: Children and Families

7.1.1. Events were held to engage on issues relating to Children's Centres, Childcare and Youth provisions. Details are set out below.

7.1.2. Children's Centres



Haringey Council

7.1.3. Events were held for staff, governors and headteachers.

7.1.4. Children's Centres/Staff

7.1.5. Three events were held, attracting 83 participants.

It was set out the consultation was in relation to £70m of savings that needed to be made over the next three years, £18m of which needs to be found in CYPs.

In response to questions it was stated:

- No firm decision had been made on reducing children's centres to 8.
- Planning on the early help landscape has been underway for some time before the level of reductions were known. Now there is an opportunity to work in partnership.

A point was raised that capacity is already at a limit, to which a response was made that we need to think about doing things differently to increase capacity.

A question was asked about how childcare will be provided differently to which a response was made that for some children access to childcare is not good enough and a step change is needed.

It was explained that Full Council will make a decision on whether to take £70 million out of the system over the next three years, plans and proposals will then come forward. We need to start thinking about how we work differently from now. Bringing services together does not mean everything under a roof, but improving the connectivity of various places and agencies that are delivering services

A point was raised with regards to cuts to youth and adult services that we need to be mindful of early years not picking up services that have been already cut and filling gaps.

It was asked what does this mean for staff if centres are merged? centres? How many staff would this affect? The response was that we have not really looked at the fine details. We need to acknowledge that people are worried and you have gone through this before.

A timescale was set out that if the budget is agreed on February 23rd consultation on a future model is likely to start in the summer, alongside a detailed Equality Impact Assessment report. A decision will be made in Autumn 2015



7.1.6. Children's Centres meetings with cluster and nursery governors

7.1.7. Two events were held with 22 people. Key points raised:

- Some of the most challenged families in the borough access services from our children's centres. You cannot achieve Priority 1 outcomes with fewer centres.
- There is no need for a one-year budget
- How will you improve access to stay and plays by cutting services?
- You mention 'improved access to stay and plays', yet stay and plays are oversubscribed and you are going to cut services, so how is this improving access?
- Where is the evidence that a small number of people currently access services from Children's Centres? Park Lane reach over 100% of the families in their area.
- Children's centres play a key role, and make a vital contribution to those starting school. Have you looked at the cost of all the things they do in relation to the budget, and what services will have to be cut if the money is taken out the system?
- Haringey Council spends too much on consultancy costs
- What modelling has been done around fee structures to inform your proposal to remove/alter the childcare subsidy?
- Detailed modelling should have been done prior to the decision to close centres.
- Children's centre are already at full capacity – they could not take families up to 25 years as well.
- Find it difficult to believe that the council cannot social workers to a children's centres
- The £4m that is currently spent across Early Years is incredibly cost effective. We continue to provide high quality services and reach the people that we are supposed to reach
- Currently children's centres are operating at over capacity. There are issues around the amount of space yet you do not want to increase the range of services. How can you possibly extend and deliver a wider range of services when you are using fewer sites?

7.1.8. Children's Centres meeting with headteachers

7.1.9. One meeting was held with headteachers with the follow issues raised:

- Three years ago you said that you would learn from the fact that we were not consulted in an appropriate way. You haven't learnt. This time round it is worse.
- Children's centres are not static sites. Staff constantly go out in to the community and engage. They do not sit there and wait for the community to come to them.



Haringey Council

- Parents are not going to trek miles to a centre.
- The starting point needs to be what the families need. I don't get a sense that this document has any understanding about what the need is in Tottenham.
- It is outrageous to say that children's centres are not working. There has been talk about outsourcing – but look at the quality ratings we've given private childcare providers in the borough.

7.2. Children's Centres meeting with Childcare providers

7.2.1. A meeting was held with 19 private, voluntary and independent childcare providers. Key issues raised are below:

- Public buildings are under utilised and could be used to hold integrated services to save money.
- There should be evidence that all childcare proposals are well thought out
- Providers need more information about the services available and their benefits so they can direct families.
- What do you want to cut from the voluntary sector? We have been delivering and piloting. Private nurseries make money, voluntary do not. I would like to pay my staff more but I do not receive enough funding through the grant".

7.3. Young people and youth services

7.3.1. Meetings were held at Bruce Grove Youth Centre and Haringey Youth Council, while a drop-in was held at The Triangle. Approximately 95 young people attended the events. The main issues that were raised are listed below.

7.3.2. Bruce Grove Youth Centre

- Concerns were raised about the centre closing and the youth club ceasing.
- Some young people did not want Tottenham Hotspur running the centres because of the belief that services would be too geared towards sports activities.
- Young people said there was a strong feeling of a family within the centre
- More effort should be made to publicise the youth centre/club more.
- Need to involve young people more in future decisions, if using external providers



- Concerns were raised about losing existing staff

7.3.3. The Triangle Youth Drop-In

7.3.4. The Triangle currently has around 150 children on its database. Erol Grant, Triangle Director, explained that they are a voluntary sector organisation with some of projects funded by the council. Most staff work for free and they would like to see the youth centre become a hub for specialist services. Project Manager Tony Walker said that there needs to be more communication between the council and youth provision in Haringey. Concerns were also raised that young people believe that services are about to stop and require reassuring.

7.3.5. Young people who attended the drop-in said that they typically play football, basketball and table tennis. They said that the centre provides a good environment with adults that they can trust.

7.3.6. Meeting of the Youth Council

7.3.7. Around 20 young people attended the meeting, with the following issues raised:

- There is not enough detail or transparency
- Council must ensure young people are involved in developing services
- Disagree with any closure of youth clubs, in particular Bruce Grove Youth Centre
- Concerned that third sector groups may not be able to provide services and would prefer to continue with services provided by the council
- Disagree with changing facilities at Bruce Grove – happy with it as they are
- Libraries funding may be better spent on youth services
- Doesn't make sense to talk about "creating jobs" (priority 4) when you're cutting jobs
- Facilities at post-16 are not seen to be as good in Haringey.
- The council should be making a full list/directory available of what exists for young people in Haringey and make it available to young people and online.
- Most activities and events for young people seem to be in the east – it should be more balanced
- Youth Council has been involved in recruiting DCS in the past – this should happen again
- Stronger youth democracy is needed – need to ensure that young people's voices are heard



Haringey Council

Other budget points raised:

- Agree there needs to greater efficiency in adults services and a strong voluntary sector
- How can people feel engaged in the community if they don't feel safe?
- Agree with Haringey being a cycling and pedestrian friendly borough
- Should combine traffic warden and street cleaner roles
- Cutting jobs can't benefit employment
- Supporting the green economy is not as beneficial as directly funding jobs

7.4. Engagement events: Adult and healthy living

7.4.1. A series of events where held with service users with a Learning Disability, Physical disability and Older people to help explain the consultation process and proposals more fully. These sessions were for service users that:

- **Receive residential or residential nursing care directly from the Council,**
- Reside within the shared lives scheme (internal to Haringey Council)
- Reside with supported living schemes internal to Haringey Council

7.4.2. Advocacy service Learning Disability Experience (LDX) was commissioned to provide independent advocacy and facilitation. LDX met with 85 people with a range of abilities, either individually or part of a group. In addition the organisation engaged with 78 people who were identified a 'Circles of Support' including family, carers, support workers and staff. The full report is summarised below and set out in full in Appendix C.

7.4.3. Osborne Grove Nursing Home: 9/1/2015 and 13/1/2015

7.4.4. Concerns were raised around the length of the consultation. There was praise for the work at Osborne Grove and the quality of care there; with distinctions made with nearby residential care providers who had recently failed their CQC inspections. Questions were raised about the actual saving to be realised from the winding down of Osborne Grove and the ability to reable the residents. Suggestions were made regarding Health Services supporting the work there further and opportunities to increase revenue at Osborne Grove. Questions were raised about the practicality of how a wind down of services would work for the residents of Osborne. It was stated: "Dementia is becoming bigger and bigger and you are closing this? We pay our rates. This is the one thing we have in Haringey."

7.4.5. Ermine Road: 06/01/2014 (2 sessions)



Haringey Council

- 7.4.6. Concerns were largely raised around the viability of the proposals for service users with Learning Disabilities and the potential for isolation. There was also concern from family/carers regarding (1) what the changes would mean for them (2) the validity of the consultation, (3) the viability of the suggestions/proposals around reablement and (4) the quality assurance that would be given if the proposals progressed.

It was stated: “Our concern is that you are putting out all these proposals that are not fit for purpose. Nothing about research back up, what the proposals mean and I cannot find anything. New empty words – transformation and reablement. You have not demonstrated proper research on cost and proper evidence which is very irresponsible. There is nothing there to show you have done any research of the adequacy of these new policies.”

7.4.7. The Haven: 09/01/2015

- 7.4.8. Points were made regarding the usefulness of the Haven in preventing isolation. Praise was given to the staff that currently work there and concern expressed for what would happen to them if the centre closed. Concern was raised as to what the changes would mean to service users and how the proposals would work in practice.

It was stated: “You are using old people, disabled people as an excuse. I know you are only doing your job but I am fed up of hearing the same thing. Don’t close places like this or the children’s place. People work all their lives, pay their taxes and then you have the cheek to say you need to save £30m. Look at where you can save money. Properties are empty. Scaffolding left for 6 months costing the council 10-15k and its not being used. What are you going to do with these people? You basically want to get rid of old people, kids, education, form for care and then you expect them to put up with it. Reason you can put them in a house and forget about them. That’s what it all boils down to, money and privatisation.”

7.5. The Haven Day Centre with advocates

- 7.5.1. The information below includes a range of views from services users expressed to advocates:

- It’s very nice to come here. If we don’t come we’ll go back to square one. If the centre closes I’ll be on my own most of the time and I’m scared because I have mental health problems.
- What about the people who can’t get out and walk. This is what places like The Haven is for.
- The day centre is family.
- It has made such a difference to my life being here. My wife and I used to come here. She died last year. She was my beautiful



Haringey Council

flower. I would be at home on my own if I didn't come here. I have my friends I like getting together and socialising.

- You don't want people coming to your home? We come here to get out on our own.
- This day centre means the world to me- more than anything.

7.5.2. The information below includes a range of views expressed by carers:

- Can we not share this building? How many people out of hospital do you think you will be getting? Let's leave this people a little bit happy.
- Cuts have previously been made and frontline adult social services should be protected.
- Mum suffers from Alzheimer's and before coming here she hardly spoke a word. Mum attends three days a week and she's made friends. Mum loves this place, without it she will regress again.

7.5.3. Linden House with advocates

7.5.4. Linden House residents were unable to speak up for themselves. Staff and family cares spoke up on behalf of residents, as set out below:

- We explained to residents that there may be some changes happening but it meant absolutely nothing to them. The group has no understanding of what's going on.
- Because of their autism and challenging behaviour, some residents will only accept support and personal care from specific staff. They go to staff who they recognise.
- There are not enough details and a lot of speculation. The information is vague. Staff feel unsettled for the residents and closer to time we will have to draw on our skills to help people understand.
- The people who live here need 24-hour supervision. They can't understand and will become very aggressive. People have bespoke complex service needs.

7.6. Osborne Grove Nursing Home with advocates

7.6.1. The information below sets out the views of service users:

- My wife has been here since it opened in 2008. She was a bed blocker in hospital. Her needs cannot be met in the community. She requires nursing care, a nursing home.
- I do not know where people like me with high support needs will go? The private sector does not want high support needs like me. I had lots of care in the community but I still had to come here in the end.



Haringey Council

- Osborne Grove is an example of best practice. It would be tragic if Haringey Council let Osborne Grove close.
- People are living longer. Carers in the community don't have enough time to support people like us. They have appointments back-to-back.

7.6.2. The information below sets out the views of carers:

- People at Osborne Grove have high dependency needs. If they are not going to stay here where are you going to house them?
- There are only 2 other residential care homes in the borough and both have failed their CQC. People will need to be shipped out of the borough.
- You haven't done an evaluation of all the residents involved.
- Publicity about this consultation is lacking. The whole thing is rushed.

7.7. Ermine Road Day Opportunities with advocates

7.7.1. Most of the Ermine Road Day Opportunities users were unable to speak up for themselves. Advocates identified 10 people to have a discussion with. The following points were made:

- I like it here because it makes me happy. I enjoy myself. I like the people.
- Daily routine. I will lose it.
- Big change. Have routines.
- I like it here.
- Trust the people at Ermine Road.
- Not happy to have change.
- I would not be happy if I was at home all of the time. I get upset if I can't come.

7.7.2. When asked how people would feel if changes were made to the service, the following was stated:

- Sad.
- [Gestured] I feel sick.
- I would feel angry
- [Gestured] tears – sad
- Lonely

7.7.3. The following points were made by carers:

- Parent carers need as much support as the service users do? Some of them are really elderly. They physically can no longer do



things anymore. Parent carers have confidence in staff and there are longstanding relationships that would be hard to recoup.

- Care in the community – it doesn't feel a lot of financial planning has gone into this?
- Health will deteriorate – unhealthy impact on health and wellbeing.
- My son loves to come out during the day. I am 69-years-old. I will kill me if he can't come here anymore.

7.7.4. Day centre provision/services for people with complex needs

7.7.5. Advocacy service Learning Disability Experience (LDX) was commissioned to provide independent advocacy and facilitation. LDX met with 85 people with a range of abilities, either individually or part of a group. In addition the organisation engaged with 78 people who were identified a 'Circles of Support' including family, carers, support workers and staff. The full report is summarised below and set out in full in Appendix C.

7.8. The Roundway Service with advocates

7.8.1. Advocates spoke to six users of services at The Roundway. The remaining users of the service were unable to speak up for themselves.

- I feel sorry
- I love my activities. I don't want to stop doing them. I loves cooking.
- I'm afraid it's going to happen.
- I would feel stressed.

7.8.2. The following points were made by carers:

- My daughter lives in a residential care home. Will she lose her day service? Structure meaning routine to her day.
- We won't be able to go anywhere. I will restrict our movements. My son becomes destructive when he is affected by change.
- Some people will become socially isolated. At least here they meet different people.
- Timescale is very rushed.

7.9. Birkbeck Road Services with advocates

7.9.1. Users of the service made the following points supported by staff:

- The centre is important.
- We love coming here.
- Please don't take it away.
- We would struggle to get through the day.
- Where would I go? Where would we go...nowhere to go?



Haringey Council

7.9.2. The following points were made by carers:

- I do not want them to close this place as my daughter is happy here despite the barriers. She is so happy.
- My sister is aging and her mobility needs and care have increased. She's not only disabled, she is also elderly. I have to consider, on a daily basis, what activities we do. I need the centre to lighten the load.
- Staff support us.

7.10. General points across all services

7.10.1. The following general points were expressed by users of the service, carers and circles of support

- Saving money should be the furthest thought away
- Accessible, appropriate, safe access life opportunities not often cut by society. Essential in people accessing society.
- The Council is building a stronger Haringey off the backs of the weakest and most vulnerable.

8. Other engagements event

8.1. The information below is a summary of other engagement events

8.2. The Voluntary Sector Forum

8.2.1. It was stated that some kind of action plan was needed for working with the voluntary sector. Support needs to go into the voluntary sector if we are to play a greater role. It was also asked: who is going to pay for other organisations to take up the slack? There needs to be more volunteers. It was felt the voluntary sector was not getting the required support that was needed from the council.

8.3. West Green and Bruce Grove Area Forum

8.3.1. Cllr Jason Arthur gave a presentation on the three-year budget and the financial issues facing the Council. He explained the process around the current consultation and summarised proposals across each priority area. A number of attendees asked specific questions about youth services and, particularly, the future of Bruce Grove Youth Centre. Cllr Arthur explained that there is no proposal to close Bruce Grove Youth Centre and said that the centre will remain open.

8.4. Quarterly Neighbourhood Watch Meeting



Haringey Council

8.4.1. Points raised:

- Are we going to encourage betting shops to increase our licensing income?
- There is a need to publicise recycling more.
- Littering is an issue in the borough what is being proposed here?
- Nuisance garages are a problem where people dump refuse.
- The Council should carry out more preventative work in schools
- Older people will suffer from neglect, and there will be safe guarding issues
- Fly tipping will be an issue if we remove roadside recycling
- Residents should keep cameras to record anyone dumping refuse.
- Apps should be used further to report fly tipping.

8.5. Events at Finsbury Park and Albert Recreational Cafe (check)

8.5.1. Points raised:

- Why is the Council not using the £70m reserves it currently holds to support reducing the severity of the cuts?
- Slashing the children's Youth and disabilities budgets are disgraceful
- Why are the Council changing the Parking Zone in Wood Green when it already works, we signed up for all day permits not just for two hours, there was no option to keep as is, why ?
- Why is the Council seeking to pursue more events in parks to achieve a £600k increase in income, when Finsbury park already has significant disruption to its users?

9. Consultation response from community groups and partners

9.1. The following responses were received:

Muswell Hill Traders Group
 The Friends of Finsbury Park
 Haringey Healthwatch
 Markfield
 Unison
 Mental Health Support Association
 Haringey People First Advocacy Group
 Open Door (Young People's Consultancy Service)
 Haringey Forum for Older People (Health and Social Care Sub Group)
 Cypriot Community Centre
 Haringey Learning Disabilities Partnership Board
 Older Peoples Reference Group
 Marcus and Marcus (provider of specialist services for Adults affected by a Learning Disability / Autism and Complex Behaviours)
 Lewis & Mary Haynes
 Hornsey Housing Trust



Haringey Council

Haringey Education Business Partnership
Haringay Traders Association
The Spitz Charitable Trust
Haringey Autism
Ambitious about Autism
Autism Working Group
Haringey Children's Centre Alliance
The chairman of the Whittington Hospital NHS Trust

APPENDIX A: Submissions from partners

THE MUSWELL HILL TRADERS GROUP

Building a Stronger
Haringey *Together*

DRAFT CORPORATE PLAN

2015 – 18

THE MHTG RESPONSE

.....

FORWARD FROM THE MUSWELL HILL TRADERS GROUP



Haringey Council

Our vision:

to make Haringey an even better place in which to work
and how the business community can help

Our approach:

to encourage a business friendly environment for the greater good of all Haringey traders,
entrepreneurs, customers, shoppers, residents and visitors

FORWARD FROM THE MHTG OFFICERS

The MHTG recognises the Herculean challenges now facing our elected councillors and the staff of Haringey Council. The council is required to make a further £70 million cut in expenditure during the next four years in addition to the £117.60 million cuts already made over the past four years.

Many businesses in our borough have had to make similar and even greater proportional cuts since the beginning of the latest recession. Sadly some of the businesses long established in Haringey have been forced out of existence. Others are surviving but only just.

Yet despite the recent gloomy economic environment there are relatively vibrant retail, commercial, trading, manufacturing and service sectors offering a vast range of goods and services to Haringey residents and visitors as well as the immediate local, regional, national and even international markets.

As the recession draws to a close the Haringey business community looks forward to working closely with the council to find new and innovative ways to ensure the best possible value for money from the council in return for the near 50% we as business enterprises contribute to the total council coffers through payment of our Business Rates.

MHTG Chair
Marcelo Monaco

MHTG Vice Chair



Haringey Council
Roger Ward

INDEX

- Forward from the MHTG
- Forward from the MHTG Officers
- Index
- Executive Summary
- MHTG
- Some General MHTG Concerns
- Some Constraints on the MHTG Response
- Facing Up To The Cuts – And Surviving
- Commissioning, Privatising and Merging Council Services
- Merging of Borough Services in North London
- Economic Use of Council Properties
- CORPORATE PLAN PRIORITY 4:
 - Town Centre Traders Groups
 - Business Rate Subsidies for Charity Shops
 - Business Rate Subsidies for Trade Unions
 - Planning Directorate Powers
- THE WAY AHEAD

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – 10 POINT ACTION PLAN

The MHTG proposes *the appointment of a Business Czar to work with leading council officers and the appropriate elected officials to lead new initiatives aimed at expanding the business sector in Haringey.*

The MHTG proposes *that the implementation of existing council policies and the adoption of any and all new policies by the council's officers and elected members be subject to a simple test as to how that policy will impact either positively, neutrally or negatively on the business sector.*

The MHTG proposes *a clear and simple breakdown on a department by department basis of the current and projected annual expenditure proposals for each of the spending Directorates linked to the Draft Plan Priorities for each of next four years.*

The MHTG proposes *a commitment be made in the Corporate Plan to identify each and every spending head for all in-house services and public services with a view to securing private sector bids to provide matching services at competitive prices with a similar or higher value for money ratio than being currently achieved.*



The MHTG proposes *immediate steps to be taken to identify council services suitable for merger with neighbouring boroughs.*

The MHTG proposes *the Corporate Plan should include a commitment to an immediate and public review of each and every council property, its purpose and perceived benefit to the community, its marginal cost benefit to the ratepayer and its value for money ratio.*

The MHTG proposes *the Corporate Plan should commit the council to reviewing and strengthening the current network of Town Centre Traders Groups with a view to providing them with administrative and logistical support in their promotion of the business sector thereby increasing the borough's business rates income.*

The MHTG proposes *the council commits to a full review of all charity shop business rate discounts.*

The MHTG proposes *the council serves notice to its recognised unions to terminate all council funded trade union activities including payment of wages to full and part time union officers. We call upon the council to inform the business rate payers of the precise and accurately costed sums of money paid by Haringey through their subsidies to those unions.*

The MHTG proposes *the Planning Directorate brings forward a set of policies to actively promote the borough's business sector.*

INTRODUCTION

The MHTG thanks the Leader of the Council and the Haringey Chief Executive for inviting participation in the consultative process prior to the recent publication of its Draft Corporate Plan for 2015 to 2018. MHTG members took part in a number of the public debates around the local Area Forum presentations of the council's "Investing in Tomorrow" documents.



Haringey Council

MHTG officers contributed to the Alexandra Palace “key partners” consultative conference in November last year. Our specific involvement was in the conference Working Party Four which eventually emerged as “Priority 4: Drive Growth and Employment from which Everyone can Benefit” in the Draft Plan.

Officers and members from the four other recognised Traders’ Groups in the borough made their business oriented contributions to the remaining listed Priorities in the Draft Plan. We are content that the council leadership and senior officers have made every effort to listen to the Haringey business community in preparing the council’s draft budget and strategic policy positions for submission to the council Cabinet on February 10th.

The MHTG submits this response to the Leader’s Office, Chief Executive Officer and appropriate drafting committee members in the hope our stated policy positions and principal observations on the Draft Corporate Plan are taken fully into consideration in amending the current Draft as it transmogrifies into the final proposals for agreement by the Full Council meeting on February 23rd.

THE MUSWELL HILL TRADERS GROUP

The MHTG can reasonably claim to reflect the borough wide mix of business types and styles. The Muswell Hill principal and secondary shopping streets and linked business hubs contain most of the recognised nationwide supermarket stores such as Waitrose, Sainsbury’s and Marks and Spencer’s as well as the national bank chains, building societies and pubs. There are the nationally branded coffee shops, restaurants, women’s retail shops, opticians and pharmacists, solicitors and accountants as well as a wide range of health and beauty outlets. We also have a superabundance of nationwide and local estate agent offices!

However, it is the significant number of independent shops that makes the Muswell Hill retail experience that extra bit special. Nearly every type of goods sold by the national chain stores is matched in our wonderful array of independent shops offering equivalent services with a local identity.

MHTG members work hard to promote Muswell Hill as a destination shopping centre. We strive to increase footfall with the hoped for resultant uplift in shop takings and the guarantee that traders gain the financial security to pay their, suppliers, rents, wages and business rates.

SOME GENERAL MHTG CONCERNS

We have two major concerns with the Draft Plan. They relate to the lack of emphasis placed on the role of assisting Haringey’s businesses in our generation of nearly 50% of your council’s budget as well as a worry that the council may still be underestimating the



Haringey Council

extent of further cuts which may yet be announced by the government and the consequent need to build sufficient contingency funds.

SOME CONSTRAINTS ON THE MHTG RESPONSE

The MHTG recognises that you have invested much detailed work in preparing the Draft Plan. The five stated Priorities alongside their Vision statements are clearly worthy and appropriate aspirations. Indeed the wording of the Plan is a masterpiece of local authority corporate objectives neatly explained and set out with fine clarity. If only all such official documents were so well crafted!

However the MHTG has some difficulty in making meaningful representations on the specifics of the five Priorities as we are not fully aware of the related background costings involved. Our efforts to make simple sense of the council's accounts drew a blank when we attempted to cost out the implementation of the Priorities.

The MHTG proposes *a clear and simple breakdown on a department by department basis of the current and projected annual expenditure proposals for each of the spending Directorates linked to the Draft Plan Priorities for each of next four years.*

The MHTG feels that without the appropriate financial information it is constrained in making properly informed observations on Priority numbers One, Two, Three and Five. Luckily we noted that there were numerous key partners attending the Alexandra Palace consultative conference with specific expertise in the fields of Education, Health, Environment and Housing. We look forward to their observations on the Draft Plan safe in the knowledge they will offer constructive contributions towards the final set of policies for approval, or otherwise, by the Full Council meeting in February.

FACING UP TO THE CUTS – AND SURVIVING

The MHTG looked at how other public bodies, of all sizes, modelled their budgets in western democracies in the face of major cuts in their income streams. Pitifully few successful examples are to be found! Those who had achieved the key objectives of making cuts in staff and services, balancing the books and then progressing to a surplus whilst at the same time protecting core services required by legislative constraints are few and far between. The best exemplar was that of the Canadian government when it was faced by the last major financial crisis that in turn precipitated the worldwide economic recession. So, it is to the core of the Canadian approach that the MHTG commends to the drafters of Haringey's Corporate Plan.

COMMISSIONING, PRIVATISING AND MERGING COUNCIL SERVICES



Haringey Council

Fundamentally the Canadian approach to policy and fiscal planning in the face of major cuts in income was a simple and open one which was transparent to all parties involved in the process.

On a Directorate by Directorate and Department by Department basis each in-house service and every service provided to the public was posed the question “can this service be delivered to a similar or better standard with a similar or higher value for money ratio by the private sector than the public sector?” In virtually every case it was discovered that by commissioning the private sector to provide equivalent services not only were substantial savings made to annual running costs as well as fixed overheads but far higher value for money ratios were achieved. The architect of this approach was the then Governor of the Bank of Canada. He has since taken up the post as the current Governor of the Bank of England.

The MHTG calls on Haringey council to adopt a similar approach to each and every one of its expenditure heads.

In doing so the leading council officers would in effect become sub-contracting and commissioning agents. Their main role would be to monitor service standard and scrutinise all such council commissioned service contracts.

Service Standard Quality Reports could then be issued regularly and be subject to public scrutiny through the existing structure of council committees. In freeing up potentially substantial sums to be made available to public contract competition the council could then redouble its efforts to encourage current council employees to use their own expertise to bid for such contracts. Since such a form of privatisation of council services has already started we see little problem in extending such a policy with a bolder approach and substantially broader agenda.

The MHTG proposes a commitment be made in the Corporate Plan to identify each and every spending head for all in-house services and public services with a view to securing private sector bids to provide matching services at competitive prices with a similar or higher value for money ratio than being currently achieved.

MERGING OF BOROUGH SERVICES IN NORTH LONDON

The MHTG suspects that in the not too near future the suspiciously large number of elected borough councils covering north London’s populous will be subject to rationalisation. Given the current nature of almost exactly similar services being offered by neighbouring councils it is an excellent opportunity to once again look at merging a range of council services where reasonable matches can be found. Such an approach should not be limited simply to external council provisions for the public but should include in-house services such as Human Resources, Rates Collection, Accounts, Finance, Legal



Haringey Council

Departments and so on and so on. This will lead to major cost reductions in expensive overheads and costly managerial staff layers.

The MHTG proposes *immediate steps to be taken to identify council services suitable for merger with neighbouring boroughs.*

ECONOMIC USE OF COUNCIL PROPERTIES

The MHTG is pleased to note at least some progress on the rationalisation of underutilised council occupied properties. We would like to see further commitments to sell off council property and a consolidation of existing council offices with a view to generating substantial income which could then be used for those essential services that are subject to increasing demand from the public especially in the fields of Health and Education.

The MHTG fully recognises the council's determination to try and ring fence certain politically sensitive services and their related premises, but we would caution against such an emotional response. In the case of library buildings for example there is clear evidence that at least some of the borough library buildings are woefully empty of customers and cannot under any circumstances be justified on any sensible economic criteria. In an age of internet downloading it will not be long before libraries are seen as a quaint anachronism – as they are already viewed in most modern high tech' cities on the west coast of the USA and across Asia.

The MHTG proposes *the Corporate Plan should include a commitment to an immediate and public review of each and every council property, its purpose and perceived benefit to the community, its marginal cost benefit to the ratepayer and its value for money ratio.*

PRIORITY 4: DRIVE GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT FROM WHICH EVERYONE CAN BENEFIT

The MHTG congratulates the authors of the Draft for the contents of PRIORITY 4 (pages 36 to 45). We have a number of specific administrative and policy issues in response to the Draft which we feel would be best included within the broad purview of PRIORITY 4.

Quite how the authors of the final documents for the Full Council wish to handle them we leave to their excellent penmanship.

These issues relate to the current structure and nature of the representative bodies of the business sector in Haringey (Town Centre Traders Groups),



Haringey Council

Council Business Rate Subsidies for Charity Shops, Council Business Rate Subsidies for Trade Unions and the use of Planning Department Powers to protect properties currently classified for business use from being converted to residential use.

It may be the view of the authors of the Corporate Plan that one or more of this list of topics is inappropriate for inclusion in the Plan on the grounds that they are more of tactical interest rather than the strategic views being adopted by the final version.

- **TOWN CENTRE TRADERS GROUPS: BUSINESS REPRESENTATION WITHIN THE BOROUGH OF HARINGEY**

There are a variety of formal and informal clubs and organisations functioning in Haringey in which companies large and small participate with the express purpose of business networking. In practice these are generally sector specific and localised to any one of the council designated Town Centre areas. In the main they tend to be social forums where business people can meet and discuss common issues.

Unlike some London boroughs there are no effective borough wide subsections of any of the nationally recognised business representative bodies such as the Confederation of British Industries, the Federation of Small Businesses or even the Chambers of Commerce.

The reason, to the great credit of our council, is that some years ago they initiated their own network of organisations to provide a route by which businesses could communicate directly with the council. These bodies are known as Traders Groups. There are five in Haringey each covering the geographical areas determined by the council as Town Centres. Town Centre Traders Groups offer the opportunity for any business within a designated

Town Centre to meet up and explore ways in which common problems can be tackled with, or without, the assistance of the council. Over time each such group has developed their own method of working. Some of them charge a subscription others are free to enter. Some are more active than others and all depend upon voluntary work usually from their respective group officers.

Each of the traders groups operate under a Joint Agreement originally drawn up by council officers setting out the terms and conditions by which communication between the traders and the relevant council officials are determined.

There are five principal Town Centres and each one has a functioning traders' group covering Green Lanes, Tottenham, Crouch End, Wood Green and Muswell Hill.

The MHTG has a long list of proposals by which the borough could strengthen the current system of Traders Group representation.

These include the extension of membership to cover Sole Traders who typically may be working from home offices or kitchens and currently pay no Business Rates. But with positive support and encouragement they may soon grow their businesses and seek out a proper business premises within Haringey. There are already many examples of businesses that began from such humble origins in Muswell Hill and elsewhere in Haringey. Such entrepreneurs can range from accountants, lawyers, tax advisors, bakers,



Haringey Council

cooks, hair stylists and beauticians to personal trainers and life coaches. The list is almost endless. It is likely to extend given the continuing and quickening long term trend towards the growth of start-up businesses and self-employment.

The MHTG proposes the Corporate Plan should commit the council to reviewing and strengthening the current network of Town Centre Traders Groups with a view to providing them with administrative and logistical support in their promotion of the business sector thereby increasing the borough's business rates income.

- BUSINESS RATE SUBSIDIES FOR REGISTERED CHARITY SHOPS

Significant savings for the council coffers can be quickly made by immediately ceasing the perverse council policy of granting 100% business rates relief to registered charity shops and offices.

Councils are obliged by legislation to automatically grant an 80% discount but that still leaves 20% business rates income.

For reasons unknown the council invariably offers a further full 20% discount to these so called charities. This has resulted in an explosion of shops registering as charities and opening in our high streets selling goods and services in direct competition with retail outlets that have loyally paid their business rates in full.

Haringey residents are used to seeing at least one of the popular and established nationwide charity outlets such as Oxfam or perhaps a North London Hospice shop perfectly reasonably adding to the local mix of retail outlets. Sadly that traditional picture is long gone.

Most of the well known nationally branded charity chain stores are now multi million pound commercial enterprises, a far cry from the corner charity shop we used to know. They have discovered Haringey's generous but hopelessly out of touch free business rates policy and are snapping up vacant business sites in our Town Centres as soon as they come on the market. These major high-street bring and buy shops look upon Haringey Council as one huge charity. Something is wrong here.

Muswell Hill Town Centre alone now has ten charity shops packed into all the prime retail sites. Ten!

Charity shop chain stores deprive the borough of much needed business rates income. They operate at a competitive advantage over other retail outlets as a result of their much reduced overheads. To add insult to injury they rarely employ any staff by using volunteers thus depriving the borough of the opportunity to reduce Haringey's unemployment totals. This is an ongoing madness which depletes our hard pressed borough of hundreds of thousands pounds. The business sector demands the council addresses this problem with urgency.



Haringey Council

The MHTG proposes *the council commits to a full review of all charity shop business rate discounts.*

- BUSINESS RATE SUBSIDIES FOR TRADE UNIONS

The business community cannot reconcile the publicly expressed angst of the council over the effects of central government funding cuts whilst at the same time that very council is spending thousands of pounds a year in subsidies to their own trade unions.

We see little reason why our business rates, 50% of the council's income, should be used to pay for time off work for full time and part time trade union convenors.

We see even less reason why businesses who are often struggling to make enough income to pay their own staff should then see their business rates being used to pay for a full time teachers' union representative involved in organising industrial action in one of our own leading schools. Such council funded activity generates yet more damaging headlines to the already poor public image for our borough.

The local government and teaching unions recognised by our council are multi million pound businesses. If they so wish to fund their own full time officers in Haringey then that is their democratic right. We wish them well providing they pay their way just like the rest of us.

The business sector does not wish to see its business rates used for this and other union subsidies.

If the council cannot face up to that challenge then we formally request that whatever sums of public monies are donated by the council to its unions should be matched by the council donating equivalent sums to buying National Lottery tickets.

With so much money at stake we are far more likely to bring some gain to the borough's residents through a massive lottery win than by squandering it on the wealthy union barons.

Should the council feel this too extreme a view from the MHTG we then commend the matter be put to a public referendum.

The MHTG proposes *the council serves notice to its recognised unions to terminate all council funded trade union activities including payment of wages to full and part time union officers. We call upon the council to inform the business rate payers of the precise and accurately costed sums of money paid by Haringey through their subsidies to those unions.*



Haringey Council

- **PLANNING DEPARTMENT POWERS TO BOOST THE BUSINESS SECTOR**

We urge the council to use the powers available within the planning laws to provide support and growth for the borough's business sector.

There are a number of ways in which this could be achieved. For example the Planning Directorate could take a proactive stance in supporting the Traders Groups in their opposition to the steady decline in business sites and workshops through change of use applications being submitted by property developers with a view to building yet more luxury housing units.

The MHTG proposes *the Planning Directorate brings forward a set of policies to actively promote the borough's business sector.*

THE WAY AHEAD: BUSINESS IN PARTNERSHIP WITH HARINGEY COUNCIL

The future of Haringey's income stream increasingly depends on the need to nurture a thriving local business sector. Failure to support and develop the latent talent within the borough's business community will inevitably contribute to a continuation of the current steady decline in our council coffers.

The Corporate Plan provides the council with a perfect opportunity to boost its income by growing the number of businesses in Haringey and thus increasing its Business Rates monthly income and reducing the borough's unemployment levels.

In simple terms the business community stands for growth leading to prosperity, profits and a better Haringey. Businesses need to invest in a business friendly environment in order to earn income to pay suppliers, to pay rent, to pay wages and of course to pay Business Rates as our contribution towards your expenditure on the Corporate Plan Priorities.

To help in achieving this objective requires a positive working relationship between the borough's business people based on mutual trust and understanding.

MHTG members fear there may be some misconceptions on both sides. Any such mutual misunderstandings are a block to our joint prosperity and it seems obvious they should be resolved.

It is sometimes the case that businesses see the council as an obstacle to growth and development. Perhaps some of us have indeed been taken in by a seemingly endless press barrage claiming to expose huge cash payoffs for council staff, massive sums on



Haringey Council

unnecessary consultancy fees, waste of public monies on abandoned IT schemes and a lack of any apparent accountability.

There is a perception amongst some in our business community that the council simply fail to recognise that Business Rates now form nearly half the council's income and that the council take the business sector for granted.

The Corporate Plan is our opportunity to jointly work towards the creation of a healthy local economy in which the business sector is actively engaged in the preparation and implementation of the crucial policies with a direct impact upon economic growth.

The MHTG proposes *the appointment of a Business Czar to work with leading council officers and the appropriate elected officials to lead new initiatives aimed at expanding the business sector in Haringey.*

The MHTG proposes *that the implementation of existing council policies and the adoption of any and all new policies adopted by the council's officers and elected members be subject to a simple test as to how that policy will impact either positively, neutrally or negatively on the business sector.*

We thank you for taking time to study our submission. We wish you well in the process of finalising the Corporate Plan confident that the council's leadership fully appreciates the business sector's concerns, and hopes, for 2015 - 2018.

NOTE: Whilst we are confident the views expressed in this document are a fair and honest reflection of the MHTG membership the author accepts sole responsibility for its contents.
RW. 16/1/15



THE FRIENDS OF FINSBURY PARK RESPONSE TO THE HARINGEY COUNCIL'S CONSULTATION: 'BUILDING A STRONGER HARINGEY TOGETHER'

RESPONSE

The Friends of Finsbury Park are opposed to any proposal which would require an increase in the number or duration of large scale events in Finsbury Park. We consider that the present level of events is excessive and that, for the duration of the concerts, including the lengthy periods of set up and take down, they impose a blight on the park and on surrounding communities.

The major events held in in Finsbury Park in 2014 led to a very large area of the most used parts of the park being fenced off for months during the summer when access to the park is most needed. The consequent loss of amenity, including access to children's playgrounds and to the tennis courts, is seen as unacceptable and unreasonable.

The considerable degradation of the Park, particularly the turf and paths, is still very evident many months after the last event. The restorative works have had very limited impact.

The noise pollution resulting from last years' concerts was widely considered by impacted communities to be the worst experienced since these major events commenced in Finsbury Park.

We would welcome any proposal for a new approach to the nature and management of events in Finsbury Park which would lead to lower noise levels and to less disruption and degradation of the park.

We are opposed to any further sub-letting or commercialisation within Finsbury Park. We believe that the Park should be maintained as a people's park and not transformed into a commercial park.

We are opposed to the privatisation of services or parks management within Finsbury Park.

PLEASE SEE BELOW A MORE DETAILED RESPONSE TO THE SPECIFIC PROPOSALS RELATED TO PARKS



Haringey Council

INCREASED INCOME FROM PARKS EVENTS

We note the intention to generate £600,000 increased revenue from events over three years.

We note that no figure is stated for projected total event income from Finsbury Park, or indeed Haringey Parks overall, during the three years of the budget proposals. We believe that these figures are central to any setting of budget targets.

We note the acknowledgement under 'Impact on Residents' that "Growth of event may have negative impact on local residents, specifically around Finsbury Park". We would, of course, want to avoid any such negative impact on park users and local residents and believe that generation of the projected additional income of £600,000 over the three year budget would be very difficult to achieve without unacceptable additional disruption, noise and loss of public amenity.

We would regret any pro-active marketing of the park for commercial purposes which led to an increase in the number of days when parts of the park were not freely accessible to all park users.

We would welcome any initiatives to 'encourage and develop community led events by local groups and residents' provided that the necessary balance is maintained to ensure that no one park is over used. We would also want to be assured that the nature of such events would not cause unreasonable additional noise disturbance within the park and surrounding areas.

Until such time as we are able to convince Haringey Council to reduce the number of these major events, we would welcome any imaginative initiative on the management of events which could maintain income whilst managing to lessen the duration and negative impacts of these events. This could possibly be achieved, at least in part, by negotiating better deals with promoters or franchise holders.

EFFICIENCY SAVINGS AND DELIVERY REVIEW OF THE PARKS

We note the intention to achieve the projected savings of £400,000 over three years.

Under 'Impact on Residents' you list no negatives. However, we would want to be assured that the loss of two staff and the proposed review of the makeup of the landscape features in parks to reduce the cost of maintenance could be achieved without some negative impact on park users.

We would welcome discussing volunteering as a means of achieving improvements and believe that there is considerable scope for Friends of Parks groups working together with the Haringey Parks Department to achieve community solutions which will impact positively on the overall Parks environment.

NEW WAY OF DELIVERING THE PARKS SERVICE

We note that the objective is to secure a further £100,000 savings in year 2 of the budget. In 'exploring and comparing different operating models' we would be very concerned that this should not encompass any element of privatisation. We would want our Parks to remain publicly owned and publicly run.

We would welcome new models which further empowered local residents. We would be interested to hear more about what is envisaged by 'promoting independence'

We welcome the undertaking to enter into consultation and dialogue with Friends of Parks Groups and look forward to fully participating in this process.

We would welcome exploring other options with Council representatives. Finsbury Park is an asset to Hackney and Islington as much as to Haringey. We have some ideas about



Haringey Council

more Tri-Borough engagement over the maintenance of this valuable amenity to all three boroughs and would welcome the opportunity to engage with you in exploring more imaginative solutions.

I would be grateful if you could confirm to me in writing that this submission has been accepted for inclusion in the contributions to the Council's budget consultation.

Many thanks,
Yours sincerely,

Kevin Duffy
Chair
The Friends of Finsbury Park



Dear Cllr Kober,

HARINGEY COUNCIL'S MEDIUM TERM BUDGET PROPOSALS 2015/18

I am writing on behalf of the Healthwatch Haringey board which has considered the proposals set out in the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy as they affect users of health and social care service users in the borough.

The statutory role of Healthwatch is to represent the concerns of users of health and social care services, both current and potential, as well as those who care for them. This very often means that we must speak for those whose voices are seldom heard, to ensure that those who make decisions do so with full knowledge of the effects of their decisions on those who cannot speak for themselves. Since our establishment in 2013, we have begun to establish a wide range of contacts and networks in order to build a sound evidence base upon which to do this.

We acknowledge of course that the Council is required to make substantial revenue savings over the next three years and accept that some savings are needed which will impact on current services in public health, for children and young people, and social care budgets. We also accept that some savings can reasonably be made by redesigning



Haringey Council

services to increase efficiency, and that improved outcomes may well, in time, result in some cases.

We have primarily considered the proposals in Corporate Priority 2 relating to Adult Social Care and Public Health but our comments below are also relevant for the proposals in Corporate Priority 1. We have of course noted many of the detailed responses from service user groups and individual representations which have been shared with us, and do not rehearse them here. However we would wish to make the following general observations:

1. The consultation period is very short with a deadline of 18th January and reduced even further by the Christmas and New Year break; leaving only three weeks at the most for people to understand the proposals and respond. We understand that there will be further consultation on each of the service proposals after the Council has agreed a budget on 23rd February but at this point the financial envelope will be fixed, leaving little room for meaningful consultation with alternative options available. This is an unsatisfactory situation as the proposed budget cuts are not clearly translated into specific service cuts, and it is therefore difficult for service users and carers to understand the full implications of the proposals at this stage. In order to understand the impact of the proposals it is necessary to see the revised financial profile for the specific service areas but this is not available. To be meaningful too, it would be helpful for the public to be able to see the current proposals against a profile of what services and expenditure will remain and have not be selected for inclusion in these Corporate Priority Pro Forma's. We think that it is wrong to assume this knowledge.

2. Our strong view is therefore that, after the Council has set the budget, there should be meaningful consultation on each of the service proposals with a well-publicised consultation programme over a reasonable period commensurate with changes of such significance. At this stage detailed, revised service budgets should be available in order to properly evaluate the impact of these changes (Healthwatch could usefully be involved in this process to provide an assurance that the consultation is appropriate and inclusive.)

3. We cannot help but observe that the various service changes included in Priority 1 and 2 are highly likely to result in outcomes which contradict important priorities and cross-cutting themes clearly identified in the Council's Corporate Plan.

- i) The implications of these proposed changes will almost certainly be to widen *the health inequality gap* that already exists in Haringey, in contradiction to the Council's stated priorities. We note that the Equality Impact Assessments are at best only partially complete for all the proposed changes, and do not at present adequately or accurately reflect the impacts on the various groups with "protected characteristics". They can only be partial at this stage because the new service models are not fully developed and in most, if not all, cases there is no evidence base on which to base the impact assessments. However, what does seem very clear is that the negative impacts of these savings proposals on social care services will fall disproportionately on those who are already disadvantaged, and that the spatial impacts will be greatest on the north and east of the borough.
- ii) The proposals in relation to Public Health similarly reflect this contradiction, as regards the importance attached to *prevention* by the Council. The proposed reductions in evaluation and health intelligence, in physical and mental health



Haringey Council

promotion, the drugs and alcohol service and sexual health for example, are perverse and also impair the effort to tackle deep seated health inequalities.

4. We are particularly surprised and concerned at the reliance to be placed on the “Neighbourhood Connects” concept. There appears to be little evidence to support doing so. Neighbourhood Connects has not been properly tested so as to justify placing confidence in the ability of the scheme to support vulnerable people in the community. It was originally a short pilot project designed to combat social isolation and delivered by volunteers. It is now suggested that it is to become a new community based service model that will replace many of the services currently delivered by professional staff, often in specialist settings. To our knowledge there is no evidence base anywhere for developing “Neighbourhood Connects” in the way that is being proposed. The short evaluation report of the pilot has not been made available but our understanding is that this would not support the current proposals. The tender specification for the “Neighbourhood Connects” service is very challenging indeed, with the proposed caseload to exceed 1000 clients across Haringey, taking referrals from GPs and other health / social care professionals and reducing unplanned hospital admissions. We do not think that this project will work in the way that is intended and would like some clarity around the contingency plans and safeguards for those vulnerable people who may be left without access to appropriate services.

5. We understand that it is proposed to develop a “Community Strategy” to clarify the vision and identify the “community assets”, both physical and social, upon which reliance is placed throughout these proposals - and in our view this should be an immediate priority. There is a significant emphasis in the proposals on community based service models, the use of volunteers, building community capacity, identifying community assets and co-production of design and delivery etc. These are attractive notions, but to form the basis of a coherent strategy upon which to responsibly entrust the safety and care of vulnerable people, there is a great deal of work to be done in the borough.

It is clear from the contact we have had from those on our network in the short period of consultation allowed, that the replacement of professional services in this way is giving rise to considerable alarm and fear. We think there is an urgent need to identify resources to co-ordinate and develop this “Community Strategy” so that it is evidence based, and a robust basis for developing alternative community based services.

6. We are generally concerned also about the lack of clarity surrounding the transition to new ways of providing services. Managing the transition from the existing service models to the new services / support mechanisms will be challenging and must be well managed. In order to avoid a hiatus in services / support the new arrangements must be in place early enough to cope with demand as existing services are reduced. It is essential too that monitoring arrangements are established from the outset which enable the effect on service use and service users to be tracked and to highlight any issues / gaps that need to be addressed. We would like to see a monitoring and evaluation framework in place at an early stage and Healthwatch would want to support this by feeding back the experiences of service users in a systematic way.

I hope that these comments will be regarded constructively and look forward to receiving any comments from the Council on them. In keeping with Healthwatch Haringey’s policies, they will be made available on our website.



Haringey Council

Yours sincerely

Sharon Grant OBE
Chair
Healthwatch Haringey.
Cc Cllr Peter Morton



Haringey Local Government Branch, PO Box 68081, London, N22 9JB
Tel : 0208 489 1172 (direct line) or 0208 489 3351 (general), Fax 0208 489 2054,
E-Mail: branchsecretary@haringeyunison.co.uk

FORMAL UNISON RESPONSE TO MTFs PROPOSALS 2015-2018

Introduction

UNISON remains opposed to the draconian cuts being made across local government services. We believe these will have a disproportionate effect on the most vulnerable in society, and in the case of Haringey will result in increased social exclusion, disengagement of young people, higher crime and a fall in standards of care for the elderly and disabled. We struggle to reconcile the content of these huge cuts with the supposed aim of building a “stronger” Haringey.

We do not understand the logic of setting a three-year budgetary envelope on the eve of a general election. In doing so, Haringey’s Labour Council are indicating that they expect the



Haringey Council

budget attacks to continue for another three years to 2018, and also that they accept them. Haringey should have considered the options other Councils are proposing, and set a one-year budget. Much is made of the supposed acceptance that local government funding will decrease at the rates set out in the current Con-Dem government's Victorian approach to public spending. After May this year there is a potential for a change of government, and any new government may have different priorities to those set out by the current administration. For example, while the overall public expenditure envelope may not change, the allocations within this could well do so, as could the availability of extra funding for specific pieces of local government work such as Early Years, Youth and care for the elderly. By setting out a three year plan to close, cut and privatise key services, Haringey is giving no indication to the current or future government that the attacks on local government funding are both unfair and unacceptable.

Additionally, it is clear any future government intends to review the method of funding local authorities. Such an exercise could lead to a reversal of the current direction of travel, which has seen money removed from the more deprived local authorities (such as Haringey), whereas more affluent areas have been affected to a much lesser degree in cash terms.

It is not enough for our Council to accept the current attacks on funding, wring their hands and then implement the sort of cuts that are proposed. It must consider alternatives and it must consider them now before the damage proposed becomes a reality. If Haringey Council implements these cuts, there will be no incentive for or pressure on an incoming government to provide the Borough with the funding it needs.

We also have serious concerns about the language that has been used in the documentation relating to the cuts. For example, there are multiple references to making Haringey "stronger" and "better". It is simply ridiculous to claim that taking £70 million out of the budget and closing such vital services will in any way be an improvement. The consequences for residents, particularly the most vulnerable, are likely to be dire.

Consultation

Our most pressing concern at this point is that the consultation period should be extended. You will be aware that on 29th October 2014, the Supreme Court found that Haringey's consultation on changes to council tax was unlawful. Although this was a different issue, the principles in terms of what is considered to be a meaningful consultation are the same. These are as follows:

- That consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage.
- That the proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit intelligent consideration and response.
- That adequate time must be given for consideration and response.
- That the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into



Haringey Council

account in finalising any statutory proposals.

We believe that the consultation as it stands would not fulfil these criteria. Only four weeks have been allowed for it, which includes two weeks for the Christmas and New Year break. Many people did not receive the documentation until after Christmas. Consultation meetings were arranged for the week commencing 5th January 2015, straight after the holiday period. The documentation is complex and much of the information is not clear. It is not reasonable to expect people to be able to read, understand and respond to the proposals in this timescale.

However, what is even more concerning is that many of the people who are affected by the proposals in priority 2 have learning disabilities and autism. The information has not been provided in an accessible format for them, so most of them will not be able to understand it, let alone respond to it. It is well known that people with these disabilities need longer to process, understand and interpret information. This is complex information, and the amount of time that that has been provided is utterly inadequate.

We understand that some so-called consultation meetings have been arranged for service users with learning disabilities, seemingly at the last minute. We have been told that no accessible information was made available to the service users at these meetings, and that they were largely unable to understand what was being put to them. We also understand that the consultation meetings were carried out by an external organisation that is also a provider of social care services, and has been known to take over (or at least attempt to take over) outsourced services. Therefore, we would suggest that there might have been a potential conflict of interest in this organisation carrying out the consultation.

Management have tried to defend the short timescale of the consultation and the lack of detail by saying that it is not a consultation on individual service proposals, and that following agreement of the budget there will be detailed consultations on each service proposal. The problem with this is that the overall cut in the budget is so huge, and many of the individual service cuts so significant, that once the budget has been set there will be very little room for change. It will be all but impossible to formulate any alternative proposals once the budget has been set, therefore any consultation that takes place after this point is highly unlikely to be able to change any particular proposal, and as such would probably not meet the criteria for being meaningful.

Our position is that it is this current consultation on the budget that is the key consultation, and that it is this which will determine the key decisions, therefore it needs to be long enough to allow all those affected to process the information and respond to the proposals. On this basis, it is clear that the consultation period needs to be extended beyond 18th January.

Outsourcing

There are plans to outsource/privatise some services. The terms social enterprise and social investment model have been used in the documentation. We have a number of concerns about this, which are as follows:



Haringey Council

- 1) There is no guarantee that any such body will want to take over the services. What happens if no organisation that wants to do this can be identified? Will the services then close? If so, isn't it the case that a separate consultation will be required, as this will be a departure from the original proposal?
- 2) What will happen if a social enterprise is then taken over by a private company? A service will then have been fully privatised, even though this may not have been the original stated intention.
- 3) Outsourcing services to any body, even a social enterprise, means that there is no longer any local and democratic accountability or control.
- 4) What happens if an organisation takes over a service and then runs out of money or simply decides that it no longer wants to provide the service? Will the council have to step in and rescue it? There have been previous examples of this happening in the council; over a decade ago, all the residential homes in the borough were outsourced to CSS, a not-for-profit organisation. This was a disaster, and the services eventually had to be taken back in-house by the council. Our concern is that companies can take on these services without taking on any of the risk, because they know that the council will be forced to step in if things go wrong. There is then less incentive on them to provide a decent service.
- 5) There is really only one way that outsourcing saves money – by cutting staff pay and conditions. Social enterprises can be just as vicious as private companies at doing this. The private care sector is notorious for low wages, zero hours contracts and poor working conditions. Social enterprises are likely to use the same methods to cut costs. There is a clear relationship between poor conditions for staff and poor quality of care.
- 6) We would advise you to look at what has happened at Barnet Council, where social care services have been transferred to Your Choice Barnet. This is a Local Authority Trading Company rather than a social enterprise, but many of the issues are similar. Some of the potential concerns we have highlighted above have actually occurred in Barnet, including running out of money and trying to cut staff pay. This should serve as a warning against trying anything like this in Haringey.

UNISON opposes all forms of outsourcing, including to social enterprises.

Alternatives

The council is trying to tell staff, service users and residents that “there is no alternative” to the cuts. In fact, there are alternatives:

- 1) Council tax could be increased. A small increase in this, particularly for the better off, would be preferable to decimating services.



Haringey Council

- 2) Set a one year budget and use reserves to eradicate or minimise the need for cuts in this budget
- 4) The council currently spends approximately £20,000 a day on external consultants, which amounts to around £5 million a year. Some of them are on ludicrous daily rates that bear no relation to the duties they actually perform. In some cases we believe that they are using Starbucks-like tax avoidance methods, meaning they pay less tax in percentage terms than the lowest paid in Haringey. There are also far too many potential conflicts of interests in these arrangements. We believe that there is scope for huge savings in this area. All contracts with consultants and interim managers should be terminated.
- 5) Terminate arrangements with highly paid private sector partners such as Agylisis and Impower, companies whose only role appears to be to create costly solutions to problems they have identified. These often involve high cost IT solutions which we suspect will need to be procured from companies with established links to those who are proposing them.
- 6) The Council should review and monitor the costs of running the ALMO with a view to bringing the unified service back in house under direct council management.
- 5) Not making cuts would save a huge amount on redundancy costs.
- 6) Councillors could challenge the government in relation to Haringey's settlement.

Priority 1

The proposals for "priority one" which are in effect services for Children are short-sited and unclear. They include proposals to cease, outsource, or reduce the full range of services designed to improve outcomes for Children. In common with the other proposals we are concerned at the lack of meaningful information as to how these will be achieved or the impact on the service reductions proposed. There are vague references to delivering services in other ways but a complete lack of detail as to what these other ways may be!

The headlines in the consultation document include "improve access to affordable childcare" and "strengthen Children's Centres and improve access to services" which appears to be in direct contradiction to the proposal to cut the budget for Children's Centres by 1.44 million. There is a complete lack of detail as to how these savings will be achieved and how this will result in better services and outcomes. We are concerned that the consultation appears to not have reached parents and users of Children's Centres and have received some evidence that staff have been discouraged from providing copies of documents which in any case are not accessible as they appear only to have been produced in English. Children's Centres are accessed by many parents whose first language may not be English. In respect of the Childcare element of the Early years offer there is once again a complete lack of detail or evidence base. We believe the Children's Centre programme has been an unmitigated success and one Haringey should be rightly proud of, we therefore wish to express our grave concerns at comments attributed to



Haringey Council

Councillors and Senior Officer of the Council which appear designed to talk down this success and to soften the community up to cuts such talk is disingenuous when it is taken into account that the service already suffered large scale reductions in earlier budget rounds.

The proposals for Youth services appear designed to largely end the provision of a universal youth offer. Again there is reference to reviewing the delivery model which we assume is consultant speak for privatisation in one form or another. The merging of the budgets of Youth with Youth Offending in the consultation document makes it almost impossible to understand what it is that the Council wishes to deliver. We are aware that Young People have expressed grave concerns about the lack of accessible information in order to allow them to respond to the consultation. It appears superficially that the Council intend to cut a sum equivalent to the total current expenditure on Youth Services. We are gravely concerned at the potential impact on outcomes for Young people and an increased level of disengagement and alienation that will result from these proposals.

On Youth Offending the proposals are lacking details or clarity. It is of concern that they may represent a reduction in the service to statutory levels rather than the current enhanced offer. While this may on paper deliver savings we contend that reduction in prevention and risk management is likely to lead to higher demand for the statutory interventions. This would appear to be at odds with the ethos of early intervention, in particular we are concerned at potential impacts on issues such as young gang criminal involvement. It is our understanding that an element of this service is funded by the Youth Justice Board in any case.

The savings from early help appear challenging, while we broadly agree that earlier intervention results in improved outcomes for children these will require significant investment and engagement. There is a lack of clarity about how this will save money and we believe these savings may take several years to be achieved. Moving to an early intervention model is not in itself a bad thing but when it is combined with an assumption of significant savings we are concerned that the impact may be negative.

The reductions in social work and social care staffing appear arbitrary and we are concerned they are not realisable. Much has been made of the fact that many of the staff are agency workers but the reality is they have been put in place in order to deal with overwhelming workloads and increased scrutiny. We all want better outcomes for Children who are engaged with the Social care system but due account needs to be taken of the need to have a sufficient workforce to deliver this.

We note under the SEND reforms a proposal to re-tender the home to School transport with an assumed attached saving. We are seeking an assurance that any saving will be made off the back of the profits of the company NOT the pay and conditions of the staff delivering the service. This retendering must take account of the Council's policy on the living wage and build this into the contract.

The proposals for Haselmere are lacking in detail, the inference seems to be privatisation in some form we would wish to put on record our opposition to any such proposals.



Haringey Council

The Traded service proposals appear to place at risk the viability of the services covered, there is a recognition that if the Council increase costs in order to reduce the subsidy that Schools will move away from these services. The services are good quality and it appears to us that the Council may be setting them up to fail as the service may wither on the vine.

Pendarren House : We are surprised and disappointed to see this proposal on the table, the cost of £220k is minuscule in the Council budget. We are concerned that a reduction in the subsidy may result in some more deprived children no longer being able to afford to attend. For some in the Borough Pendarren may be the only experience they get of seeing life outside of the Borough.

We note the options appraisal carried out but this has yet to be shared with ourselves in contravention of agreements between the Trade Unions and the Council. We remain opposed to any leasing or other privatisation of the facility as this would inevitably reduce its ethos and commitment to young people in Haringey since a profit motive would emerge. We strongly believe the offer at Pendarren needs to be strengthened and retained as an in house service. If investment is needed this could be found by small reductions in capital projects elsewhere, consideration should also be given to public-public solutions such as a shared service with another Borough.

In conclusion the proposals for Priority 1 will have the opposite outcome to that desired and we particularly object to the attempts to dress these cuts as service improvements.

Priority 2

We are dismayed to see that the proposed cuts will effectively mean the end of social care services being provided directly by the council. Most services will be closed, and the remainder will be outsourced/privatised.

In terms of service users and their families, the cuts are likely to have a devastating impact. You will be cutting services for the most vulnerable, services they rely on to stay safe and well, to have a decent quality of life, and to avoid isolation and loneliness. This is likely to cause great harm to both the users of the services and their families/carers, who will have much more pressure put on them. The cuts are likely to be a false economy in the long run, as people will probably end up needing even more care and support at a later date due to services being removed.

UNISON completely opposes the proposals for cuts made in Corporate Priority 2.

The Haven, the Grange and the Haynes are lifelines for the people who attend them. For many of these people, going to their day centre is the only social interaction they have, as well as the only stimulation they receive. Closing the Haven, and reducing the availability of dementia day care, is clearly going to leave many vulnerable people without a service. This is likely to lead to isolation, depression and other serious consequences. The use of Neighbourhood Connects is not going to be able to compensate for the loss of day services.



Haringey Council

The closure of three day centres for people with learning disabilities and autism will have a devastating impact on both those who use the service and their parents/carers.

Osborne Grove is a successful and well-regarded service and we do not understand why there is a proposal to shut it. Also, Linden Road provides an essential service for vulnerable adults with learning disabilities. These closures will mean that the council will no longer directly provide any care homes, and that vulnerable people will have no option but to use private sector services that are often poor quality.

The cuts in social work and care management are likely to lead to huge and unsustainable increases in work for the remaining staff, as well as risks to vulnerable people.

Cuts proposed in mental health and in care purchasing packages will create risks for those whose services are reduced, and could lead to possible harm. There are claims that these changes will lead to greater independence and other improvements, but we are concerned that this is an attempt to gloss over the impact of the cuts. The fact is that the intention is to save significant sums of money from these cuts, and it is difficult to see how this can be done without creating the risk of harm to vulnerable people.

In relation to care purchasing for residential care, the problems with high costs are caused by the fact that almost all residential care is purchased from the private sector, which exists only to make money and over which the council has no control. This situation has been both created and worsened by the closure of local authority care homes. It may well be the case that some providers charge fees that are excessively high, and it may be reasonable to try and reduce those costs. However, our concern is that this may have a negative impact on residents, particularly if providers claim that they can no longer afford to provide a service to them. We are also concerned that providers may try to compensate for any reductions in funding by cutting the pay and conditions of staff, which are usually already poor. We would like to know how the cost of residential care packages managed to get so out of control.

Reablement, and the increased use of it, is mentioned several times. Reablement is the use of short-term input, usually after discharge from hospital, with a view to improving someone's situation so they do not need long term support. Whilst this can be useful in certain cases, such as if someone has had a fall, it is also limited in its usefulness and scope. It has no real relevance to people with long-term conditions and it certainly cannot be a replacement for the kind of services that will be cut if these proposals go through.

It appears that the voluntary sector will be expected to cover some of the huge gaps in services that will result from these proposals. We do not understand how the sector will be expected to do this when it is facing a cut of £1.4 million.

Priority 3

We recognise the potential to increase parking income recovery but believe this will be challenging. There is also potential for adverse public reaction to increases in parking charges and in particular consideration needs to be taken on the potential impact on lower paid residents and staff. We are pleased to note that the Council has recognised savings



Haringey Council

from contracts but would hope these have not had an adverse effect on staff employed by the vehicle contractors who tend to be low paid and overwhelmingly BAME.

We wish to place on record our complete opposition to the proposal to consider privatisation of the parking enforcement service. The Service is a high profile one and the experiences in other Boroughs of privatisation have been negative both for staff and for residents as there has been clear evidence of a profit motive becoming dominant. For staff there have been a combination of poor pay and often evidence of discrimination within the workforce, Haringey need to be aware of these issues and UNISON's position remains that services are most effectively delivered in-house, any options appraisal exercise must not be driven by the cheapest option being the best option.

While we welcome some of the proposals for Parks in terms of looking for more work from outside of the Council Parks we have serious concerns about the following. The commitment to significantly increase commercial income from Parks infers that Parks will be less available to the local community than at present. Specifically that whole parks or areas of parks will be closed in order to allow profit making to take place, this is of concern as Parks are an invaluable resource for the Community not least those with Children as they represent a place where they can take part in activities without having to pay an entrance fee.

We are concerned at what appears to be a proposal to outsource parks management in some form whether this be a Social enterprise, Community Interest Company or outright privatisation the effect will be the same a loss of ownership and control over Parks services. It is of concern that volunteers are to be further promoted presumably in the name of empowerment. The reality of a move from direct provision for the workforce has been seen in other previous privatisations pay falls and commonly staff turnover increases as the new employer "encourages" staff protected by TUPE to leave so that cheaper staff can be hired. This pattern has been seen across local government and in Haringey.

As with all such exercises there are costs associated with options appraisals and if chosen procurement options. We feel that the service which was last reviewed as recently as 2012 would be better off if these costs were instead given to the service to promote and develop their offer.

In respect of the cleaning contract it is disingenuous to show no staffing impact, in fact it is clear there will be a staffing impact in that Veolia will be forced to make people redundant to make these savings. A drop in street cleanliness is likely to lead to a reduction in the resident empowerment the Council is seeking. In short faced with rubbish on their streets the residents are less likely to have regard to promoting social responsibility.

We have similar concerns about the impact of proposals on street recycling and the Neighbourhood Action team. These reduction will limit the Council's ability to deal with dumping for example.

The proposals for Wolves Lane appear designed to create space for Dignity to make further profits by expansion of the cemetery. This would in effect be privatisation of current publically owned land. The impact and disruption caused by the closure on service users



Haringey Council

with Learning Disabilities is yet another blow for this group on top of the huge proposed cuts in Adults.

Similarly to waste management it is disingenuous to suggest there is no staffing impact this is solely because of the NLWA running the site. We have concerns about the removal of facilities from Tottenham in favour of retaining these in the west of the borough.

Priority 4

The reduction in the availability of consultation for planning to statutory minimums presents risks in our opinion. This is particularly in the context of increasingly ambitious plans for Tottenham which may include large scale demolition and rebuilding

The proposal under planning to increase use of fixed term contracts and consultants suggests potential increased costs. There will also be a reduction in opportunities for staff development. It appears to be potential privatisation by the back door.

There appear to be further privatisation proposals for Economic Development, we believe that before this approach is taken consideration should be given to a service improvement plan for an in-house provision. It is clear there may also be TUPE implications arising from these proposals and we seek an assurance that the Council agreement on potential outsourcing will be followed in full. If the film office is self funding it is simply wrong to close and re-procure this.

It is disappointing that the Council wishes to reduce its involvement in carbon reduction programmes. Haringey was rightly a leader in dealing with environmental issues and as the report recognises there is a very real risk of the target not being met as a result of the proposed cuts. This would truly be short termism of the worst kind.

With Alexandra Palace again we assume there are potential staffing reduction from the cut in subsidy. There will be a need to ensure the fabric and services are protected we remain concerned Haringey is effectively the bank of last resort should the current company fall into difficulties.

On a rare positive we welcome the HLF bid to improve Bruce Castle but we are concerned once again to see this is to potentially cease to be run by the Council.

The investment in Tottenham is much needed but we are concerned at some of the potential negative impacts on the Community. This is specifically in relation to the potential “gentrification” of the local area resulting in long standing residents and potential residents being priced out. Of particular concern are the proposals related to Council Housing which remain unclear. Our position is unequivocally that at the end of the process the Council must have more and better Council housing stock. We do not believe so called “affordable” housing is accessible to the vast majority of residents in Haringey.

Priority 5



Haringey Council

We welcome the proposals for a licencing scheme on private sector rental properties. This is much needed and we hope that it will be adopted and rolled out speedily. We similarly welcome proposals for a Private lettings and management agency.

The reduction in temporary accommodation will only in reality work if the causes of the need are addressed effectively.

We reserve our position on unified housing synergies until more details are provided of the proposals. We remain firmly of the opinion that savings can best be achieved (and service improvements) by winding up the management arrangement and bring housing management back into the Council.

Enabling Savings

We have serious concerns at the proposals for a reduction of 72 FTE within Customer Services. Clearly such a high level of job losses would be detrimental to the ability to deliver an effective customer services offer. There has been a complete lack of effective consultation on how the changes to delivery will negate the need for these posts to date. Once again the Council is spending significant amounts of money on a private company to tell it how to make savings, perhaps this would be better spent on investing in the services to make the improvements. We are concerned at the lack of effective public consultation on the new service offer and the over reliance on investment in technology: what is the Plan B if the money cannot be found or if the magic bullet fails to deliver. There needs to be an urgent equalities impact assessment on these proposals so as to ensure the most vulnerable and socially excluded do not suffer a reduction in service.

We reserve our position on the Muswell Hill Library proposals as the content of these is unclear.

The Libraries savings are a great concern, Libraries in our view are similar to Parks in fulfilling a vital role in social inclusion. We are concerned the Councils commitment not to close libraries is being delivered by reducing floorspace and potentially changing use of the Libraries to a more customer service based one. We note the document makes little or no comment on the proposal to reduce the size of Marcus Garvey library in order to accommodate services currently delivered at Apex House. There has been a lack of transparency in these proposals both in terms of staff consultation and public consultation. There needs to be a recognition of the professional status of Librarians and Libraries rather than an attempt to hide cuts as transformation. We remain particularly concerned that there has been a lack of risk assessment of the issues arising from changes of use in Library building as well as a lack of an equality impact assessment.

We are concerned at the lack of consultation or detail to date on the shared service centre proposal/BIP. So called back office functions are all too commonly viewed as easy targets for savings but it needs to be recognised these teams have already achieved considerable savings. A reduced central support could have unintended consequences such as increased risk to Council budgets through reduced monitoring as well as equality issues arising where the automation requires the public to access services and complete processes electronically. Once again we are concerned at the huge expenditure to date on consultancy on this project.

**Haringey Council**

Within the BIP project sit the current revenues and benefits service where there is a great deal of public interest and involvement. We remain unconvinced that automation can deliver the savings proposed, as with a number of other services it is the case that the bulk of Housing Benefit costs are covered by the subsidy grant. One obvious way of reducing costs would be to revisit the issue of Council Tax reductions as the reality is there is a high cost attributed to collection of small amounts of money from individuals. This is of course aside from the human cost and stress caused to many of the most vulnerable in Society, it is morally wrong that while the Council proclaims to be protecting people by freezing Council Tax it fails to take account of the impact of attempting to recover money from the poorest in the Borough.

We remain committed to defending services across the Borough and opposing attempts to privatise or outsource these. The proposals in the MTFS fail to deliver for the residents and they fail to deliver for staff. The consultation process is deficient and lacking in the opportunity to provide real alternatives.

Sean Fox & Chris Taylor on behalf of Haringey UNISON



Haringey Council

Response by Markfield to the Haringey Council consultation on its draft corporate plan, Jan 2015

Markfield is a voluntary sector organisation that has been running for over 35 years in Tottenham, working with disabled children and adults and their families. We provide short breaks services for children (after school clubs and playschemes) and social clubs and travel training for adults with Learning Disabilities and/or Autism, as well as information advice and support to families. Over a thousand people a year use our services, the overwhelming majority are Haringey residents. We have several contracts with LBH for the provision of services and receive support through the Voluntary Sector Investment Fund. This bedrock of funding we receive from the council enables us to bring in significant additional funds into the borough – eg. we have secured over a £million from lottery, government and trust funding over the last 5 years to provide services to Haringey residents.

We support the council's stated aims of the corporate plan – to give the 'best start in life for every child', and to 'support people to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives, with control over what is important to them'. In particular we strongly endorse the cross cutting theme that is stated in the plan of emphasising early intervention and prevention. *However*, the key actual proposals in the corporate plan and budget relating to services for disabled children and adults will, in our view, have exactly the opposite effect.

The proposed cuts to spending on local services will have a very detrimental impact on our service users, and also on our ability as a local voluntary sector organisation to survive:

Disabled children

The council's budget for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities is proposed to be reduced by 26%. The budget papers on the council website do not fully explain how this reduction will be made – beyond stating that services will be more 'family focused and localised'. Short breaks (respite) provision is one of the services that falls under this budget heading, so we are very worried that short breaks provision will be cut. If this is the case it would be damaging and short sighted – because short breaks are one of the key interventions that can prevent family breakdown. National research (Every Disabled Child Matters) has shown that investment in short breaks provision saves money in the long run – because it reduces stress on families, and reduces the likelihood of family



Haringey Council

breakdown. In Haringey it has been recognised that the significant reduction over the last 5 years in the number of disabled children being placed in expensive foster care and residential placements has been achieved because of the investment in short breaks under the Aiming High for Disabled Children programme.

Adults with Learning Disabilities (LD)

The budget proposes a reduction of 48% in spending on day opportunities for adults with LD. In the budget document and in the consultation meetings council officers have emphasised that they want to look at new and innovative ways of including people with LD more in the community, and to expand employment opportunities. We fully support this sentiment; the creation of innovative services and community participation for people with LD has always been at the heart of our mission as a charity. We have had a block contract from LBH for many years to provide such services and we want to continue to work in partnership with the council. However it is completely unrealistic to think that such a huge reduction in public investment in these services over a short space of time can be achieved without detrimentally affecting this vulnerable group of disabled people.

Being able to socialise and take part in meaningful activities is not a 'luxury extra' for disabled people – it is essential to maintaining physical and mental health. If these needs are not met they will not just disappear - if people cannot take part in appropriate social activities this will lead to higher levels of stress, and physical and mental illness. Having friends and social contacts is also a vitally important aspect of safeguarding vulnerable adults. Therefore to halve the investment in day opportunities is very short sighted, as it will simply shift pressure onto family carers and the health service, and increase the risk of abuse.

There has been understandably a lot of attention focussed in the local media coverage and in the consultation meetings on the plan to close 3 of the council run day centres – as a very tangible example of the loss of services. We would also like to highlight an aspect of the proposals that has been less discussed and explained – but will affect an even larger number of people with LD – all those living in residential homes and in supported housing (which includes most of the people who come to Markfield social clubs under our block contract with LBH). In the budget proposals and in the consultation meetings it has been stated that in future the housing providers will be expected to fund 'day opportunities' for such residents/tenants (ie. the residents will *not* qualify for funding for this through a personal budget). However at the same time the council is seeking to significantly cut the levels of funding to housing providers (through care purchasing efficiencies). Therefore it is not realistic that providers will be able to fund adequate day opportunities. So the likely result of this policy will be that people with LD will be stuck in their homes and will have little or no opportunity to go out to do activities in the community. This is a huge step backwards in the human rights of disabled people. It will also jeopardise the financial viability of the very successful Markfield adults social clubs for people with LD.

Safeguarding

The proposal to reduce the budget for social work staff by 25% is very worrying. There are not enough social workers at the moment in the learning disability partnership, which means that there can be extremely long delays in transitions assessments, for example. We are concerned about the impact on safeguarding of such a large reduction in social work capacity.

Impact on carers



Haringey Council

The unpaid care provided by family carers saves many billions to the public purse nationally. Markfield provides support to carers who are under massive pressure and many who are close to breaking point. What can often make the difference to enable carers to 'keep going' are services such as short breaks and day opportunities. These services are an essential part of prevention and early intervention. It is already extremely difficult to access these services – families tell us that they find that the routes to apply for them are complex and very well hidden. Eligibility criteria are very tight already - only those with critical or substantial needs qualify. This is why the proposals for these unprecedented cuts to local social care services for disabled adults, and the implied threat to cut spending on short breaks for disabled children, have created such a huge level of anxiety, despair and anger among carers – many of whom have responded individually to the consultation, and why, for example, over 6000 people in ten days have signed the petition to 'Save our Autism Services in Haringey'.

Voluntary Sector Investment Fund

The ending of the voluntary sector investment fund (HVSIF) in August 2015 will affect Markfield badly. We have received £50k per year under this fund over the last three years, which has partly ameliorated the loss of our core grant in 2012. The HVSIF pays for provision of advice surgeries to carers, and the bulk of the funding is used to pay for after school club places for children with additional needs and siblings. One of the reasons why the children's services we run are high quality is that we run services consistently throughout the year and can employ a permanent play development manager to co-ordinate this. The loss of the HVSIF will remove around a third of the funding from our play services, and will jeopardise the whole financial viability of these services.

It has been emphasised at the voluntary sector consultation meeting that the council envisages a much bigger role for the voluntary sector in the provision of services in Haringey going forward. Taken at face value this is good news for organisations like Markfield. However, there is very little in the budget proposals that explains what actual resources are being put into commissioning services from the voluntary sector. As explained above, the reality of the huge cuts to spending on services for disabled people that are set out in the council budget proposals will be to seriously undermine the viability of our organisation to survive.

Sarah Miller
Director
Markfield



Mental Health Support Association
 Tottenham Town Hall
 Town Hall Approach Road
 N15 4RY

Consultation Response to London Borough of Haringey's' Medium Term Financial Plan
 We acknowledge that LBH are in a position, whereby they will be in receipt of less central government funding than previously. This has resulted in plans to save £70 million over the next 3 years with £30 million being reduced from the adult social care budget. The Mental Health Reference Group has considered these proposals and would like to have the following comments included as part of the public consultation.

Neighbourhood Connectors

- We are concerned that new and different ways of working with those using learning disability, mental health and older persons services including the enablement model and use of "Neighbourhood Connectors" need to be firmly embedded and confidence gained in the way they work before older services are withdrawn.
- We have not seen an accurate evaluation of the pilot "Neighbourhood Connectors" project including outcomes, how they were measured, how the budget was worked out and it's' on going sustainability.
- Relapse rates, hospital admissions and numbers of clients on the Care Programme Approach (CPA) are not available for its' use in a mental health setting. How "Neighbourhood Connectors" will be extended from involving older persons to those with mental health needs is not laid out both in the service specification for "Neighbourhood Connectors" nor the Councils consultation documents.
- We acknowledge that social isolation is of equal importance in both groups.
- If the project is to be self-financing at the end of year 1, we would like to know whether clients will need to have a personal budget to access these services. We would like a detailed assessment of how personal budgets will work in this situation bearing in mind that there has been varying decisions made on what exactly a budget holder may spend their budget on?
- Support as well as Information ,for service users to access services is essential. This needs to be recognised.



Haringey Council

- Internet based databases should not replace face to face support .

Better Care Fund

- The overlap between health and social care costs are to be met by the Better Care Fund but it is not documented how much money there is available and whether this is to be ring fenced. This is surely a vital link within all the proposed changes.

Housing

- Reorganisation of housing related support is recognised as being a need for some time. The relationship between positive mental health and wellbeing with accommodation is acknowledged by all.
- There are concerns that clients who have high needs may find themselves feeling unready to move on but encouraged to do so without necessary support. The lack of good quality affordable housing in Haringey is evident and we would like to see how accommodation needs of this vulnerable group will be met. Will clients “moving on “be given preference on waiting lists?”. We foresee a greater need for “floating support” and would like to see how this need will be met
- For many years mental health service users have had to move home at each stage of their recovery as their care needs change. We welcome the idea of “care following the person rather than the building.
- At the moment we are not aware of data showing relapse rates at intervals after discharge from “floating support”. This would be useful information to view.
- There is a well -documented need for smooth transitioning of young people with mental health needs who are entering adult services. This crucial period needs to be recognised as an area when accommodation needs should be looked at extremely carefully.

Equality Impact Assessment.

- We note the Equality Impact Assessment . It has not taken in to consideration the high number of young males from BME communities with severe and enduring mental health needs living in the east of Haringey. These changes will no doubt impact on them in their usage of housing related support.
- The consultation document in both its’ e-version and hard copy is available in English only. We do not feel that this has allowed the consultation to be as open and inclusive as it could be.

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident of Haringey and Member of Haringey People First self advocacy group.



You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care), Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim



Haringey Council

head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited** and what that will mean for clients so that



Haringey Council

they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

“ The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. “ page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The



Haringey Council

situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people's social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverley Tarka at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guardians of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feelings for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Mark Heath on
member

Haringey 3 year
Learning Disabled
who is co-chair of
Partnership Board
First self advocacy



Behalf of Haringey People first

plan consultation contribution from a
resident of Haringey Dianne Smith
Haringey's Learning Disability
and supporter of Haringey People
group.



You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up



Haringey Council

in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a



Haringey Council

learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

“ The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. “ page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people's social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverlay at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.



Haringey Council

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guarders of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feeling for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Dianne Smith, Co-chair of Haringey's Learning Disability Partnership Board)

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident of Haringey Elif Alper who is a member of Haringey's Learning Disability Partnership Board and supporter of Haringey People First self advocacy group. (I was not able to meet with Elif during this period and so she asked me to hold a red card up on her behalf.)





Haringey Council

You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day



Haringey Council

centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

" The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. " page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no



Haringey Council

day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people's social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverlay at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe quarders of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feeling for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.



Haringey Council

Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Elif Alpar, Member of Haringey's Learning Disability Partnership Board)

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident of Haringey Michael Brookstein who is co-chair of Haringey's Learning Disability Partnership Board and Member of Haringey People First self advocacy group.



You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.



Haringey Council

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**



Haringey Council

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

“ The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. “ page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*



Haringey Council

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people's social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverlay at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guarders of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feeling for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Haringey People first member (Michael Brookstein)

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident Sylvia Brookstein of Haringey and Member of Haringey People First self advocacy group.

You will note the Learning communication proposed cuts, 25% cut in strongly about fellow clients those that do themselves, them so that and so that their



picture includes the holding of a red Disability Partnership Board card. This represents a firm NO to the especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and social workers. The group feel very the affect these cuts would have on and wanted to represent the many of not have the ability to communicate for This red No card is being held up for they can be included in this consultation voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".



Haringey Council

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

" The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. " page 13



Haringey Council

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to *“improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people”*

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that $\frac{3}{4}$ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people's social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Yourself at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guarders of these services for Haringey Residents.




Haringey Council

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feelings for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.

Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Haringey People first member (Sylvia Brookstein)

Haringey 3 year plan consultation contribution from a Learning Disabled resident Patrick Smalling of Haringey and Member of Haringey People First self advocacy group.



You will note the picture includes the holding of a red Learning Disability Partnership Board communication card. This represents a firm NO to the proposed cuts, especially to 3 out of 4 day centres and 25% cut in social workers. The group feel very strongly about the affect these cuts would have on fellow clients and wanted to represent the many of those that do not have the ability to communicate for themselves, This red No card is being held



Haringey Council

up for them so that they can be included in this consultation and so that their voices can be heard.

Dear Councillors and those considering Haringey's 3 year plan proposal.

Some of the below content has previously been sent to Beverley Tarka (Interim Head of Adult Social Care) , Zina Etheridge (commissioning manager) and Michael Murphy (interim head of the LD community team in Haringey), Beverley was the only one that had the grace to respond as an individual despite each e-mail asking each of them to provide answers on their own input into the drawing up of these proposals. Disappointingly, Beverley however only chose to answer a small percentage of the questions to the clients she is paid to represent. I hope that as the letter was formed by me supporting the clients to get their feelings and thoughts onto paper that others will choose to actually listen to all of the questions and find the answers that are obvious to us and in so rejecting the drastic proposals being considered currently on the most vulnerable in our society.

The members of the group feel let down by council management/councillor's and MP's and those responsible for drawing up this proposal. They asked me what the persons high up in LD service management and provision have done to represent the deep concern and cuts in services that this year 3 year proposal plan represents. They wanted to know what BT/ZE and MM's input was into the drawing up of these proposals, they all presumed that their first reaction would have been one of worry and concern, just like us. They want to feel that as they are protectors and key holders to the vital services they receive, that they have represented them, their first reactions surely could not have been, "wow, this is going to be great for the learning disability community".

As we have not received adequate answers from our first point of contact on matters like this. Please detail what you have done to represent the community you are employed to safeguard and provide life opportunities for in terms of what did you do to try and stop un person centred proposals like closing 3 out of 4 day centres and reduction in social workers even being put into the proposal in the first place?

As referred to by Beverley Tarka at the last PB on 10-12-14 when discussing the important and vital role advocacy played in consulting with Whitehall Street residents when that service was in the process of being "reprovided", the local authority knew how traumatic this change would be for residents, as with the life altering cuts potentially being imposed on clients now and so in response to this the council organised multiple consultations (at least 3 for this single building consultation) events supported by independent advocates as well as 'one to one' advocacy to support residents to have their voice's heard at separate and convenient times for those individuals. Group events are especially difficult for those with LD to contribute to which is why at PB's we break up into groups where individual time can be spent with the client. As Beverley mentioned at the last PB, this is very much similar except on a dramatically bigger scale. With this in mind



Haringey Council

then, **will the same vital/necessary independent advocacy/need be provided to each and everyone of those day centres clients on a one to one basis in order to make sure that those being affected by these proposals get the opportunity to have their input into this process.**

At the time, Haringey Mencap had to produce easy read literature for the Whitehall St consultation with clients, in the interest of making information available to everyone despite their level of need, **will the local authority be making an accessible easy read version of their 3 year plan proposals unedited and what that will mean for clients so that they can be empowered to understand these changes and subsequently have their say on their own lives and their services?**

Elif spoke to me about how when she moved to Enfield with her mother she lost all her friends overnight as she no longer accessed Markfield Friday Night and Haringey services, she still feels the impact of this now. She said the clients in the day centre's have been mixing and socialising together for years and years, if they do not see each other in **their** day centres, when will they see their friends. Many of them will lose life long friends overnight. **What will you do to ensure that this does not happen?** These services are not luxury add ons, not one single client has had any control on whether they have a learning disability and these services offer opportunities that the society we professionals operate freely in cannot. e.g. choice, inclusion and accessibility.

In considering the proposal comment.

“ The overall aim of the service re-design will develop a range of integrated health and social care community services that will support social inclusion, ensure that people are treated fairly and will enable people to access mainstream community activities wherever possible, enabling them to lead full and active lives in their communities. “ page 13

Where is the evidence for this fantastical statement. As mentioned at the last HLDPB on the 10-12-14, there is a presumption by council professionals that the Haringey we live in will be able to absorb and provide opportunities for these clients now potentially left with no day service provision. The work of Haringey People First in terms of disability hate crime, transport and the media, already show you that the society we live in is not inclusive and filled with opportunities for people with LD. Everything has to be fought for. Please actually listen to those that have to operate in society and deal with the lack of accessibility and inclusion for those with a LD.

The big society being promoted currently is words on paper, nothing more than an ideological fantasy.

With this in mind Haringey People First members have asked **what extra/new/additional money and services will the council provide to make sure that people are able to access day time activities, opportunities and that ability to make friends?**



Haringey Council

One of the recommendations on page 12 makes reference to “*improve the availability of day centres and befriending opportunities for local people*”

How can this be dared to be written into the plan when it has been clearly stated that ¾ day centres are proposed to be closed. Also how does it dare to say that decisions will improve the opportunities of befriending when such proposals directly work in reducing opportunities to maintain friendships, please note the voice of Elif, an actual former Haringey resident on the affect a family decision to move out of borough had on her. The situations are directly comparable. Overnight, people’s social networks of support and friendship could be scrapped.

Also, can you please advise why the HLDPB E-mail that was sent to all members of the HLDPB to form their consultation response on has no reference to 3 out of 4 day centres possible being cut as detailed by Beverley Tarka at the former mentioned partnership board meeting, for those that are able to read and absorb information it would be more valuable for us to be consulted on all of the proposals as opposed to those that have been selected for highlight.

Question 3 states that given the financial challenges, what do you think of our objectives and plans for adults as set out on pages 10-13.

The group reject in total commitment that any proposals to cut services for vulnerable residents of Haringey should be overwhelmingly rejected. There is no justifiable fiscal or moral argument which can justify any sanction of the proposals to remove Day centres that provide vital, essential, accessible, appropriately staffed and places of friendship for the vulnerable residents of Haringey. We also fully reject any plans to cut social workers who are the frontline key holders and safe guards of these services for Haringey Residents.

Your time and effort in answering these questions from Haringey Learning Disabled Clients and including their thoughts and feelings for consultation on these cuts proposals is greatly appreciated.



Many thanks,

Mark Heath on Behalf of Haringey People first member (Patrick Smalling)

Haringey residents say “no” to cuts to day services and “no” to a reduction in Social workers, please think about the affect of these proposals on the vulnerable people’s lives that lie behind the numbers and words of such funding cuts proposals.



Haringey Council



young people's consultation service
12 Middle Lane, Crouch End, London N8 8PL
tel 020 8348 5947 fax 020 8341 1684

Charlotte Pomery
Assistant Director Commissioning
Commissioning Unit
River Park House
225 High Road
London N22 8HQ

January 18th 2015

Dear Charlotte,

Re: Building a Stronger Haringey Together – Budget Consultation

I am writing to you in relation to the Budget Consultation process currently underway and the call for responses which closes today.

We fully appreciate the considerable pressures placed on the Council by the cuts in central government funding and are fully aware that difficult decisions have to be made about the size and shape of services in the coming years. We are very encouraged by Claire Kober's reported refusal to 'simply manage decline' and fully endorse the five key priorities set out in the Three-Year Corporate Plan - 'Building a Stronger Haringey Together'.

As a service dedicated to improving the mental health and well-being of young people and families, we particularly welcome the centrality given to prevention and early intervention in the three year plan and its stated aim to enhance health, resilience and self-reliance. These are at the heart of what Open Door aims to achieve in its own work with young people and families and we are already actively involved in the Early Help initiative and are optimistic about its future in the borough. We also welcome the proposal in the corporate plan to diversify service providers and to commission organisations which can deliver



Haringey Council

innovative and creative solutions. As active members of the voluntary sector in the borough we fully recognise the important contribution made by the sector and the value it adds to statutory provision.

Whilst we are broadly positive about much in the Corporate Plan we have some concerns about how the local authority will manage to balance what one might characterise broadly as a 'self-help' / 'enabling' approach - which also envisages an increased role for volunteers - with the need for specialist services delivered by appropriately skilled professionals. This is less about protecting jobs, than it is about recognising that the multiple and complex needs of many Haringey residents require high quality specialist input.

In the Corporate Plan there is a great deal of emphasis on information and advice through which young people, parents, etc. will be able to identify their needs and make 'informed choices' about what help they might need and to signpost them. The obvious concern is whether there will be sufficient services to actually signpost people to.

Our concern about how this might look in practice is perhaps best illustrated by our own situation. For some years, Open Door has received limited funding from the Council towards its transitional service for young adults, aged 18-24. We managed to hold on to 45% of funding following the first round of budget cuts. This relatively small amount - £9,500 - has been crucial not only in allowing the delivery of therapy (by staff and volunteers) but also in providing seed money from which we bring in additional resources, more than tripling our budget for this work. As you know, this funding stream will be cut from April 1st. We have been invited to bid for a couple of Mental Health tenders in Haringey and had hoped that we would be able to develop this much needed service. However, the emphasis in these tenders is essentially on information, advice, education, sign-posting, anti-stigma, etc. This is of course valuable, preventative, early-intervention work and fits within the remit of Public Health. Amongst other things, providers are instructed to, 'enable people to disclose their mental health problems in a supportive atmosphere'. Our issue with this is what happens next, if services like Open Door are no longer there to provide specialist mental health support and treatment.

It might well be that the Local Authority no longer sees this as its function and that this belongs exclusively in the Health Service. If this is the case there needs to be clarity and effective joint commissioning. Failing this, a campaign, which we will gladly join!

I do not wish to reduce everything to our own situation but feel that this example captures our concerns as well as our hope that the Council will continue to offer support to organisations who can demonstrate effectiveness both in terms of outcomes and financial sustainability.

We understand that there will be further opportunities for consultation with providers and users of services which we look forward to participating in.

With good wishes,



Haringey Council

Julia Britton
Consultant Child & Adolescent Psychotherapist
Director

Health and Social Care Sub Group of the Haringey Forum for Older People.

This is the joint submission of Health and Social Care Sub Group of the Haringey Forum for Older People. We have a number of points to make. 1. it is unnecessary for the Council to push through a 3 year budget plan. They are only obliged to produce a 1 year budget plan. Given the possible change in central government from May 2015 it would be prudent to formulate budget plans for further years after the May election. 2. it is almost impossible to comment on the impact of this proposed budget when there is no detail whatsoever on the mechanism of achieving these proposals. We point out that there has been no usable impact or risk assessment made available. We would also point out that the period of consultation and availability of the document has been poor to say the least. 3. Nowhere are any transitional plans mentioned let alone detailed. For cuts of this extent to be viable and not adversely affect the vulnerable a transitional plan MUST be in place before the first cut is made. 4. Your strapline 'Building a stronger Haringey together' is completely misleading when your cuts are at the expense of the most vulnerable in our borough. Your five objectives in this area are totally at odds with your proposals - what you will get is a community of residents that will live healthily for less time, who will not feel supported to live independently and who will not be helped at an early stage to maintain their CURRENT health and well being. 5. This budget proposal does nothing to further the mental health of the population of Haringey. One of the main priorities of the Health and Well Being Board is to concentrate on improving mental health in the borough - including combating social isolation, instead your proposals will exacerbate this and other mental health issues. 6. With the cuts to social care in the Haringey Budget you will INCREASE the burden on our NHS services in the borough. It is already difficult to marry up the free NHS service with a means tested social care service. The result will be that Haringey residents will be unable to access NHS health services that they need because patients have not been assimilated back into the community. 7. In many parts of your proposal there is an assumed reliance on volunteers and the voluntary sector. Yet on the other hand in the same document you are slashing the voluntary sector funding by 50%. Utterly incompatible. You will need to fund the organisation of all these volunteers, someone will need to recruit these volunteers, they will need training and checks. This does not come for free and without the controls in place you expose adults and families to abuse. This is totally against your vision under priority 2. We strongly feel that your proposals are empty rhetoric reflecting adversely on the vulnerable of Haringey.



CYPRIOT COMMUNITY CENTRE. HARINGEY

Building a Stronger Haringey Together Three-Year Plan & Budget Consultation For Residents & Businesses

Comments & Replies from Cypriot Community Centre (CCC) including Cypriot Elderly & Disabled Group & Day Care Services (CEDG)

Question 2 covering pages 4-9

The larger community centres with the right facilities, e.g. the CCC has a Youth Floor, can be used to provide “After School” facilities.

In addition, they can be used for Education to run play schemes in the holiday periods. The latter used to happen at the CCC but this does need funding i.e. for CRB accredited youth workers.

Simple games and clever “fun” tutoring could be provided on site but external trips which would involve “risk assessment” responsibilities could be avoided.

Page 2 Statement”Extend the range of services on offer to cater for more Haringey residents, for example, by providing employment support help with English Language skills and housing advice”.

The Housing Related Supporting People schemes at present funded by Haringey Council to the B&ME organisations (which include the CCC and the CEDG – Cypriot Elderly & Disabled Group & Day Services who are “Housed” at the CCC) already provide housing and housing related advice.

The CCC is also inundated with requests for employment support, job information, liaison with our Haringey Job Centres, etc.

We would like to recommend the continuation of the funding for these services beyond 2016.

The CCC is also seeing a growing number of residents from EU countries, in particular from Greece, whom we should encourage to attend English classes. Ideally, these can be held in “community friendly” central points, e.g. CCC.



Haringey Council

Page 7 Community centres can be used and seen as “attractive”, for After School Learning but would need tutors and overheads to be met by the Council.

1

**Building a Stronger Haringey Together cont.
CCC's * & CEDG's comments cont.**

**Question 3 covering pages 10-13 Objectives & Plans for Adults, i.e.
Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives**

Our Council to avoid using private companies who provide “chilled” or “frozen” for Meals-on-Wheels (MoW). This is because many residents needing MoW have slight dementia and there can be heating problems, i.e. how to heat food safely.. In addition, when one of our Muslim Turkish-Cypriot clients, who is also diabetic, ordered a meal, he was sent a meal which contained a whole range of additives and he was sent a pudding which was not for someone with diabetes.

The CCC's MoW service provides daily, freshly cooked nutritional meals plus a separate diabetic menu (non- pork to also meet the needs of Haringey's Muslim residents. These hot meals also provide a contact point for isolated residents, e.g. knowing that someone “cares” about them, and will report any mishap to the appropriate service or agency. Additionally, this provides peace of mind for family carers who work during the day or live a long distance from their elderly parents who live in Haringey.

People discharged from hospital into the community particularly need this support.

Centres with Drop In areas such as the CCC provide a 363 days a year safe and warm environment.

Day care services such as the CEDG which provides transport as well as other “personal” support and welfare advice and accessing, advocacy support, are vital to retain residents' independence within the community and support, where they exist, for carers. For the clients' health, both mental and physical, Activities. Exercises. Chiropody, conversation, reminiscing, etc. are also provided. Therefore, we would encourage and welcome our Council to continue referrals to the CEDG to maintain and support residents within the community.

GPs – the CCC and CEDG already have excellent relations with our GPs – indeed across the borough and, in particular, those who have language skills. This could be developed further.



Haringey Council

We agree that the NHS should be encouraged to work closer with us, i.e. the Council and the community – to help retain and support residents in the community. Dare we say this, but also financially!

The CCC is a One Stop Centre and, bolstering our advisory service would avoid residents having to shop around and getting “lost” in the process. In addition, in the CCC’s case, the residents also receive cultural and linguistic support and advice.

Other services, such as Housing, Police, can and do provide outreach sessions at the CCC. This could be further developed.

Question 4 – Clean & Safe Borough pages 14-19

Apart from providing a safe and warm environment through the year, the CCC has a good liaison with our local police and encourage them to call in whenever possible. In addition we have a good relationship with the Metropolitan Police Greek Staff Association.

We would like to see our Council using our local Cypriot Press and Media more regularly regarding information re council services and developments.

We would like to see more ordinary and larger litter bins throughout Haringey and especially in our parks and “common” areas, e.g. Ducketts Common.

The CCC has a contract with British Pest Control and we believe other establishments should be encouraged to do the same for the protection of residents/users.

Pages 18 Agree with these proposals.

Page 19 The CCC has excellent facilities and equipment for training and we would like further usage of our facilities by both the Council and the Health Authority. This also applies to

Question 5 – Create Employment Opportunities pages 20-22

We agree with jobs and targeting the Wood Green area.

In fact, the CCC is in a key area to provide support services in the Wood Green area. The CCC provides a “community friendly” environment to learn about job opportunities and vacancies. Therefore, perhaps “Job/Employment Surgeries” could be held here.

At this point, although we are primarily a Cypriot Community Centre, we welcome anyone who feels that they can benefit from our services and facilities and relevant developments, i.e. we are

Inclusive and not exclusive

Susie Constantinides Chair, Cypriot Community Centre



Haringey Council

Chris Stylianou Manager/Co-ordinator, Cypriot Community Centre

John Constantinou Service Manager, Cypriot Elderly & Disabled Group & Day Care Services

Haringey Learning Disabilities Partnership Board

Dear Cllr Morton,

As members of the Haringey Learning Disabilities Partnership Board, we are shocked and alarmed at the plans for major cuts to services for adults with severe learning disabilities. Planned cuts include:

- Closure of 3 of the 4 day centres for people with LD/autism;
- Closure of Linden Road residential home
- Reductions in spending on individual care packages and residential placements for vulnerable adults of just under £10m (around a fifth of the budget);
- Reduction in the number of social workers by a quarter;
- Removal of council funding for daytime activities for people living in residential homes and supported housing.

We believe that these proposals represent an abandonment of the Council's commitment to protect its vulnerable residents. Furthermore, we believe that, if these cuts are implemented, the Council will be unable to comply with its legal responsibilities under the Care Act 2014. We are fully in favour of exploring new and better ways of enabling people with LD to live fuller lives and we accept the importance of promoting *prevention and early intervention* (as stated in the Corporate Plan). However we believe that the proposed cuts in funding for services will achieve *exactly the opposite result*. Evidence from research carried out by the LDPB (see below) shows that these budget cuts will make the lives of people with LD much harder, and put family carers under more pressure, leading to a greater potential for family breakdown, abuse and neglect.

Impact of the cuts

The Corporate Plan asserts that that the 'impact on residents' of cutting £30 million (a third) from the adults social care budget will be 'improved well being'. However, no evidence has been put forward by the Council to back up this wholly unrealistic assertion. The LDPB undertook substantial research in May 2014 into the views of people in Haringey with LD, their family carers, and staff who provide LD services. This research has now been published.* Our study found that:



Haringey Council

- People value highly existing local services such as day centres, social clubs, and supported housing. People with LD said they would be 'upset', 'sad', 'angry', 'anxious', 'lonely' and 'isolated' if services were withdrawn. Many said that cuts to their services would have an adverse impact on their health.
- Carers regard these services as essential to their own well-being, as well as to the well-being of the person they care for. A key finding was that cutting services that help carers to carry on supporting people at home would not actually save money - because it would result in many carers no longer being willing or able to fulfil this role, with the result that more expensive services, such as 24-hour or residential care, would then be needed.

Closure of day centres

Three out of the four centres providing day activities for people with LD are set to close, with the loss of skilled, experienced and dedicated teams of staff. The Corporate Plan asserts that 'community-based activities' will replace the provision currently provided by day centres. The plan offers no evidence that there will be capacity to support the genuine inclusion of people with LD in mainstream community activities in the absence of a centre from which this can be organised. We fear that these closures will result in more people with LD – and in particular those with more complex needs and challenging behaviour – being stuck at home. The resulting isolation and boredom are likely to have adverse effects on their physical and mental health – as well as imposing a greater burden on families and carers. After ceasing to fund access to day centres for people in residential care and supported housing, the council expects housing providers to support daytime activities, but without providing additional funding. Some providers may be unable to provide such services, and it is not clear how the council could monitor these provisions – especially in view of the proposed cuts in social worker staff.

Cuts to individual care packages

Under the Care Act it is unlawful for local authorities to use reviews of individual care packages as a mechanism for reducing support - *unless* there has been a reduction in the actual level of need. Yet the council is proposing to reduce by a fifth the budget for such packages. It does not explain why it expects the levels of need to fall so dramatically.

Driving down contract costs: a 'race to the bottom'

The council aims to drive down the costs of commissioned services to match those of the cheapest in London. There is likely to result in a 'race to the bottom' in terms of quality of services. The Plan does not give details of how it can ensure that the quality of care is maintained.

London Living Wage

The quality of care is intrinsically linked to the training, skill and commitment of the workers delivering that care, and decent pay and conditions are an important element of this. The Plan makes no reference to the council's previously stated aim to achieve London Living Wage accreditation. Has this commitment been abandoned?



Haringey Council

Access to and objectivity of assessments

The LDPB currently receives regular reports from the carers' forum about the great difficulty families are experiencing in gaining access to social workers, and about delays in assessments (notably in relation to 'transition' to adult services). The plan to cut social work numbers by a quarter will only make this situation worse. We are also concerned that social work managers are being urged to have 'uppermost in their minds' the need to make budget savings, potentially to the detriment of their professional duty to the individual client.

Access to advocacy

We are concerned about plans to reduce advocacy services:

- The new contract allocates only £50k for all advocacy needs of vulnerable groups, including people with LD, mental health service users, and dementia sufferers, and their carers. This is inadequate to meet the requirements stipulated in the Care Act.
- The remit of the new advocacy support offer is narrower and more restricted than the previous arrangements. People will be unable to refer themselves but will have to be vetted by the council, which has a clear conflict of interest in cases where people are seeking advice in relation to challenging council decisions.

Provision of support for the Partnership Board

We would like to place on record our shock and dismay at the way the decision to withdraw the contract providing support for LD members on the LDPB has been handled by the council. The lack of consultation, lack of information and hasty decision-making have been distressing for all involved and have resulted in the loss of valued and skilled advocates. (We note that the Interim Director of Adult Social Care has made an apology to the board in relation to this matter.)

Consultation period is too short

We are concerned that the council has arranged a very short time for consultation over these proposals. A consultation period arranged over the Christmas break makes meaningful consultation with those affected by these cuts very difficult.

We urge the Cabinet to reconsider the proposed cuts to services for vulnerable adults, and we request the following:

- Clarification of the council's position on the London Living Wage.
- A commitment that all families and users of services are *routinely* informed of their legal rights under the Care Act before any changes to support packages are considered. They should be informed that reviews *cannot* be used to cut support *unless* there is evidence of a change in the level of the person's needs. They should also be told how they can challenge council decisions on care packages.



Haringey Council

- That the council provides (anonymised) data to the LDPB on the results of reviews to care packages, indicating changes to levels of funding and support.
- That the council commissions independent research into the impact of any cuts/changes in service provision on vulnerable residents and publishes the results on its website.
- That the council publishes data on delays to assessments of eligibility for adults social care, and sets a target for length of time from an assessment being first requested to it being completed (under the Care Act this must be timely and reasonable).
- An extension to the consultation period on the draft Corporate Plan.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Miller and Mary Langan

on behalf of the carers, service users and voluntary sector representatives on the Haringey Learning Disability Partnership Board

cc.

Haringey Councillors

David Lammy MP

Lynne Featherstone MP

** 'The impact of cuts in services for people with learning disabilities in an inner city borough', in Learning Disability Today: November/December 2014 Pavilion Publishing Ltd*



Older Peoples Reference Group response to proposed Council cuts

Dear Councillor Morton, and Councillor Kober,

I am writing now, to you both as lead on health and wellbeing and as Council leader, on behalf of the Older Peoples Reference Group [OPRG] which is constituted to relate to the Adults Partnership Board with the Council and CCG representing older people as users, and also now as joint partners in services. As you know I have written to you, Councillor Morton, earlier this month with a first response. I am now able to summarise below the results of discussion by the OPRG and of our views following the open consultations which you had at some of the sites.

Our position on the intended closures outlined is that:

A] **The Haven** must remain as the essential service which it is. You will have heard how people with mild dementia, and those for whom it is their main point of contact outside the home depend on the place, the staff, and the friends they have there. All the social and psychological research of which we are aware underlines the value of contacts beyond the home and of regular stimulation in a social setting, amplified by nutrition, for those in isolated and in depression inducing circumstances. As both family and domiciliary care are now so stretched, both through demands of living standards for many not rising [or actually falling] and eligibility criteria for home care and delivery being so limiting, we cannot see how closure of day centres can be compensated by short term measures such as re-ablement. Re-ablement is important but it is no way a substitute for day care and vital contact, as it is a specific service for recovering individuals.

B] **The day centres** for people with dementia, Haynes and Grange, must remain. They are literally a lifeline for many people. Again I am sure you must now be aware of this, having heard from carers.

C] **Osborne Grove** nursing home should not be run down as it provides for a vital residential care need which will not diminish no matter efforts which are made to provide more preventive care -- which we support-- as all the current projections are for more older people, and the clinical knowledge base advises that frailty and dependency in later life are increasing. There is also space under-used in Osborne Grove which can of course be put to good use.

D] **Staff reductions** should not be made as there is enough evidence that present staff loads are over-stretched and any further reduction will have a very high risk of losing important skills and experience as well as lack of direct care which needs to be provided by trained professionals. Family, volunteer involvement, co-working and space for re-



Haringey Council

ablement are all worth pursuing -- as the Priority 2 document suggests -- but they cannot be regarded as substitutes for funding to be taken away and the loss of professional input; what's more these are un-costed, without transitional plan, and any impact assessment on the most vulnerable people.

E] Older people are sometimes themselves **carers for** younger people, for instance **those with learning disabilities**, and the intended closure of three day centres for people with learning disabilities, is extremely alarming for people who are anxious enough about their children's prospects when they as parents or carers will no longer be alive. And as 24 hour continuous care is in short supply, the OPRG opposes the closure of Linden House and the running down of day centres for some of the most vulnerable people in the borough. We re-iterate the shock at this expressed by those in the Learning Disability Partnership Board.

F] Our position is that older people in Haringey have not only a right to life, but a **quality of life** -- and we take that as directly implied by the **Health and Wellbeing Strategy** currently promoted by both Haringey Council and the CCG, and the priorities identified within that. We understand these priorities are now under review. We see "empowering adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives" meaning that professionals and other staff will help do that, NOT that we just manage amongst ourselves, have more volunteers, and are commissioned at a distance. We are stating that we consider that this MTFS framework and the three year £70 million savings and cuts programme is putting this aspect of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy at **unacceptable risk** for older adults [and indeed others such as young people with the taking away of youth services].

G] Of the alternatives put forward we understand well enough why the Council should seek to develop **social enterprises**, and indeed we would welcome local social enterprise in preference to some of the larger corporate firms which now engage in domiciliary and other forms of care, often employing staff well below a living wage, or even minimum wages in some cases. **Neighbourhood Connects** is cited as one such alternative. But how can you put up a pilot programme well below £1million in funding as replacement for about £16.9 million cuts set out for residential care, funding for physically disabled people [some of whom are elderly], social workers, care packages, and reduced funding for the voluntary sector [£1.4 million there alone, yet the voluntary sector is held up as the future of provision]?

H] We also understand that the **Better Care Fund** is due to come on line, and that the Council will have new responsibilities under the **Care Act**, from April 2015, and more from April 2016, including rights of all adults to assessment for care when asked for, and the Council's requirement both to engage and make provision. There is as yet uncertain committed funding for this, and an election in the offing, so why now state how much you will take away, before you even know what income is coming in, and before operational costings of significant changes have been done? And under the **NHS and Social Care Act** there are new duties, particularly related to public health functions to be taken on, yet you intend to make savings amongst public health staff? Now that the Shadow Secretary of State for Health has said he will repeal the NHS and Social Care Act if put in government after May this year, and will take further measures to **integrate health and**



Haringey Council

social care, this seems all the more reason not to give up a £70 million reduction in funding now. In the year ahead there are bound to be some significant adjustments to all the central calculations for local authority funding and indeed the assumptions of less spending on welfare, so **why now of all times ask the most vulnerable people in the borough to give up much of their social care?**

1] There are other areas of these cuts, **not just in Priority 2**, which will seriously affect elders. Reductions in respite and in childrens centres affect grandparents too. Losing recycling points will seriously disadvantage those with limited mobility. The housing strategy needs re-thought. Enfield for instance have found a way round the restrictions on Right to Buy diminishing housing stock. The determination to make so much more access to services through on-line means does really disadvantage many older people further, and the moreso those very people who are currently not visible and cannot afford computers or the learning costs for use. We do not oppose better and more technology --- particularly given that tele-care and alarm systems are important for frail elders, and many of us do use on-line technology but that cannot be put forward as the only or main preference for access.

I am writing separately on the question of the economic and financial alternatives which the Council does not seem to wish to consider.

But at this point the OPRG wishes to point out the following:

1] You could **consider a Council Tax rise**, and even given the strictures put on that by current central government, there is a strong argument for people paying a little more, especially the better off, and not penalising further the poorer people in the borough by your only active Council Tax policy of trying to get moneys back from those who can ill afford it. We note that this latter has been challenged in a Supreme Court judgement. We also note that Islington Council is raising Council Tax and reckons to alleviate harsher measures by doing so.

2] You could consider a **one year budget legally now**, while we think you have not allowed nearly enough time for consultation on this one, and could also postpone the budget setting until March.

3] Constructing a three year financial course now, predicated on budget savings from the core elements of social care and some environmental care, is not only **morally the wrong course but financially unnecessary** unless your main aim is in fact to reduce the role of the Council to a commissioning authority with little or no direct provision.

4] There are **Reserves** you could use, and take more imaginative, and legal, ways of constructing the revenue and capital budgets so that core statutorily backed functions are not adversely affected.

5] You should spend significantly **less on consultants** who are not accountable and there is no proof of value for money for us. Co-operative working with residents groups and various associations in the borough on shared budgetting proposals would be much better. And you could **approach the trades unions** about preferred ways of working differently with staff job descriptions and jointly with community based organisations.

6] There is **no transitional funding plan** and volume costs estimates to meet expected needs, and **impact assessment**, which should precede --- not come after, as at present -- any proposed large scale budget reduction.



Haringey Council

7] There are safeguarding implications for vulnerable adults you have not included in this framework, and we consider that dangerous both morally and legally.

8] There are better ways in which you could **use planning gain income**, and not yield to development corporation priorities.

We would happily meet with you or other councillors to consider both the impact and alternatives should you wish.

These possibilities assume you do not intend to challenge the current government policies.

We would prefer that you did challenge them on our behalf, and we simply do not believe that the threat of commissioners would be worse than you are doing. On a personal note, as someone who lived and worked as a chief officer through that threat in the Thatcher years, I think it is wrong for you to say you have no alternative but to do what the government plans for local government and to make Haringey stronger by doing it this way. That is frankly an incredible statement.

On the basis of the foregoing and such feedback as you have listened to in the very short time for consultation to date, the OPRG urges you to think again and not make these projected cuts.

Yours sincerely,

Gordon Peters

Chair, Older People Reference Group, and member of Haringey Older Peoples Forum



Haringey Council

Marcusandmarcus.co.uk

Dear Councillor Morton,

I have just been made aware of the proposed cuts and efficiency savings to the Adult Learning Difficulty budgets for the next three years.

We are a local provider of specialist services for Adults affected by a Learning Disability / Autism and Complex Behaviours. We currently employ around 230 support staff. We pay our support staff a minimum of £8.50 to £10 per hour. As an Organisation we have frozen support staff wages for the past 4 years.

As Councillor you must be aware of the costs of living within a London Borough like Haringey ie. Renting a single bedroom [what you would ordinarily refer to as a "Box Room"] costs approximately £350 per week.

Note that this is for a room within a house with no access to a Living Room etc. ie. all rooms including the Living Room are let out!!

A double room costs anything from £550 to £600 per month.

These figures are for Tottenham and not Crouch End or Muswell Hill. Factor into the above transport and food and very soon support staff would not be able to live in Haringey.

This being the case, the cost to travel to work would correspondingly increase if they live out of Haringey.

Know that parts of the Borough are already out of reach for frontline support staff eg. Crouch End, Muswell Hill, Highgate, Bounds Green etc.

Add to this, the recent gentrification of Tottenham with "City workers" has made buying a terraced house in Tottenham impossible for even civil servants – a terraced house costs around £500,000.00 to £600,000.00.

Whilst I appreciate that efficiency savings are necessary, decimating services to the point of no return or creating a climate ripe for a local "Winterbourne Scandal" would certainly not be in anyone's agenda!!

I think that it is important for decision makers to be in touch with local providers and understand the true cost of employing, training and supporting staff. We recently organised an Open Day to recruit staff.

Typically, we would get applicants from the local Jobcentres. The Open Day in question was specifically set up to recruit staff to support a young man with a diagnosis of Autism and



Haringey Council

Complex Behavioural issues. The parent of this young man asked to be involved in the Open Day. We had 25 attendees and at the end of the day, the feedback from the parent was "...I would not employ any of them I saw today to even take care of my dog"!!! It was a slap in the face for the staff who had organised the Open Day and quite soul destroying. Whilst it would be easy to jump and label the parent as "unreasonable or difficult" – I am fortunate that I know this parent quite well and he is far from difficult nor unreasonable.

By the way, the proposed rate of pay for the staff was £10 per hour!! Factor into this a conversation I had with a recent ex-Commissioner in Haringey who told me that it was possible to employ support staff at the National Minimum Wage.

Whilst it is always possible to employ someone at the National Minimum Wage, would you like someone who cannot read, write or speak basic English, who is unreliable with their time keeping to support your vulnerable son or daughter?

Know that we are not talking about recruiting staff to deliver meals or merely dispense medication or to give someone a bath. We are talking about providing support to people with complex behavioural and communication needs, people who struggle with using and understanding communication, people who respond to consistency of staffing, people who struggle with social interaction. Employing someone who is unreliable, someone who turns up for work one day and not the next, someone who has excuses for being late every time – is but only going to heighten levels of anxiety and challenging behaviour.

Know that the people we support do not choose to be born with a Learning Difficulty or Autism or both. What some of them do know is to use a range difficult behaviours such as screaming, aggression to property and or persons, self-harm, faecal smearing etc to communicate their unmet needs and a system that responds to this, using tokenistic approaches is a system that is not fit for purpose.

There has been lots of talk of the use of "Zero Hour" contracts within our sector of late. Typically, "Zero Hour" contracts give companies tendering for "Block Contracts" a competitive edge. My experience of employing support staff for the past 18 years is that unless staff are given Fixed Term Contracts, it is not uncommon for staff on "Zero Hour" contracts to place their name on the register of every Employment Agency going and thereon respond to the first employer who calls them offering the most tempting pay. Again, employing such staff to support someone with complex behavioural issues who needs consistency of staffing is only going to further teach them to use inappropriate behaviours to communicate their needs.

Whilst I cannot tell the Council what to do and what not to do, I am concerned about the use of "Block Contracts" to achieve efficiency savings. I am not sure if the ideas of Personalisation and Block Contracts are compatible at all??



Haringey Council

As explained above, I have been providing services within Haringey for the past 18 years. When I started in 1996, it was not uncommon for most people with complex needs to be placed out of Borough as there weren't local services to meet their needs.

The notion of a person being sent miles away from his or her family just because of their disability is not something to be proud of. I am aware that the Borough has tried at various times to bring such people back to the Borough, but with sky high local property prices and increased costs of living, unless we have a coherent commissioning plan and one that is sensibly funded, we are on the road to destroying and dismantling existing services and dis-incentivising entrepreneurship.

As a Company, we have been part of the process of making savings for the Borough eg. we brought back CN from Suffolk – saving Haringey about £2000 per week – this is just one example!

Should you wish to discuss the email above, I would be more than willing to arrange to meet you.

Edward Marcus
Director

MARCUS MARCUS

www.marcusandmarcus.co.uk



The following responses were also received:

Hornsey Housing Trust

As a long established housing association working exclusively in the borough and providing homes and services to elderly and vulnerable people, Hornsey Housing Trust very much welcome the opportunity to work with Neighbourhood Connects to deliver high quality services from our 5 sheltered schemes, in light of the closure of your day centres. We are currently operating a dementia pathway service in partnership with the Alzheimer's Society, which is providing support and guidance to our residents as well as people suffering from memory loss in the local community. This could be an opportunity to develop partnerships with Neighbourhood Connects to reduce social isolation through befriending opportunities. As a contractor providing housing related support services to residents so that we can develop their capacity to live independently in appropriate accommodation, we are well placed to review the appropriateness of care packages and consider alternative approaches. We look forward to working in partnership with Neighbourhood Connects.

Haringey Education Business Partnership

The Haven has offered work experience to children within the borough of Haringey for the past 15 years and is one of the few places left who offer this opportunity to give young people an insight into working and working in a social care setting. This has proven especially powerful for those wishing to do a Health and Social Care course and make a career of this once they have left school. We have also had good results from placing children with Special Needs at The Haven, with one student moving into the world of catering after being inspired by the cook at The Haven.

I understand that there is a proposal to close this valuable asset and would ask you to reconsider this proposal. This would not only be appreciated, I am sure, by the older people who attend but would be a tragic loss for young people who will not have the opportunity of a work experience placement at The Haven.

Haringey Autism

I view with great dismay and trepidation phrases used in section 17 of the documenting outlining proposed cuts in social care to be debated tonight.

To drive down service providers costs to those of 'higher performing authorities' is in fact to drive down costs to the level of the lowest level providing authorities, and is merely clever use of wording to disguise the reality of forcing providers to hire at minimum wage or little above that and expect them to be able to provide consistent, trained and safe staffing for



Haringey Council

our most difficult, complex and vulnerable adults in a sole working environment. All of the providers I spoke to who specialise in autism assured me it was not possible to do well or safely. I believe it is not possible to do, merely for the less scrupulous organisations to dupe the council into believing it possible at the tendering stage, then leaving the council to pick up the pieces when it goes very wrong.

This is a concern we have raised before with Continuing Care and Adult LD leads and have been engaged in an autism working group on where we have at length put forward our concerns regarding cuts for this group.

I am deeply disturbed to see this issue rising again with no consultation with the very autism working group set up for this purpose by Claire Kober.

AMBITIOUS ABOUT AUTISM

Dear Jason

I hope you don't mind me emailing you directly with Ambitious about Autism's response to Haringey's consultation, however, as Clare Bull may have mentioned, I'm not convinced that the submission sent correctly when I attempted to complete the online form last Friday. We had a very short response to the consultation which I have included below:

Priority 1

- The needs of children, young people and adults with autism should be protected and their access to statutory services should not be restricted as a result of budget cuts. The National Audit Office estimates that supporting young disabled people to live more independently can reduce lifetime support costs by £1million per person. Supporting them to access work reduces lifetime costs to the public purse by £170,000 per person, and increases the person's income by 55 – 95%. Cutting support for young people with autism is a false economy.
- In September 2014 the Children and Families Act came into force. This places a number of new duties on local authorities regarding children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). We are concerned that there is no clear strategy for SEND within the proposals and no real detailed plan for Haringey to be able to ensure that it meets the requirements under the Children and Families Act.

Priority 2

- Ambitious about Autism believes that cutting grants to voluntary agencies will have an impact on Haringey's early intervention and preventative aspirations. Smaller voluntary agencies may not be in a position to tender for contracts, leaving a gap in provision of services such as advice and support.

Please do let me know if you have any questions or if you need any further information.

Best wishes



Haringey Council

Rachel

Rachel Dufton
Director of External Affairs
Ambitious about Autism

From Autism Working Group

Re: Cuts to services for people with autism and complex needs in Haringey

We are shocked to hear of the proposed major cuts to services for vulnerable adults in Haringey, made public on 11 December in the Council's draft corporate plan and medium term financial strategy. These cuts will bear very severely on people with autism and complex needs and have been announced without any review of need. Furthermore there has been no attempt to consult with all those (including people with autism, their families and carers and staff in various support services) who are going to be affected.

You will recall that, on 5 November 2013 and 16 January 2014, you met family members and carers who were concerned about the use of reviews of care packages to drive down costs, without giving due consideration to the particular needs of the individuals concerned. In the course of these discussions, it was accepted that the council would not reduce funding without a comprehensive review of needs. It was also accepted that the further implementation of policy in this area would proceed in consultation with an Autism Working Group, formed with a view to establishing an Autism Partnership Board. Yet, despite engaging over the past year in a series of meetings with council officers in pursuit of these objectives, we now discover plans to implement even more drastic and wide-ranging cuts.

- **Care packages**

The council plans to reduce spending on individual care packages and residential placements for vulnerable adults by almost £10m (around 20% of the current budget). This is likely to result in pressure to transfer individuals to supported living projects run by the lowest cost providers – who rely on poorly paid staff, often lacking in relevant skills and experience, with limited training opportunities. This will lead to a high turnover of staff and a loss of continuity and quality of care. Some individuals with complex needs and challenging behaviours will be transferred 'into the community' – in some cases into the care of ageing parents and other carers. Contrary to the presumption that this will provide a higher level of care, it is likely to put more pressure on families, resulting in crises in which emergency care becomes necessary. This is not only a false economy, it is also likely to lead to admissions to 'Winterbourne View'-type institutions – exactly what the recent Bubb Report aims to avoid. Furthermore if these cuts are implemented, we believe the council will be unable to comply with its legal responsibilities under the Care Act 2014, which include strengthening support for carers.

- **Day opportunities**

The council plans to close three of the four day centres in the borough, including the one at Roundway, the only day service in Haringey designed for people with autistic spectrum conditions. This is justified by the presumed superiority of services provided in the community over 'buildings-based' services. But some people with autism (who may



Haringey Council

experience high levels of anxiety and present challenging behaviours) need the sort of consistent and structured service currently provided in a secure and familiar place with staff who have relevant training and experience – and who have built up relationships with the people using their services. Furthermore, there is often limited scope for community-based activities and people may find themselves seeing a succession of poorly-paid carers (often lacking in training or experience).

- **Social workers**

The plan to cut social work staff by 25% will increase the risk of people with autism being subjected to diverse forms of abuse and exploitation. Even at current staffing levels social workers are struggling to provide adequate safeguarding procedures for vulnerable adults in the community; the cuts are likely to make a bad situation worse.

- **Consultation**

We are concerned that the council's engagement with the autism community in the borough has acquired the character of a series of perfunctory and token gestures. The proposed meeting of the Autism Working Group in November was cancelled at short notice and no further meeting has been arranged. We were not even consulted about the allocation of the Autism Innovation Fund Capital Grant. In all these circumstances, it seems that these committees and meetings have come to serve a more useful service in legitimising the council's pursuit of the policies of austerity rather than advancing the interests of people with autism in the borough.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Langan Parent Member Autism Working Group

Michael Fitzpatrick Parent Member Autism Working Group

Martin Hewitt Parent Member Autism Working Group

Hilary Gedroyc Parent Member Autism Working Group

Vida Black Parent Member Autism Working Group

Julia Yang Parent Member Autism Working Group and Haringey Autism Branch Officer

Anna Nicholson Member Autism Working Group and Policy and Participation Officer

National Autistic Society

Sue Hessel Family Carer



Haringey Council
Labour Party policy

From Harringay Trader's Association

The HTA would like to comment on the draft Corporate Plans proposed for the next three years.

Whilst we understand that the Council now has to manage the decline on funding cuts from central government for the next three years, we want to ensure that priorities are considered and given to the business rate payers within the Borough, to help and support businesses both large and small.

We feel our members deserve greater transparency and support from the Council. We would like the Council to engage and work with the businesses to tackle any issues and help nurture and develop Town Centre strategies to deliver healthy and vibrant high streets and town centre.

We are in general support of the response submitted by MHTG and would like to further stress the importance of a business Czar, and developing a localised Town Centre policy for each individual Centre, to recognise the various destination USP.

Mr Shef Mehmet

Chair of Harringay Traders Assoc



Haringey Council

From Steve Hitchins, Chairman, Chairman of Whittington Hospital NHS Trust

Congratulations on producing this document which is much clearer in its vision for Haringey than many others I have seen for other councils and coming as it does at a very financially challenging time for your Council. Thank you.

Thank you for the opportunity to be engaged and involved with the Corporate Plan. I should say at the outset that we at Whittington Health are very pleased to be involved in this way and want to play our part in delivering this ambitious but achievable plan.

The comments here are mine and I haven't discussed them in great detail with Executive Directors but I hope they are helpful and supportive and they certainly match our developing approach.

I've read the plan and with special interest in the Priority 2 regarding health where this is particularly the case as you will see in our developing clinical strategy about which we will also be consulting soon. (The last of our public engagement events is at the Bernie Grant Centre on Wednesday 21st January at 6pm)

I was particularly pleased to see early intervention and prevention as well as the emphasis on working with the voluntary sector. In both of these areas we are also beginning to focus our attention.

For example we are now encouraging our Emergency Department to monitor excess alcohol geographically to report poor licensing practice. And also trips and falls by older people to see if it's poor street lighting, blocked by overgrown trees or broken pavements and report them to Highways. We hope that this contributes to prevention!

And on Wednesday 28th January we are hosting an event to which we have invited over 200 voluntary and community groups from Haringey (and Islington) to meet with us to discuss their participation in delivering our clinical strategy.

How to use the public health budget and measure the difference it makes effectively is a challenge. I have been disappointed but not surprised by the lack of impact on health outcomes that millions of well-meaning leaflets, posters and adverts have produced. Now responsibility for this lies with local government which causes me to be optimistic because much more innovation is likely from you than from the NHS!

I would be interested in exactly what you had in mind with the further introduction of technology. I think this is most likely to be successful when linked with volunteering support. I am aware of the increasing use of telemedicine by some Haringey GPs but as ever those in greatest need are often the least able to articulate their complaints especially by phone. As with many new approaches the people most likely to take advantage are those already following good practice in their own healthcare. We would like to use much



Haringey Council

more technology in our community services and are monitoring a number of NHS pilots around the country.

The plan is bold and ambitious which promises a strong future for Haringey. My one slight concern is possibly raised by the presentation in five priorities. It seems that each is more independent of the others than is of course the case. There are no barriers only links between poor housing, mental health, physical health and say, poor educational achievement and the quality of the local environment. There is a good attempt to address this in the draft cross-cutting themes but here I wondered if you would be interested in discussing how Whittington Health might become directly engaged.

For example Objective 5 on page 60 is commendable but the measure of success column reinforces my comment above about how ineffective the public health budget has been over the past fifteen years. Is there an opportunity here for an innovative pilot (eg preventing type 2 diabetes), targeted (eg Black Caribbean men?) linking public, voluntary and private sector partners (eg dieticians, food shops, leisure centres, district nurses, community health centres, pharmacists, football clubs, advice and community groups) in a big push?

I am talking to our consultants to encourage some new thinking. It seems to me that one experiment that might make a significant difference and establish a different approach to simply more of the same!

We at Whittington Health are keen and enthusiastic to play a significant role in delivering your corporate plan for the residents of Haringey.

Thank you again for the chance to comment and be involved.



Haringey Council

Haringey Children's Centres Alliance

Cuts to Haringey children's centres

On 16 December, you spoke at the Cabinet meeting to explain your proposal to cut 42% of the children's centres' already very constrained budget.

We are aware of the reality of needing to make efficiency savings and the pressing financial constraints and understand the realm of difficult decisions faced because of this. However there is a concern that the need to refocus monies has with it brought a hurried response and dismissal of the excellent and vital work that exists within the current setup. We are asking for clear indications to what alternative model is proposed and how this thinking was informed.

Within your speech Haringey's children's centres were presented as neither offering qualitative nor quantitatively valued services, with the suggestion that centres were not engaged in early intervention and that people did not use centres. We do not believe this is the case and we have responded below to your comments.

A significant concern is that we are not aware of any evidence to support this viewpoint. The local authority has made no meaningful attempt to consult with governors, parents or staff about possible changes until now, but the consequences will be far reaching for families. It has taken years to build up effective and experienced teams and develop the services that many parents rely on and that benefit the wider Haringey community. It would be an immense shame and counter to the first priority of the Cabinet's Corporate Plan to throw it all away.

We would ask that this letter is included as a formal response to your current budget consultation.

Participation

Regarding use and take up, most centres have very high rates of user registration, and high numbers of users. They have sophisticated and well developed outreach strategies.

Most centres have exceeded LA agreed targets in relation to registration and user engagement, the majority of centres having registered and engaged with a 'large majority' (65-79%), 'very large majority' (80-96%) or 'overwhelming majority' (97-100%) of all children ages 0-4 in their respective reach areas, which is fantastic and should be a cause for celebration. It is our understanding that the regular monitoring by your officers in Children's Services confirms this. To move forward we ask that if that is not the case, where is the evidence for this? And which of the 16 centres across Haringey are you concerned about?

Range of early intervention services provided

You introduced your speech by saying you wanted to talk about 'the way we're trying to remodel children's services so we have much more focus on early help, early intervention, to prevent the really sad cases that end up with us being very expensive for us, very



Haringey Council

difficult for families.’ You went on to say you wanted to ‘try and provide more support at an earlier stage, both from our services and from families and communities, so it’s building up families, building up communities’.

These remarks were concerning as children’s centres strive to and successfully achieve high levels of help, early intervention and support for families. Centres are engaged in this work every day, offering both targeted and universal services. To note a few examples:

- They work with families on the child protection register, attend child protection conferences and often provide the critical information and subsequent support
- They provide immediate support to families where there has been domestic violence, which including assisting in organising refuge placements, liaising with police, housing and social services.
- They help families who have been made homeless and have other problems. One example involved providing a safe place for a homeless pregnant mother of a young child. The children’s centre referred her to the relevant social care team and took her to their office for a meeting. The LA found temporary accommodation and the children’s centre organised basic supplies such as bedding, toiletries, baby wipes, food and drink along with supporting the family through the whole process i.e. not leaving their side until they were settled.
- They support families where there are mental health problems which often need multi-agency involvement. This can include the children’s centre assisting finding safe placements for children if their mother needs to be sectioned
- They routinely do home visits to new mothers and encourage them to use centre resources. Where there are concerns they act as eyes and ears for other services linking especially with health and social care.
- Centres provide drop in groups, stay and play learning sessions, ESOL classes, family learning, and where possible also provide early learning for two year olds funded through the government’s two year old programme. Centre staff also use drop in groups and stay and play sessions to engage in early intervention and early help with individual families. It is through the universal groups that families build their trust in the staff and are therefore able to make disclosures in a safe environment.
- Centres are used for contact visits where looked after children can see their parents, and often centres are involved in working with those families. As an example of this ‘on the ground’ work a centre supported an absent father to being to re-engage with his young child whom he had not seen for some time and introduce him to his baby whom he had never met before.
- Community outreach happens all the time, with families routinely signed up and registered.
- Centres use every engagement to encourage families to register their children for 2, 3 & 4 year old early education.

We acknowledge that not all this work is visible, and the work is done by very small teams indeed. Children’s centres took a 50% cut in 2011/12 but because of the dedication of the teams and the collective imagination of those who fought for them, they survive and provide these very wide ranging and hugely valued services.

We consider this work to be incredibly important early intervention.



Haringey Council
Reaching families

You said 'Also, whether actually having 16 children's centres, which are static premises, is the best way to help families, and if we shouldn't be going out, to where families gather, whether they're in supermarkets, or wherever they are, and trying to provide more support in their community. So that's what we're trying to do with children's centres.'

Children's centres are by definition fixed sites. When developed by the Labour government the intention was that families with under fives had a non-stigmatising centre to enjoy, and from which they could receive key services which helped ensure the best start in life for children in the crucial early years. This approach was at the heart of Sure Start.

The children's centres provide a huge and changing variety of services for families and the local community (see above) in positive and supportive environments. Most crucially, they are local and easily accessible – vital for parents pushing a buggy, who have very young children, need help, are isolated or want their young child to have a safe place to play. For parents with no money then the children's centre can be a real lifeline.

Midwives, health visitors, Job Centre plus, CAB, Future Proof money and debt advice, Housing Advice and many other agencies all use children's centre premises to offer services to families. There are baby weighing sessions, ante and post natal appointments, counselling, and mental health support. They are used by children's social care for contact visits where children who are looked after can see their families in a controlled and safe environment.

Given the huge variety of activities and services, centres are both cost effective and inexpensive.

Your comments could be taken to suggest that there is no outreach being done by staff in children's centres and that you are critical of that lack. We would ask you to share the evidence on which you base this. Our experience is that outreach is ongoing with great and continuing efforts being made to find and register the hardest to reach families. If it is believed outreach is inadequate has this been raised, and if so, when and what action has been taken?

Evidence base for your comments

We are concerned that you may have been inadequately briefed and invite you to and fellow councillors to engage with us to discuss if there have been problems, and poor levels of participation, to explore what steps have been taken to support centres.

You suggest that the work being done can be better achieved by going out to supermarkets. Outreach to families is very much part of our remit, but for issues of confidentiality and child protection it is important that more than one model of working is proposed.

We welcome the opportunities for such dialogue to explore together examples of work elsewhere where supermarkets or other locations are being effectively and successfully used in the way you suggest. Can you tell us if your team visited anywhere to see the



Haringey Council

practice? Have issues such as confidentiality, ratios, child protection, safeguarding and the need for families and children to have meeting and playspace been considered? Are social care contact visits being held in these locations? And has account been taken of the demographics of who goes to which supermarket? Has any impact assessment been done?

Childcare Subsidy

You also spoke about the funding provided for subsidised child care provided through children's centres. As this funding does not come from the revenue support grant – it is provided through the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) - cuts on this budget would be **additional** to the £1.440m cuts to children's centres that you are already proposing. The subsidy supports wraparound and extended childcare provided through the three nursery schools and the five larger children's centres.

It is apparent from what you say, and the limited background text on the website, that you think removing subsidy will enhance childcare provision. How and where this will happen is unclear. Can you tell us if your team have done any modelling regarding removing the subsidy and the impact it would have on the viability of centres?

This, in turn, links to the amount of income generated through fees, so we would also ask what work has been done to research fee structures to inform your proposal to remove/alter the childcare subsidy. Can your officers provide the background work they have done on this which might support centres in delivering the quality childcare? For example, introducing sliding fee scales which are more reflective of people's income and ability to pay may have a very positive impact in income generation, viability and fairness. From the Early Help Partnership board papers now available it would appear no such work has been undertaken.

The childcare subsidy contributes to keeping families in work, many of whom are in Tottenham. What is your plan for the DSG funding to improve childcare for more people and have you considered the cumulative impact on centres of what are effectively two reductions, which together amount to almost £3m?

Haringey's nursery schools

Amongst its childcare offer Haringey is fortunate to have three nursery schools that provide high quality integrated care and education. In addition, these centres are children's centres offering the wide range of services related to the overall care of children to support children's growth, development and well-being. This full services integrated model is recognised as being very powerful in the findings of the House of Commons Education Committee (2013 – 2014).

These centres provide excellent outcomes for children and families. They also have the capacity to act as teaching centres and network hubs with fully integrated services. The nursery schools have established a training and development consortium that is currently working with more than 30 PVI providers as part of the Being Two project. There is a close working relationship with Haringey's Early Years team and the training programs



Haringey Council

complement one another. The strength of the model is that lead practitioners from within the nursery schools are able to provide peer-to-peer support and provide training to early years providers in the nursery schools.

The childcare subsidy contributes to the capacity of the nursery schools to be outward looking and to develop local network of early education and childcare providers and to raise quality throughout the system.

A small conundrum regarding the government's target for increasing places for two year olds. How will these cuts assist you in creating more places for two year olds to meet government targets? If you reduce children's centres, withdraw subsidy and funding, you will lose places. So how will you create the 800 new places you are required to provide on top of the ones you will lose? And how will you ensure quality and consistency?

Consultation

The online consultation on these far-reaching, serious cuts opened on 18 December and will close on 18 January. Taking into account the Christmas break, in reality the consultation period has been just two weeks. Papers from your Early Years Partnership Board reveal that these ideas have been discussed for well over a year, but there has been no discussion with either governors or parents. The meetings being held this week were only organised after pressure was exerted, and dates were sent out after schools and children's centres had broken up for Christmas. The Schools' Forum has an early years working party. A report could have brought to the Schools' Forum about the childcare subsidy since this is DSG funding and presumably therefore, accountable initially to the Schools' Forum. This opportunity has not been taken.

Neither has there been any report from officers or Haringey 54,000, yet the funding is complicated, interlinked, and getting it wrong could decimate centres and the whole fabric of their work. It has taken over five years to build up the Children's Centres and many more prior to their development to build the multi-agency integrated working on the ground. The cost of losing the staff expertise and relationships with families will be huge not just financial but in experience, continuity and skills. This way of working takes years to develop but a very short time to destroy. Once gone, it is unlikely to be rebuilt and a vital infrastructure supporting social regeneration will be lost.

We would ask you to reflect on this, and consider if you really think Haringey is truly complying with the four requirements for consultation as spelled out by the Supreme Court in its October decision regarding consultation in Haringey. At minimum we would ask that the consultation period is extended to allow parents, families, staff and users to contribute their views.

Plans for alternative provision

If these cuts are implemented the question then arises of what happens afterwards, and what exactly is being planned to put in their place. The cuts are being proposed in connection with Priority 1 of the corporate plan: "Enable every child and young person to have the best start in life, with high quality education". But making cuts will not in itself



Haringey Council

meet that priority. What alternative model is proposed? Where are the background papers which inform the thinking? What detailed plans are there? There is no such detail in the corporate plan, but there must be detailed plans which inform that document.

In order for a consultation on the proposed cuts to be meaningful, the Council must, **as part of the consultation process**, provide detailed plans for the alternative provision that is to be made.

As a Labour Council, have you taken into account the commitments by the Labour Party regarding childcare and Sure Start should they win the general election? The BBC reports Tristram Hunt saying on January 8, that 'We will increase free childcare for working parents with three- and four-year-olds from 15 to 25 hours, making a real difference to hard-pressed parents'. The Labour Party website states that Labour will allocate a further £800m to do this. Such additional guaranteed government funding would drive a review of the childcare subsidy and could lead to some very positive outcomes. Has any work started on developing some models?

We would suggest that this increase in the free hours, should it happen, would have a significant positive impact on the childcare subsidy. Wouldn't it make sense to model this, and look at the potential of a means tested sliding fee scale before agreeing any cuts which would harm irreversibly these centres. The general election is a few months away and childcare is a major issue so why agree destabilising and potentially destructive cuts now?

Labour Party Policy

Labour Party policy also states that 'We will renew and reinvigorate Sure Start, reforming the way local services work together to shift from sticking-plaster services to radical early help, to provide good quality support to all families that need it'.

It seems perverse timing to take steps a few months before the general election that will destroy the children's centres that have been at the heart of Sure Start and would make it much harder for a Labour government to deliver on its policy.

Concerns and summary

We are wishing to work together to address the need to reduce or redirect resources in an open and positive way, to have a frank and genuine dialogue that consults about possible changes and how the consequences will be far reaching for families.

Funding from the Dedicated Schools Grant as well as from the Council has been used to develop Early Help over two to three years and yet despite requests from the Schools' Forum to see an action plan about how it will work nothing has yet been forthcoming. Meanwhile, the children's centres are working with families and partners, providing valued and real services, building networks and continuing to develop and improve what they do. Parents are full of praise for the support they give. The funding for Early Help could be used to develop their work further whilst holding on to early intervention principles. We appreciate meetings are happening this week, but these do not bring everyone together. Given the complex mix of services within and between centres we think this is



Haringey Council

vital, and as governors and parent representatives we are asking for an open meeting with you, Cllr Arthur and any other councillors as soon as possible and certainly before any decisions are taken.

We understand the Cabinet is discussing the budget proposals again on 10 February so a meeting before then would be very helpful.

We look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible so a meeting date can be confirmed.

Natalie Merritt, Chair of Governors, Woodlands Park Nursery School & Children's Centre and Downhills Link Children's Centre

Andrew Sich, Chair of Governors, South Haringay Infant School & The Ladder Children's Centre and Stroud Green Link Children's Centre

Martin Mulube, Chair of Governors, Rokesly Primary School & Children's Centre

Judith Pow, Chair of Governors, Campsbourne School & Extended Services

James & Anna Jameson, parent representatives, Stonecroft Children's Centre

Yvonne Denny, Chair of Management Board, Triangle Children, Young People & Community Centre

Zena Brabazon, Chair of Governors, Seven Sisters Primary School & South Grove Children's Centre

Andrew Bethell, Chair of Governors, Earlsmead Primary School & Children's Centre

Asher Jacobsberg, Vice Chair of Governors, Welbourne Primary School & Children's Centre

Marilyn Francis, Chair of Governors, The Willow Primary School and Broadwater Farm Children's Centre

Melian Mansfield, Chair of Governors, Pembury House Nursery School & Children's Centre and Bruce Grove Link Children's Centre

Kaye Dunn, Vice Chair of Governors, Rowland Hill Nursery School & Children's Centre

Annex D



Haringey Council

1 Responding to the issues raised

The Budget Process:

- 1.1.1 The questions and comments raised around the budget process are noted. Three issues about the overall budget process were prominent – the setting of a three-year-budget, the proposal to freeze rather than raise Council Tax and the overall consultation process. All the available evidence points to a continued challenging financial environment for local government, and all local authorities including Haringey, regardless of the result of the General Election with all major parties committed to deficit reduction. Labour's Shadow Chancellor Ed Ball noted on January 5th that he does not foresee changes to current spending plans for local government.
- 1.1.2 The Council has to plan strategically over the next three years with many of the savings proposed requiring significant long-term changes in the way services are delivered. A single year budget would involve significant uncertainty for staff, stakeholders and residents, and put at significantly great risk the long term delivery of services and service improvements.
- 1.1.3 Haringey already has relatively high level of council tax compared with most London councils. The Government provides councils with an incentive to freeze council tax rates, which means that if we had increased levels to the maximum allowed before a referendum (2%) we would have only received an extra £600,000 in revenue once the loss of the incentive is taken into account.

The consultation process:

- 1.1.4 In response to comments around the consultation process, it must be emphasised that there will be no significant changes in services based on this consultation alone. Where major changes to service users are proposed after budget setting, detailed plans will come forward and decisions will only be made after much more detailed consultation which will take into account all the options available to the Council, including Equality Impact Assessments. The current process allow us to consider whether plans should be developed, and if they are, allow us to take on board feedback and where possible ensure that future proposals are co-designed with the community.

Young people and families:



Haringey Council

Youth services:

- 1.1.5 Concerns were raised during the consultation process about the future of Bruce Grove Youth Centre. No proposal in the draft MTFS or Corporate Plan requires the closure of the centre. Bruce Grove Youth Centre will remain open. The Council will work with young people to develop the strategy for youth services and Young People in future. A draft strategy will be issued for consultation in March.

Children's Centres:

- 1.1.6 In response to concerns raised about the proposed reduction in the number of Children's Centres, it is proposed to allow for a longer period of consultation and engagement with users, stakeholders and parents who do not currently user centres to further develop the proposals on Children's Centres. This will also enable the Council to continue to work with the community in co-designing any proposed changes to the future operating model. Formal consultation proposals will be issued following that further engagement. However, the budget envelope is recommended to remain as set in the MTFS.

Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre:

- 1.1.7 The Council agrees with the views expressed that Pendarren is a valuable educational resource. While the Council has no desire to see this diluted, we do need to consider how we can reduce operating costs.

Children with complex needs:

- 1.1.8 The Council is proposing changes to services for children with complex needs, which will reflect the wider policy changes in the reforms under the Children and Families Act. We will conclude our options appraisal of respite services, including the residential respite offered through our in-house provision at Haslemere, and review our passenger transport policy. Detailed proposals will come forward for any changes that are made.

Adults and healthy living:



Haringey Council

Adults with complex needs:

- 1.1.9 Having regard to the responses set out in the consultation, the Council has a responsibility to embed the changes set out nationally through the advent of the Better Care Fund, the Care Act and the SEND reforms of the Children and Families Act. This puts an increasing emphasis on early intervention, integration and joining up services around residents. In addition, the pressures on the public purse mean that we cannot continue to do things the way we have previously we need to promote health in all our policies, work with communities and transform our services.
- 1.1.10 Our experience in Haringey has demonstrated that people prefer to live ordinary lives in the community where they have the opportunity to have control over their lives. This includes people with complex needs.
- 1.1.11 We believe that the current model is not sustainable. In developing a three year plan we have been able to set out our vision, moving away from incremental budget cuts, to considering the changes that need to take place to deliver, within reducing budgets, equitable, inclusive support, for those who need services.
- 1.1.12 Haringey is committed to supporting the most vulnerable people in the Borough but difficult decisions have to be made because of the scale of the budget challenge.
- 1.1.13 People who are in receipt of adult social care, or who may need adult social care, have an assessment of need and the Council has a duty to meet assessed need. There is nothing in the medium term financial plan which changes that position. Everyone has the right to respect and dignity, and care packages that support this.
- 1.1.14 However, we have listened to what people have had to say and are now recommending that, on the basis of the consultation feedback, the proposal to make savings of £5.7m on care packages is removed. The Council will however, look to make changes to our reablement approach.
- 1.1.15 Promoting independence is a principle underpinning many of the proposals, as is the belief that vulnerable adults should not be segregated from the rest of society, but welcomed into and supported by it. Prevention and early intervention are central to this vision.
- 1.1.16 The Council needs to work with partners to intervene earlier but also understand the need to step care up and down as needs and the



ability of individuals, carers and families to cope also changes.

- 1.1.17 The Council needs to make money go as far as possible in supporting older and more vulnerable adults. When there is such pressure on the budget, to spend money on day centres that support only a small number of people with such needs is untenable and does not deliver equity and fairness. Our aim is to ensure that as many people as possible are supported to have social opportunities and support, but also that we use the money we have as wisely as possible.
- 1.1.18 The Council has said throughout the engagement process of recent weeks that reablement is not the answer for everyone. Where it has the potential to enable people to regain, and/or maintain, their independence, we will apply it. We believe that everyone has the right to choice and independence and it is right and proper that we support people to achieve that. We currently support younger adults with complex needs through enablement, which is a pathway which is about developing life skills so that people can engage safely in aspects of community life, and to develop goals to improve health and quality of life.
- 1.1.19 There is no suggestion that we will move away from assessing people's needs and ensuring that they receive services in accordance with those needs, but believe our assessment is as much about understanding people's strengths and potential and enabling people to realise that. We need to focus on early help and prevention to ensure people can live as independently as possible for as long as possible.

The Voluntary Sector:

- 1.1.20 We recognise the important role of a vibrant and diverse voluntary and community sector in the borough - and indeed, we commission numerous voluntary services across the council. Feedback has confirmed this understanding that local voluntary organisations are often well placed to deliver prevention and early intervention and to build individual and community capacity in line with our core objectives and across the reach of the Corporate Plan. We are keen to develop further our partnership with the sector, many elements of which are not funded by the Council, to strengthen our approach and to build on the many assets in the community. We believe the Corporate Plan offers a number of opportunities for further commissioning of the voluntary sector as we continue to move towards prevention and early intervention; we will continue to work with the sector to foster innovative approaches which are sustainable and draw in new investment to the borough.



Haringey Council

Environment and community safety:

- 1.1.21 Points were raised about the future performance of the street cleaning service which will be taken on board in any future redesign of the service. It is also recommended that a review is carried out on the future of the Park View Road Reuse and Recycling Centre before any changes are made, which would enable us to give consideration to concerns raised about the impact any closure would have on fly-tipping.
- 1.1.22 The Council will also continue to engage with the community around park events and ensure that, where events are organised, they are done so with the minimum of disruption.

Growth and employment:

- 1.1.23 The consultation responses on Corporate Plan Priority 4 (Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit) were wide-ranging, reflecting the different strands of work that come together in this Priority. The council was particularly pleased to receive feedback from some of individuals and groups who are centrally involved in the borough's economic life, including the Muswell Hill Traders Group, and to receive constructive suggestions on how the overall vision for this Priority can be achieved.
- 1.1.24 Some respondents raised concerns about a range of issues including the impacts of regeneration on existing residents and businesses; the quality and salaries of new jobs being created; and the importance of tailoring support to town centres and both existing and prospective businesses. These issues are important to the council and will be at the heart of our plans as we implement this. Unsurprisingly, other proposals were raised which are not currently part of our plans; some have already been considered and not pursued for a variety of reasons, but others have clear potential merit and will be considered further.
- 1.1.25 Overall, while there were questions about the detail of implementation, the majority of feedback gave support to the broad approach the council has proposed for this priority. The council has therefore made only minor changes to the wording of the Corporate Plan itself – to ensure consistency with the recently published Economic Development and Growth Strategy – and will address many of the issues raised in the consultation feedback as it develops its plans for implementation.

Housing and communities:



Haringey Council

- 1.1.26 The consultation responses on housing and communities demonstrated how passionately residents feel about access to high-quality housing and what the council can do to improve standards across Haringey.
- 1.1.27 In general, respondents supported the council's ambitions to build its own homes and for more shared ownership options to be among those. There was also support for the council's proposals for a private landlord licensing scheme and for getting empty homes back into use.
- 1.1.28 Common issues raised by respondents included a concern about the level of affordable housing in the borough, a need for more social housing and repairs to existing council housing, and concern that regeneration would price people out of the area.
- 1.1.29 At the heart of the council's proposed Housing Strategy is a focus on providing more high-quality affordable homes, with a mix of ownerships and tenures to support balanced and diverse communities. The council is committed to building more than 100 social rent and shared ownership properties in the next three years on small plots of underused land, as well as exploring options with communities at larger sites, through our Housing Investment and Estate Renewal Strategy, to see what the options are to bring long-term improvements. We are also investing money into the Decent Homes programme to improve existing council homes. Housing management is important to us too, and we maintain high standards for our own Council tenants and leaseholders, and set that expectation for local Housing Associations and landlords.
- 1.1.30 The Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework sets out our commitment to improving existing homes and building thousands of new high-quality homes – both to support existing communities' right to a modern home and to meet housing demand.

Muswell Hill Library

- 1.1.31 The range of views expressed are noted and The Council will ensure, should proposals be developed, that the community are involved in decisions around potential re-location and the future use of the site itself.
- 1.1.32 On wider issues, the budget recommendations set out a commitment to retain library services across the borough.



Haringey Council

Marcus Garvey Library/Customer Services:

- 1.1.33 Concerns are noted. Through proposals coming forward we will give an assurance that any additional services that are delivered to improve customer access will not reduce current library space and we would ensure that any reconfiguration improves and modernises the space for young learners.

Equality Impact Assessments (EQIAs):

- 1.1.34 Every effort has been made to ensure that the draft EQIAs developed for the savings proposals were as complete as possible at this stage. EQIAs will be developed further as new operating models, service and policy changes are considered, consulted on and implemented over the lifetime of the three year MTFS.

2. Changes to the Corporate Plan:

- 2.1.1. The information below sets out changes that have been made to the Corporate Plan.

Priority 1: Children and Families

- 2.2. Targets will be set for each indicator, which will include indicators for quarterly analysis. This will give greater transparency to outcomes that are being delivered.

Priority 2: Adults and Healthy Living

- 2.3. A new measure of success has been added around reducing social isolation, which replaces the previous measure on residents living in their own homes and communities longer.
- 2.3.1. A new measure of success has been added around increasing financial investment into the voluntary and community sector, looking beyond council resources alone.
- 2.3.2. A new measure of success has been added around improving the health and wellbeing of residents, which replaces a previous measure around increasing employment, physical activity and volunteering.
- 2.3.3. A previous measure on volunteering has been strengthened to make it clearer that the Council aims to increase the number of people involved in volunteering.

Priority 3: Environment and community safety



Haringey Council

- 2.4. The title of the priority has changed from “A clean and safe borough where people are proud to live” to “A clean, well maintained and safe borough where people are proud to live and work.”
- 2.4.1. A new measure of success has been added around improving the health and wellbeing of residents, which replaces a previous measure around increasing employment, physical activity and volunteering.
- 2.4.2. A reference to sharing intelligence and information has been strengthened to make it clearer that the Council will strengthen the way we work with communities to prevent and reduce environmental and anti-social behavioural crime.
- 2.4.3. A new measure of success has been added on improving the percentage of traders who are proud of where they work.
- 2.4.4. An objective around moving towards more sustainable modes of transport by making Haringey one of the most cycling and pedestrian friendly boroughs in London now has a specific delivery plan as set out below:
- Introducing a borough wide 20mph limit,
 - Providing more cycle racks,
 - Increasing the network of dedicated cycle lanes,
 - Providing more cycle training,
 - Improving signage,
 - Improving safety measures on priority pedestrian crossings, and
 - Providing a smarter travel campaign to change behaviours, getting more people to use sustainable modes of transport.

Priority 4: Economic Growth and employment

- 2.5. Measures of success around delivering growth and creating an environment that supports investment in business and jobs have been changed to below, as in line with the Council’s newly published Economic Development Strategy.
- 2.5.1. **How will we know that we have been successful?**
- We will have made progress towards our long-term aims that, by 2030:
 - The number of jobs in Haringey has increased by 20,000 from the 2011 London Plan baseline position
 - the profile of Haringey-based jobs changes so that retail and public sector employment are less dominant, and there is a better range of jobs, including a greater proportion of jobs in the more highly-skilled sectors, such as sustainable technology, digital design and skilled/craft manufacturing



Haringey Council

- The number of jobs per square metre of employment land has increased by 20%, reflecting a shift to more intensive and productive employment

How will we measure success from 2015-2018?

- Success in the Corporate Plan period can be measured through achievement of the direct outputs listed below
- 50 new businesses established in Haringey
- 1,235 new jobs created in Haringey
- 1,000 businesses benefiting from superfast broadband technology
- We should also observe a positive trend on the key long-term indicators with:
- 8,000 more jobs in Haringey, measured against the 2011 London Plan baseline
- The expansion or establishment in the borough of at least 10 knowledge/technology-led businesses

Priority 5: Housing and communities

- 2.6. The wording has been changed in objective 1 to “We want to see a step change in the number of new homes being built.”
- 2.6.1. The wording of objective 2 to” Prevent homelessness and support residents to lead fulfilling lives.”
- 2.6.2. The wording of objective 3 has changed to “Drive up the quality of housing for all residents.”

HARINGEY COUNCIL ADULTS SOCIAL SERVICES CONSULTATION - BUILDING A STRONGER HARINGEY TOGETHER

**[Priority 2: Empower all adults to live healthy
long and fulfilling lives]**

**Learning Disability Experience [LDX] Independent Advocacy
Support and Facilitation Outcomes Report**



Project Title	<i>Haringey Council Adults Social Services Consultation – Building a Stronger Haringey Together – LDX Independent Advocacy Support and Facilitation</i>
Version	<i>Version 1</i>
Date of Issue	<i>22nd January 2015</i>
Project ID	<i>HCASS/LDX1</i>
Consultation Period	<i>17th December 2014 – 18th January 2015</i>
Author	<i>Ann S Weekes, Chief Executive Learning Disability Experience [LDX]</i>
Author Contact	<i>Email: aweeke@ldx.org.uk</i>

GLOSSARY

Advocacy	An independent service which takes action to help people say what they want, secures their rights, represent their interests and obtain services they need. Advocates and advocacy schemes work in partnership with the people they support, promote social inclusion, equality and social justice.
Advocate	The member of staff who supports the user/s of service to have their needs and wishes met and carried out in such a way as if they had spoken for themselves.
Carers, Family Carers or Parent Carers	A carer is anyone who cares, paid or unpaid, for a family member, a friend or other person who is in need of assistance and/or support with their daily living due to illness, disability, a mental health problem, an addiction or other ailment and cannot cope without their support.
Council or Local Authority	Haringey Council or other Borough Councils
Customer	Resident or User of Service
LDX	Learning Disability Experience [Independent Advocacy Service]
Proposal	A plan or suggestion, especially a formal or written one, put forward for consideration by others.
Service [Service Provider]	A person or organisation that provides any form of health, social and/or community care service.
Service User	Anyone who receives any form of health, social and/or community services. Also known in this report as the User of Service, the Customer or the Resident.
Staff	The employee, worker, contractor and volunteer who carries out the service provision.
Stakeholder	A stakeholder is anyone with an interest or concern in Haringey Council services and business. Stakeholders can be any individuals, groups or organisations that are affected by the activity of these services or the management of the Council's business affairs.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Learning Disability Experience [LDX]

Founded in 1964, Learning Disability Experience [LDX], formerly known as Waltham Forest Mencap, is the lead provider of community learning disability support in Waltham Forest and the surrounding areas.

LDX is a well-established organisation providing holistic outcome-based opportunities for children, young people and adults with learning disabilities and other disabilities.

Based across 3 buildings and in the community, LDX employs 14 permanent members of staff, 40 sessional staff and 10 volunteers.

LDX's services are based around the 3 key structures of Information, Advice & Independent/Group Advocacy, Social & Leisure and Campaigning & Influencing. Within these structures we provide significant support in many areas.

Our **Vision** is of a world in which people with learning disabilities experience their basic human right to be fully empowered and included in society. We strive to achieve this by making it our **Mission** to exist in order to maximise quality of life and improve life chances for people with learning disabilities and those who care for them. We do this by:

- Providing information, advice and advocacy support
- Creating social and leisure opportunities and;
- Developing an attitude of effective change through campaigning and influencing

Our strengths show a commitment to making a difference to the lives of people with learning disabilities and their carers by maintaining the following **Values**:

We are:

- Efficient: we show value for money
- Accessible: we include everyone
- Empowering: we maximise choice and control
- Trustworthy: we are reliable and responsible
- Innovative: we are creative and imaginative
- Experienced: we are knowledgeable experts in our field
- Objective: we provide fairness and equality

1.2 Haringey Council Adult Social Services [HCASS] – Building a Stronger Haringey Together: Three Year Plan and Budget Consultation for Residents and Businesses [draft plan]

The Present:

Currently Haringey Council's Corporate Plan, **One Borough, One Future 2013 – 2015** sets the Council's priorities and outcomes, which are underpinned by five principles:

- One Borough Focus
- Investing in prevention and early intervention
- Promoting equality
- Empowering communities
- Working in partnership

These principles have been used over the last 3 years to inform service aims and objectives, delivery and outcomes.

The Future:

Priority 2 of the new Haringey Draft Corporate Plan **Building a Stronger Haringey Together** requires Adult Social Services to: 'Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives'.

The current service delivery model must be transformed to ensure compliance with the Council's statutory obligations within their financial targets, ensuring services operate as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Haringey Council's vision is to create greater focus on self-management, prevention and early intervention for their customers. The core principle is to deliver services based on putting the service user, family and carers at the centre of their solution. This requires the redesign of existing service delivery models to facilitate:

- Recent legislative changes that provide opportunity for further integration of care and support services to improve outcomes and maintain people in their communities for as long as possible.
- New National policy directives which are aimed at empowering people to be independent.
- The growing demand for Adult Social Care services within the borough.

Proposals for the transformation of Haringey Council's service delivery model have been submitted and were open to consultation from 17th December 2014 to 18th January 2015. The Council did this to ensure that their users of services are aware of the proposed changes, how the proposals would affect them and to gather their views.

Haringey's Council Cabinet will meet on February 10th 2015 to recommend a budget to Full Council which meets on February 23rd 2015. Once the budget is agreed on February 23rd detailed plans and proposals will be drawn up over the next three years. Where they have an impact on service users or groups of service users, they will be subject to more detailed consultation before any final decisions are made.

2 PROJECT DETAILS

2.1 Summary Project Specification

LDX were commissioned by Haringey Council Adults Social Services to provide independent advocacy and facilitation to help explain anything that is unclear and provide expert advocacy assistance to their less able customers/residents in responding to the above consultation at the following corporate sessions **[Fig 1]** attended by Councillor Peter Morton (Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing) and Beverley Tarka (Interim Director of Adult Social Services) and specialist sessions **[Fig 2]** attended by users of services, carers and supporting staff.

The independent advocates will be expected to help people to express their wishes and feelings, support them in weighing up their options and assist them in making their own decisions regarding the service proposals.

The individual advocacy arrangements were agreed at a preliminary meeting between Haringey Council and LDX where the requirements of the brief and the service provision were fully explained. The specification did not determine a set or minimum period of advocacy provision for each individual and was flexible and responsive to need regardless of person or care group.

A full breakdown of the outcomes [which include details of the feedback and comments of customers, residents, users of services, carers as represented at the consultation sessions] is provided by LDX to Haringey Council Adult Social Services in the form of this report.

Fig 1: Corporate Consultation

Dates	Event 1	Event 2	Event 3	Hours
Monday 6 th January 2015	2:00pm-4:00pm Ermine Road DC 2 Ermine Road N15 6DB	5:00pm-6:30pm Ermine Road DC 2 Ermine Road N15 6DB		3.5 hours
Advocates/Facilitators	Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	Ann S Weekes		
Friday 9 th January 2015	8:30am-12:00pm The Roundway 20b Walthef Garden N17 7DX	12:00pm-4:00pm The Haven DC 20a Walthef Garden N17 7DX	5:00pm-7:00pm Osborne Grove Nursing Home 16-18 Upper Tollington Park N4 3EL	9.5 hours
Advocates/Facilitators	Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	Ann S Weekes	
Total hours				13 hours

Fig 2: Specific Consultation [specialist sessions for users and carers of services]

Dates	Event 1	Event 2	Hours
Monday 12th January 2015 Advocates/Facilitators	9:00am-2:00pm Ermine Road DC 2 Ermine Road N15 6DB Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	3:00pm-6:30pm Lindon House 10 Linden Road N15 3QB Ann S Weekes	8.5 hours
Wednesday 14th January 2015 Advocates/Facilitators	10:00am-2:00pm Birkbeck Centre 2 Birkbeck Road Hornsey N8 7PF Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	3:30pm-7:00pm Osborne Grove Nursing Home 16-18 Upper Tollington Park N4 3EL Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	7.5 hours
Total hours			16 hours

Total Advocacy Hours Provided	29 hours

2.2 Scope and Beneficiaries

The commissioned independent advocacy and facilitation was made accessible and accountable to all vulnerable people and carers who approached LDX and Haringey Council to engage, who are residing in Haringey Council and who may come from all wards within the borough.

Approachable recipients did not need to meet the FACS eligibility criteria for adult's health and social care services as the Council has taken into account those groups that did not meet the criteria but required support such as those identified as low or moderate or people with Aspergers.

Individuals and groups were assisted to:

- Understand the proposed changes to Haringey's Adult Social Services and involved spending considerable time with people, considering their communications needs, their wishes and feelings and their life story, and using all this to assist them to be included and where possible to make decisions.
- Communicate their views, wishes and feelings during the consultation.
- Challenge a decision or process made by the local authority; and where a person cannot challenge the decision even with assistance, then to challenge it on their behalf.
- Decide what outcomes/changes they want

- Understand what advice and help they can expect from others.
- Understand what parts of the process are completely or partially within their control.

2.3 Haringey Council Adults Social Services Consultation Audience

Haringey Council sought the views, experiences, comments and concerns of customers, residents, users of services and carers of those using adult social care services in relation to **Priority 2: Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives.**

In spite of any possible challenges, timeframes and the consultation exercise itself, LDX has most certainly sought to give a voice to vulnerable adults within Haringey's diverse borough paying particular attention to hearing from those who may be seldom heard, as well as those who may be isolated.

LDX supported the remit to hear from as many individuals as possible within Haringey Council and paid particular attention to people with learning disabilities, the elderly, those living with dementia and their carers as per the requirements.

At any one time the support LDX provided focused on accessibly reaching out to those identified above. This was done in the format of wider consultation and specific discussions.

To support people with non-verbal communication and/or limited understanding LDX also accessed people identified as 'circles of support' such as family members, carers, residential care support, programme coordinators, team leaders, care workers, assistant managers and managers. This was to stringently seek their views [as individuals who know the users of services best] for the sole purpose of speaking up on their behalf. This was done through group meetings and 1:1 conversations.

LDX user engagement was robust and credible and we have fully demonstrated our professionalism, knowledge, appropriate skills level and competencies throughout the process; required to deliver the requested functions to the highest possible level to achieve the Haringey Council specification.

2.4 Independent Advocacy

An advocacy service is provided by an advocate who is independent of social and health services. Being independent means they are there to represent people's wishes without giving their personal opinion and without representing the views of the local authority or any other services.

Many local councils and some hospitals fund local advocacy services to support people, particularly those who are vulnerable in the community. For wider issues which impact on all people, groups and services from the same community the assistance of external independent advocacy may be required.

Independent advocacy should always be separate from any service provision, its staff, users of services, families, carers and any stakeholders directly or indirectly involved with or affected by service provision.

Therefore any advocacy support or facilitation must be independent and free from possible conflicts of interest.

Independent advocacy providers (individuals or organisations) should not be involved in the welfare, care or provision of other services to the individual for which they are providing advocacy.

Independent advocacy should be provided by an organisation whose sole role is independent advocacy or whose other tasks either complements, or do not conflict with, the provision of the independent advocacy requested.

As such, Haringey Council Adults Social Services seeking external independent advocacy and facilitation has been a good action and best practice as it protects everyone involved against any probable implications.

For the purpose of the Haringey Council Consultation, LDX has been utilised as an external independent advocacy service to autonomously provide individuals or groups with the information they need so they can make real choices about their circumstances.

LDX Independent Advocacy:

- Puts people first.
- Is accountable.
- Is as free as possible from any conflicts of interest.
- Is accessible.

LDX:

- Supports individuals or groups to put their choices and wishes across to others and to speak on their behalf when they are unable to do so for themselves.
- Represent the views of individuals or groups.
- Protect individuals or groups who are particularly vulnerable to make informed decisions.
- Feedback an issue raised by individuals or groups to service providers as part of any decision-making process and so that services can be constantly improved to meet the needs of the growing market.

In addition and where appropriate independent advocates may also:

- Support an individual/group in seeking resolution to issues which concern them.
- Help to safeguard the rights of individuals or groups.
- Empower individuals or groups to make informed decisions and to take greater control over their lives.

2.5 Contact

For all matters concerning the outcomes in this report and anything in relation to the Haringey Council Adults Social Services consultation please contact:

Haringey Council Social Services

40 Cumberland Road, Wood Green, London N22 7SG

- Donna Simeon, Transformation Project Manager donna.simeon@haringey.gov.uk

3 EQUALITY MONITORING

LDX met with 85 people with a range of abilities either individually or as part of a group. A summary of participant profiles is set out in the tables below.

Identification

User of Services	52
Carer [in their own right]	33
Total	85

Gender

Male	21
Female	64
Total	85

Age Group

18-25	1
26-30	1
31-35	5
36-40	4
41-45	3
46-50	11
51-55	6
56-60	1
61-65	2
66-70	7
71-75	4
76-80	3
81-85	3
86-90	2
90+	3
Unspecified	27

Ethnicity

White British	12
White Irish	5
Caribbean	9
Black British Caribbean	4
Mixed White British/Black Caribbean	1
African	1
Asian	1
East African/Asian	1
Arab	1
Italian	1
Greek Cypriot	2
Turkish	1
Turkish Cypriot	1
Turkish/Kurdish	3
Indian	1
Philippines	1
Unspecified	40

Religion

Christian	3
Roman Catholic	9
Church of England	4
Seventh Day Adventist	3
Methodist	1
Muslim and Non Practicing Muslim	5
Greek Orthodox	2
Presbyterian	1
Non-Conformist	2
Alevism	1
Unspecified	54

Post Code

N4	4
N8	4
N10	4
N15	11
N17	16
N22	4
E3	1
E5	1
Lives outside of the borough	1
Unspecified	39

In addition to the above, 78 people were identified as 'Circles of Support' for users of services as they helped individuals and groups of people with learning disabilities, older people and other vulnerable groups to speak up for themselves and/or they spoke up on their behalf during the consultation sessions.

Circles of Support

Family/Carer	25
The Roundway Staff	13
The Haven Day Centre Staff	3
Ermine Road Day Opps Staff	14
Birkbeck Road Staff	9
Linden House Staff	7
Osborne Grove Nursing Home Staff	5
Residential Home Support Worker	2
Total	78

4 REVIEW OF INDEPENDENT ADVOCACY AND FACILITATION OUTCOMES

4.1 Council Proposals

People who attended the consultation sessions were very focused on expressing their views about specific services that were identified in the Haringey Council draft plan as proposed for closure or significant change. People wanted to talk about New Pathways for:

- Older People [Osborne Grove Nursing Home]
- Learning Disabilities [Linden House and Shared Lives]
- Day Opportunities Learning Disabilities [Reduction of building based day care]
- Increased reablement Physical Disabilities [The Haven Centre]
- Increased enablement Mental Health [Osborne Grove Nursing Home]

No person who LDX consulted with appeared to have prior understanding or knowledge of the broader picture of planned proposals for Haringey Adult Social Services up until their attendance at these sessions.

The proposals for the following did not come up as areas of immediate concern when addressed by LDX at the corporate or specific consultation:

- New Model for Care Management
- Care Purchasing Efficiencies
- Care Package Reductions
- Voluntary Sector Budget
- Healthy Life Expectancy
- Substance Misuse – Public Health/other
- Sexual Health
- Improve Public Health Efficiency

It was very clear that people wanted to talk about proposed closures and significant changes to service provision as the bulk of the feedback will show. As such, the outcomes from the consultation sessions are set out by affected services with general comments at the end.

Figs 1 and 2 of the Summary Project Specification [2.1] identify the timetables for the corporate and specific consultation exercises.

All people who LDX consulted with agreed the following:

- ✓ I have learned something about the consultation that I did not know before.
- ✓ I enjoyed the discussion.
- ✓ I have been able to say what I wanted to say.
- ✓ I have felt listened to.
- ✓ I felt respected during the sessions.

4.2 Questions

LDX asked individuals and groups that came to the consultation sessions [in various accessible formats] 3 questions:

- If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your day to day life?
- How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]
- Why do you feel like this?

5 FEEDBACK FROM HARINGEY COUNCIL ADULTS SOCIAL SERVICES CONSULTATION – PRIORITY 2: EMPOWER ALL ADULTS TO LIVE HEALTHY, LONG AND FULFILLING LIVES

The following comments are the acquired independent views and opinions of residents, customers, service users, carers and stakeholders living in Haringey or accessing services from Haringey Council Adults Social Services.

Unless explicitly stated, the independent views, opinions and/or comments from and of the above individuals or groups **do not** reflect those of the organisation Learning Disability Experience [LDX] or any of its staff members.

5.1 THE HAVEN CENTRE DAY CENTRE



Service User – The Haven Day Centre

“I am diagnosed with dementia. I didn’t want to accept it at first. It was rough. Professionals came and went and they did what they did. You followed what was being done to you.

I came to England from Africa. I was training to be a nurse but had to stop because my father arranged my marriage.

I go to the Haven 2 days a week Thursdays and Fridays. I learned how to read, sew, crochet, knit, embroidery; all at The Haven. Drivers take me Door to Door. I get a 2-course meal. I don’t need to eat again when I get home.

In the past I hurt the people who were looking after me because I didn’t understand what they were doing. I didn’t realise people were monitoring me to help me. I learnt how to respect others more than myself. I learnt this at the centre.

My daughter is my carer but she has a husband who is very ill and doesn’t have the time to look after me full-time. Elderly people have families who cannot support them because their families have their own problems too.

It’s very nice to come here. If we don’t come we’ll go back to square one. If the centre closes I’ll be on my own most of the time and I’m scared because I have mental health problems.”

Users of Services General Comments – The Haven Day Centre

User of Service – The Haven Day Centre



“This day centre means the world to me. My mother came here and that’s why I came here. Where is it going to put me? Out on the street?”

-  What exactly are the proposals as they are not very clear?
-  Will new services be more expensive to run?
-  Will it be possible for Haringey Council to look at other Councils to see how they use their budget?
-  What about the people who can’t get out and walk? This is what places like The Haven is for.
-  We come here to socialise.
-  Everybody in this room has worked all their lives. Now that we are non-productive you want to throw us to one side.
-  Everyone keeps telling us that we worked too long.
-  I don’t think it’s worth listening to you Councillor.
-  I’ll stand out in the street.
-  The day centre is family.
-  Why don’t you do away with one Councillor per ward and use the money to save services? You’ve already made lots of staff cuts so maybe it’s time to cut Councillors.
-  This is very devastating news. I was very active until my accident on the building site. I had to give up my allotment and most of my activities. I don’t like to be indoors. I would lose my social life.
-  The Haven is a nice place. I wouldn’t like to lose it. Not one bit.
-  All my friends are here. I love it here.
-  I wouldn’t like to leave here. They are good to me. They pick me up and take me home. I wouldn’t be able to get around if they didn’t do that kindness for me.
-  It has made such a difference to my life being here. My wife and I used to come here. She died last year. She was my beautiful flower. I would be at home on my own if I didn’t come here. I have my friends. I like getting together and socialising.

- 💬 I'm a very happy lady. Very grateful for my life. My main thing – why are we being cast aside? We are old people and they think that they can do what they like with us.
- 💬 You don't want people coming to your home? Majority of us can't come or get out on our own. Makes me feel like I am not human anymore.
- 💬 Not happy, I like coming here. I enjoy the company. I come twice a week. Rest of the week I am at home. Keeps me occupied. I buy second-hand things here.
- 💬 I look forward to coming here. I come four days a week. Such a nice crowd. If I did not come here I would be a little depressed. I gave up driving, I use a walking frame I won't go on the bus on my own. I would not be socializing.
- 💬 This is the only bit of enjoyment that I have.

Users of Services Individual Comments – The Haven Day Centre

User of Service – The Haven Centre



"I feel sad about the proposals. I feel sadness. I am sympathetic to the views of everyone, as I understand how they feel. I would feel cheated if they closed the Haven because I would have nothing to look forward to. I come here 2 days a week. Thursdays and Fridays. That's not a lot, is it? I don't think the reasons for closure are good enough. The financial reasons for making savings are not good enough.

The Council could rent the building out to make more money. Don't they have empty buildings and assets that can be rented out to generate money? Being on your own makes quite a difference to the way you think."

💬 Service User 1

I was really ill. I went to a private doctor at The Priory for a long time. I then went to a day centre at St Anne's Hospital. It was horrible. I then went to Woodside Day Centre for 6 years and then they closed it down. I became very depressed. When I was really ill I never left the house. I lost my skills. My son did everything for me.

I have now been at The Haven for 4 years. I come here 5 days a week. I have settled in. The Haven opening was like winning the lottery. I am very aware of things now. I have lots of confidence.

When I come to the day centre I play dominoes and tri-ominoes. I mix with other people. I go on trips. I love going to Ikea.

If The Haven closes I'll go back to square one. I'll end up like a cabbage again. The panic attacks and depression will come back. Some of the homecare workers are useless. The Haven is the best care in the world and I look forward to it. It will be really sad. We're like a family here. They are my family.

It will be the death of some of us.

Service User 3

I lived on the settee for 5-6 years. My son had to leave work to look after me. I came to this centre. This is my second home. Who will look after me? If you do close it down I will be back where I was. I was at Woodside. It took me time to get used to this place. I won't be able to leave the house again. My son has bills to pay. No one will look after me.

Service User 4

If I feel sick they make me feel better. I won't eat – I have diabetes, they make sure I eat regularly. It will kill me. It will make me ill again. I get very panicky. Wonderful staff, wonderful management. The Haven gives our children peace of mind knowing that we are coming here.

User of Service – The Haven Centre Day Centre

"I appreciate everything the council has done for us. Please don't close the centre – I have learnt so much here, please do not close this. Many of us need this without this we cannot survive. When I get home I am very lonely. The manager encourages us. Please Sir, I am asking you to help us – without this we have nowhere."



Service User 6

If people don't want to listen they will listen to me. Staff has been good to me. Everybody here has been good to me. I think the world of this day centre. I'm telling you this much the other week I left this centre it was really cold, I ended up in hospital. People from this centre did not know where I was. I was nearly on my deathbed if it was not for these people and these drivers. This day centre means the world to me – more than anything. I know a lot of people here and they are all kind to me. What will happen to me? Please, please I want this day centre to stay open.

Service User 7

If you are going to keep a place open then keep this one open. Everyone here loves coming. It is a big family. It will be sorely missed if you get rid of it. My family have been in Tottenham for over 100 years and this is what you are doing to us. We pay our taxes. When I came here it absolutely changed my life. I had two days. I could socialise.

It's not the same at home and talking to someone on the phone is not the same as seeing someone. We might be old – but we are still human. This is a lifeline.

 Service User 8

My daughter and granddaughter are my carers. When I am here they can relax knowing I am OK. We are constantly hearing about the aging population. I thought I would be settled here for the rest of my life. I love coming here. When I am at home I am very lonely.

 Service User 9

I come here once a week so it won't affect me much. I listen to the radio at home on my own. At home I have meals on wheels they are not very nice. The food here is good. I enjoy the food. I meet other people. I have a home help at home twice a day. She talks to me. If I didn't see her I would not talk to anyone. I would miss this place if it closed. Makes me feel sad because it is such a good service.

 Service User 10

Be a shame if they close this place. I come here 3 days a week because I am lonely at home. Bus picks me up I don't go out on my own anymore. Walking is a struggle. I enjoy the company. I worried about this because I will have no one to talk to during the day. I would be very sorry if they close this place. They encourage us to go to the Doctors. They keep an eye on us if we are not well.

Carers – The Haven Day Centre

Carer – The Haven Day Centre

"Can we not share this building? You have an extension there. Why can we not share the building? How many people out of hospital do you think you will be getting? I understand people need rehabilitation. Give us an alternative. Let's leave these people a little bit happy. Let's share this building. At least these people will have somewhere to go and to keep warm and to have a proper meal."



 This centre is amazing. My mother comes here. Have you thought about the people who come here?

 Cuts have previously been made and adult social services frontline services should be protected.

 I'm representing my parents. If my dad didn't come here it would kill him. It would also kill us. You're using people, children with disabilities or adults with learning disabilities. People sold houses and pensions to pay for their care. What are you going to do with all these people? Who's going to pay for staffing to care for these people? They will be stuck in their homes?

- ☞ I've come out today because it's so important. Mum suffers from Alzheimer's and before coming here for a long time. I am her sole carer. She hardly spoke a word before then. Mum attends 3 days a week and she's made friends. My mum joins in as much as she can, she will regress again. I've been able to go to work and I pay my taxes. My mum loves this place. For lots of people their main meal is here. I'm still a carer for my mum, some people have nobody. What I am grateful to Haringey Council for is bringing my mum back to me. Give them an alternative. If you want more money I will pay more money. Keep these services open. We don't want you to close this place. Not 6 months or 3 years down the line.
- ☞ My mum comes here. I would have loved her to come here twice a week. She comes once a week. This is the legacy of overspending over many years; how people in government have dealt with the finances of the people.

5.2 LINDEN HOUSE

Linden House residents are unable to speak up for themselves. One resident did not want to talk and the others were unable to. Another resident is also affected by possible changes within another service and had spoken with us during the day.

Staff and family carers were identified as 'Circles of Support'. They spoke up on behalf of the residents.

Session 1 – Circle of Support Linden House

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect the resident's day to day life?

Circle of Support – Linden House



"No one has shown anxiety or distress as yet because they don't understand what is about to happen to them and their home. How can they understand? The explosion will happen if and when they move. It will be a tremendous explosion. It will happen in a matter of days. Only then will the impact really be felt."

- ☞ We explained to the residents that there may be some changes happening but it meant absolutely nothing to them. This group has no understanding of what's going on. There has been little immediate reaction because they had no idea about what we were telling them.
- ☞ The residents have been here a long time and they are settled. Some residents have been here for over 7 years. They can't speak up for themselves.
- ☞ The move from agency to permanent staff was an excellent move. The home has come on leaps and bounds. The permanent staff team have been here for 4 years. We've worked hard with the residents to help them settle and learn about their needs and choices.

We have significantly reduced their challenging behaviours. All staff took beatings, bites, spitting, smearing and cursing from the residents to get them to where they are now and we'd do it all again because we know what has been achieved for the residents so that they can have an excellent quality of life. They get social interaction from us that they won't get anywhere else because no one else will want to work with them in the way that we do.

- 💡 Because of their autism and challenging behaviour, some residents will only accept support and personal care from specific staff. They go to staff who they recognise. It's taken a very long time for them to build trust with us. It's taken years for some residents to get to where they are now.
- 💡 The changes will have a profound detrimental effect on the resident's health and well-being. It's going to be very hard for all of them. Some residents have been passed around and they have now settled. There will be extreme challenging behaviours. They will digress. They will be put through unnecessary hell.
- 💡 Noise levels and certain behaviours of the residents are unmanageable in the community. Some individuals can be a danger to themselves and to others if they are not carefully supported. They are not suitable candidates for Shared Lives/Supported Living. These residents need 24 hour care support and bespoke services. Safeguarding is a real concern.
- 💡 If Shared Lives doesn't work residents will get forgotten. They may get chucked in an older people's home, a mental health unit or sent home to unmanageable situations.
- 💡 Some residents have physical needs. Some are not able to get around like others.
- 💡 This will have a negative impact on family orientations. All families will suffer. The clients will feed off their anxieties. Families depend on good staff to care for their loved ones.
- 💡 Some clients have known each other since childhood. They went to school together and have gone through the 'system' together.
- 💡 If the home closes it won't be good for everyone involved.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services?

Circle of Support – Linden House

"Residents will be devastated when they realise what's going on. They may feel abandoned when they don't see any of the staff and they realise [in their own way] that we're not coming back or not there anymore. Residents will withdraw and their mental health will deteriorate."



- ☞ The council is taking away the resident's experience in exchange for profit or savings. It will have a detrimental effect on their health and well-being.
- ☞ It is difficult to say much else without more information. There are not enough details and a lot of speculation. The information coming through is vague and inconsistent. Staff feel unsettled for the residents and closer to the time we will have to draw on all our skills to try and help people to understand. For the resident's sake we really hope the Council doesn't go ahead with the closure.

Why do think the residents will feel this way about the plans?

Circle of Support – Linden House



"It will take a very long time for residents to resettlement; if they do at all?"

- ☞ It will be a huge learning process for any new staff team working with residents. They will need to be very experienced.
- ☞ The neighbours have become accustomed to the residents. The manager has worked hard with the neighbours to manage peace controls, as they sometimes get upset about the noise levels. Residents can be extremely loud. They need to be in an environment where they can be free to express themselves. They need space when their behaviour becomes challenging and when they are no longer able to manage their own behaviour. The new neighbours won't know what has hit them.
- ☞ The residents are not going to experience real choice and control because they are being 'sent' to a new place. They don't get to choose where they go. They don't get to choose their new home.
- ☞ Residents will digress. It will be too hard for many. They need consistency.

Session 2 – Carers Linden House

If Haringey Council go ahead with their plans ... How would it affect your loved ones' day to day life?

- ☞ Try to be realistic [staff have told me]. They look out for me as a carer. When Linden House closes will the same staff go to Muswell Hill? Will staff lose their jobs? The staff has a risky job. For the work they do they should be paid more money not losing their jobs? They are not being paid their worth.
- ☞ There were lots of problems in the beginning at Linden House. The agency staff caused so many problems. We were always worried. It took years for the clients to settle. The new staff that came in is much better. The clients are now happy. I have seen a big change in my son.



Carer – Linden House

“The previous manager and staff were not very good. Now it’s wonderful with the new staff and manager. It’s much better now there is full-time staff. The staff at Linden House is perfect. They do everything. I’m too old now and can’t look after my nephew.

You will take my nephew somewhere he doesn’t know. He will become very aggressive like before. He’s used to his current surroundings. Why destroy him? I understand that savings have to be made but leave Linden House alone.

My nephew knows staff and staff know him. He will be confused and will start hitting people again. I am concerned that staff who do not know him and who are not trained will start hitting back [when no one is looking].”

-  The people who live here need 24-hour supervision. They can’t understand and will become very aggressive. People have bespoke complex service needs.
-  There should be a way to make the cuts that does not include our loved ones. The Council is making cuts but it’s our loved ones and us who will be bleeding. We pay our taxes so why can’t they find another way to make savings? Haringey doesn’t have money but they have lots of managers.
-  I went to see the proposed building at Muswell Hill. It looks totally unsuitable. It will not be familiar surroundings. How does the Haringey evaluate who is suitable for shared lives? Will the new home be monitored? What will happen if Muswell Hill is not suitable? Are there any other places?
-  I read somewhere that if the worst comes to the worst people will be sent home to live with their families. Parents will have to give up work. We would lose our jobs. We cannot depend on benefits. No one helped me when I needed the money now they want to take it away. I would not be able to look after my son at home. He is too strong for me. My health would deteriorate. My family would suffer.
-  Staff work very hard to achieve the quality of service. The old staff team was very inconsistent in the past, it has been a hell of a job for me.
-  Why the consultation is so short and why was it during the Christmas Holidays? I think the proposals should be challenged. We can’t allow this to happen.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

Carer – Linden House

"Impossible! I won't accept it. Leave Linden House alone."



-  We feel stressed and distressed.
-  Frightened.
-  We will have to give up our jobs.
-  We don't trust the Council.
-  We feel that there is no room to challenge Haringey.

Why do you feel this way about the plans?

Carer – Linden House

"We are annoyed because the Council keeps doing this to us and to our loved ones."



-  The clients won't be able to do the things that they do now. They find it hard to meet new people. They are strange faces. They will have real problems settling. Our sons would lose their friends they've been with all their lives.
-  It would be criminal if something happened. People should not be moved until death. I would like my son to stay here as he is.
-  I believe that Haringey Council has already made up their mind. They are in the habit of making promises but they couldn't care less. The council are not thinking about the people who live at Linden House.

5.3 OSBORNE GROVE NURSING HOME

User of Service – Osborne Grove Nursing Home

"The dissemination of information is very poor. There is an assumption that because we are service users we are not intelligent and we don't understand what's going on. That may be the case for some of the people who live here but not for everyone. Not for people like me. I understand."



Users of Services – Osborne Grove Nursing Home

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your day to day life?

-  I'm concerned that if you're going to bring in a mixed population the service will be diluted. If it's gradually going to change its nature how are they going to manage this?
-  My wife has been here since 2008, since it opened. She has to be here. She was a bed blocker in hospital. Her needs cannot be met in the community. I used to care for my wife for a number of years. I can't now due to ill health. I come to see her almost every day. She requires nursing care, nursing home.
-  There are 4 units all high dependency and some with higher needs than others. The people who live here, will they continue to get the same high level of care as what is currently received? What about redundancies? Will all the staff be made redundant?
-  My sister helped me to look at untold amounts of nursing homes before we settled for Osborne Grove. Most of them were not suitable for my needs and others would not take me.
-  The staff here are very willing and caring. Osborne Grove is an example of best practice. It would be tragic if Haringey Council let Osborne Grove close.
-  I do not know where people like me with high support needs will go? The private sector does not want high support needs like me. I had lots of care in the community but I still had to come here in the end?
-  My wife and I live at Osborne Grove. We were at another home but my daughter did not like it there. The hospital felt that I needed to come here. My wife has dementia. She has to be on her own. I see her every day.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

User of Service – Osborne Grove Nursing Home



"This place is good to me. This place is nice. The staff is nice. The food is nice. I do not remember who brought me here?"

-  I am very nervous for my future.
-  I have mixed feelings about being here. I don't care about me but I am very worried about what will happen to my wife. She's only alive because she's here. She will die if she has to leave.
-  I'm really worried about the timeframe for when all of this is going to happen. It's like having the sword of Damocles hanging over me.

- ☞ I would like a clear timeframe that lists all the different things that are happening and when. I'd like to know when decisions will be made and if changes are agreed, when those changes will come in to effect?

Why do you feel this way about the plans?

User of Service – Osborne Grove Nursing Home



“People are living longer. Carers in the community don’t have enough time to support people like us. They have appointments back to back. They cut short their appointments with us so that they can make time to get to their next appointment.”

- ☞ If they plan to use the same staff for reablement services, management at Osborne Grove will be split in their responsibilities. As the Osborne Grove residents gets smaller and patients leave or die what will happen to those left behind? Will we be left in a back room somewhere?
- ☞ According to the hospital I cannot stay at home or look after my wife because of my own health needs. As far as I’m concerned I just make up the numbers. My daughter speaks up for me but she couldn’t make it. I have nowhere else to go. This is my home but it’s not the same as your own home.

Carers – Osborne Grove Nursing Home

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your loved ones’ day to day life?

Carer – Osborne Grove Nursing Home



“I would like to stress what a hard and upsetting experience it has been. Haringey nursing care provision is not great but it is home to many. Day services are as ‘cheap as chips’. You don’t need to close them. There’s going to be nothing left. I don’t care what Party people support you all need to get together and sort this out.”

- ☞ People at Osborne Grove have high dependency needs. If they’re not going to stay here where are you going to house them? The residents’ lifestyles are being threatened. It is unsettling for everyone. It’s all a bit vague.
- ☞ The demographics won’t change. People will still be ill. There are only 2 other residential nursing homes in the borough and both have failed their CQC. People will have to be shipped out of the borough.
- ☞ I’m very hands on with my mum and the staff. This helps everybody pick up what’s required to support her. If you move people out of their environment it will bring on mental stress. No one is prepared for this and it’s a medical fact that once you move sick people they die. Haringey Council would not be able to provide what is medically required for our loved ones out in the community.

They have higher needs and require specialist medical care. Most relatives have had to fight tooth and nail to get their families in to Osborne Grove. The home has all the potential to stay without loss of money. Everyone's supposed to be working as a team instead of at loggerheads. It is a good home it has all the pluses. Where's the contingency plan. How are you going to look after these people in the community?

- ☞ You haven't done re-evaluation of all residents involved. You're going to decide the budget first and then try to organise the services.
- ☞ This makes a mockery of consultation. This should have started months ago.
- ☞ People like my sister are going to need somewhere to be looked after.
- ☞ Care homes providers are obliged to accept what the council gives. Services suffer as a result. Some care homes are business orientated.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

- ☞ Concerned and worried. If less people are here there will there be fewer nurses? It is very stressful looking after someone with dementia.
- ☞ I'm scared. Not only for my family but for everyone – they should not close Osborne Grove. It's a great facility.

Why do you feel this way about the plans?

Carer – Osborne Grove Nursing Home

"I have gone round homes here and in Yorkshire somewhere pretty grim. People do not understand the implication."



- ☞ Publicity about this consultation is lacking. Whole thing is rushed. We've been off for Christmas for 3 weeks. This has been pushed through by the Council. Very few people in this home have people who are able to speak up for them.
- ☞ This place was purpose built and opened by the health minister for people with dementia. What happens if you are not well after the 6 weeks?
- ☞ The staff always has to consider the safety of the people who live here. Everybody bar one person needs care in a place like this. How are they going to look after those people who remain? Will they have the correct facilities? No one knows when they will die but the Council is banking on people dying quickly. If the people here are not here they will be in hospital.

5.4 ERMINE ROAD DAY OPPORTUNITIES

Most of the Ermine Road Day Opportunities users of service were unable to speak up for themselves. LDX was able to identify 10 people to have a discussion with.

Staff and family carers were also identified as 'Circles of Support'. They spoke up on behalf of the users of services.

Session 1 – Users of Services, Ermine Road Day Opportunities

Based on the question: If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your day to day life? We asked people “What does the Day Centre mean to you?”

User of Services – Ermine Road Day Opportunities



“I like it here because it makes me happy. I enjoy myself. I like the people.”

[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

- ☞ Got nowhere else to go
- ☞ Develop friends.
- ☞ Daily routine, I will lose it.
- ☞ Big change. Have routines.
- ☞ I will lose my self-confidence.
- ☞ Happy.
- ☞ Trust the people at Ermine Road.
- ☞ Come in for 2-3 days but better services.
- ☞ I like to come to the day centre to see my friends.
- ☞ It's my routine.
- ☞ Will affect my confidence and health.
- ☞ No one understands cant? ... what this will look like.
- ☞ Research about outings and activities.
- ☞ I like it here.
- ☞ I like to come here – I do different things – I enjoy going out.
- ☞ I go from home to here for 5 days.
- ☞ Not happy to have change.
- ☞ 1 or 2 good sessions but rest of the time babysitting
- ☞ I like coming here, I lost weight, I go swimming, I go cycling.
- ☞ (a drawing of a house)
- ☞ I would not be happy if I was at home all of the time. I get upset if I can't come.

User of Services – Ermine Road Day Opportunities



“If I don't come to Ermine Road I would have to stay at home.”

Based on the question: How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question] we asked people “How would it make you feel if the day centre had to change your service?”

[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

-  Sad
-  It makes me feel sick, sad and angry.
-  I will fight [gestured fighting].
-  [Gestured] tears – sad.
-  [Gestured] I feel sick.
-  Pointed to picture of Ermine Road. I feel upset and unhappy. [arms raised]
-  Makes me feel bad.
-  I would feel angry.
-  I don't want to lose my friends.
-  Lonely.
-  Not fair up and down. Keep on making changes. Every time I get used to it they change things again.

Based on the question: Why do you feel this way about the plans? We asked people “Why do you feel this way?”

[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

-  I want to stay here – I love all the things I do here.
-  I want to stay where I am – it's all I know.
-  Being at home is like being in a cage.
-  I'm used to being at home, nowhere else to go.
-  It makes me feel unwanted and used. The staff mean a lot to me.
-  I've been coming for 16 years – it's a part of my life.
-  I was very unhappy took 5 years to settle.

Session 2 – Circle of Support, Ermine Road Day Opportunities

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect the users of services day to day life?

Circle of Support – Ermine Road Day Opportunities



“People need to take a holistic view when looking after the health and wellbeing of the service user. There are such high needs here. A lack of consistency affects deterioration of behaviour. It's not that simple for people with learning disabilities being out in the community.”

-  The day centre will need skilled, motivated staff to continue to co-ordinate the sessions for service users and who will facilitate them? i.e. Hydro pool + rebound therapy, sensory support, cycling and art scope etc.
-  How will service users have access to personal care in the community?

- 💬 We cannot reassure our client groups who have some understanding because we don't have enough information. Everything is too vague. It would be nice to have more concrete information to make available to parent carers.
- 💬 What appropriate community services will be available? The local community is still not as accessible as people think it is for people with learning disabilities. Clients may become de-skilled if they get less support to be independent.
- 💬 Safeguarding - We are the first port of call for service users and carers. We can identify concerns with clothing, bruises, not eating, health deteriorating, money not being paid etc.
- 💬 Carers are very concerned that the model works for them and their loved ones. For some of the parents this is all too much for them, they are asking what does it really mean?
- 💬 Parent carers need as much support as the service users do? Some of them are really elderly. They physically can no longer do things anymore. As a gesture of good will and beyond the call of duty we support them with many things during the day including taking clients to the foot clinic, the dentist, picking up prescriptions, keep a check on health and well-being issues and remind families of important dates and appointments etc. Parent carers have confidence in staff and there are longstanding relationships that would be hard to recoup.
- 💬 How will the community be regulated to make sure that people are safe? Safeguarding will be a huge issue. Who will be responsible for checking DBS in the voluntary sector?
- 💬 There will be a huge impact on behaviour with clients hitting themselves and others.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

Circle of Support – Ermine Road Day Opportunities



“Regulation – how do you know people are doing what they say they do? Safeguarding needs to be put in place around the ‘model of social enterprise’. In the voluntary sector who will be responsible for co-coordinating/ checking DBS?”

- 💬 Care in the community – It doesn't feel a lot of financial planning has gone into this?
- 💬 Feel that Haringey council is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the parents/ carers.
- 💬 Service users' self-esteem and health will suffer.
- 💬 Bit by bit would have been better than cuts all at once.

Parents/ carers are being dragged through the system again.

Why do you feel this way about the plans?

- Vulnerability – Concerns for the future, the unknown. People are hyper vulnerable.
- Sustainability – This will happen, this is just the start
- Health will deteriorate – unhealthy impact on health and wellbeing.
- Constructive vulnerability – Making people more vulnerable than what they are already.
- Collateral damage – people will deteriorate and possibly die if their care package is not there anymore.
- Fearful – unknown for the S/U uncertainty. What will happen to them?
- This is unfair, why? – because these kind of changes are unfair.
- Stress and strain on all staff will manifest itself in the service users in other ways. We will feel the pressure
- Abandonment – because it feels like everything the service worked for, has achieved and produced will be gone. Resources will disappear.
- We are here because we like to look after the needs of our service users. It's never been about the money. If our jobs go we'll get another one but what about the people with learning disabilities? We do it for them. We do it because we care.
- It's going to be hard to be positive until we see the action plan and outcomes.
- There is still a lot of negativity and barriers in the community. Many people and services still have a negative view of people with learning disabilities.

Carers – General Discussion

Carer – Ermine Road Day Opportunities

"My son has spent 6-7 years in the care home. He was active before this. My daughter asked the home "What activities does he do?" Besides the cinema he doesn't have any other activities. It is a nice clean home but no activities."

- It is important that my son has access to social and day opportunities including going out with groups.
- They want to close down Ermine Road. My daughter went into residential care. She had no day services for 4 years. She needs more assessment.

The residential home do not help her during the day. They make excuses i.e. have not got staff or transport etc.

-  Would it not make sense to have a 1 year instead of 3 year plan? The Council should wait for outcome of general election before making any decisions?
-  I take offense to the consultation being done over the Christmas period. We don't have time to consider these things during this period.
-  The documents we received don't explain what Beverley Tarka explained today at the consultation. The wording is confusing. It doesn't say "Day Service" it says "Day Centre". It's misleading (consultation document).
-  Carers are not supported enough to support my son whilst in care home. This is neglectful. There is not enough day centres for people like my son. I don't have peace of mind about my son. I am very disappointed.
-  My son is in Ermine Road. He knows how to do work. He can file etc. The social workers keeps saying they will help him in 1 year. I call and nothing changes. The Council have spent time and money for him to go to college etc. but 4 years later no change. He goes to Ermine Road and then he comes home. Every day is the same thing. He's not doing anything. He has forgotten how to do things. He is getting lazy. He could easily, with support, do 2 hours a day working. He can work.
-  I had a lot of trouble getting my son social activities. If this proposal goes ahead it will be very difficult.
-  My son loves to come to come out during the day. I am 69 years old. It will kill me if he can't come here anymore. He is in his room when he is not coming here. My son does not sleep at night so I get to recover when he comes to the day centre. I want more services not less.

5.5 THE ROUNDWAY SERVICE

LDX spoke to 6 users of services at the Roundway. The remaining users of service were unable to speak up for themselves.

Staff and family carers were identified as 'Circles of Support'. They spoke up on behalf of the users of services.

Session 1: Users of Service, The Roundway Service

User of Service – The Roundway Service

"Oh no why? ... If you cannot, please don't. It's not fair – I won't be happy. Don't want to miss the centre."



Based on the question: How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question] we asked people “How would it make you feel if the day centre had to change your service?”

[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

-  I feel sorry
-  I love my activities. I don't want to stop doing them. I loves cooking.
-  It can't be happening – why?
-  They help me go out.
-  I'm afraid it's going to happen
-  I would feel stressed

The users of service did not want to answer any further questions.

Session 2: Carers, The Roundway Service

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your loved ones day to day lives?

Carer – The Roundway Service



“My daughter was taken out of services for a while. Staff had to call the police because they could not deal with her. If staff who knows her well can't cope how are strangers going to manage?”

-  When a stranger comes to pick my child up I would not allow it.
-  My daughter lives in at residential home. Will she lose her day service? Structure meaning routine to her day.
-  My one would think she could go into the shops and help herself to things. She doesn't understand that she has to pay? If she has to stay at home it will have a negative impact on her. It's another change to her routine.
-  We won't be able to go anywhere. It will restrict our movements. My son becomes destructive when he is affected by change.
-  All clients are different they are not all the same. They all get tarred with the same brush. My daughter does not understand. When things are very bad she ends up spending time in a Psychiatric residential home. The last time she spent 9 months there.
-  My daughter has been a part of these services for 11 years she is used to this. It should be replaced by something better not worse. What will she do if she can't come here?
-  If they close the day centre I will have to take my son out of services.

- 💬 Very stressful
- 💬 Maybe it was not appropriate after all for these service users to be at this meeting but I won't allow anyone to consult with my daughter without me being present.
- 💬 These people can be a bit challenging, need structure and routine. They will run rings around them.
- 💬 I don't like the idea of volunteers taking them out in the community. Are they going to have DBS checks?
- 💬 I have two disabled sons. I am worried that I won't be able to do anything anymore. It will stop me going to the Doctors or going to work.
- 💬 If my daughter is at home and is not kept doing something she explodes. She would be up and down the walls driving me crazy with no day centre.
- 💬 He is always at the door waiting for the bus to come. My son would be lost without this place. If he doesn't see the bus coming he starts hitting himself.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

Carer – The Roundway

"My daughter was taken out of services for a while. Staff had to call the police because they could not deal with her. If staff who knows her well can't cope how are strangers going to manage?"



- 💬 I do not trust Haringey Council, they are not genuine. They've already decided what they are going to do. I am outraged
- 💬 How can we give you feedback if we do not know what we're consulting on? How can we be consulted on what we do not know about?
- 💬 We have only learnt about what's going on because of the staff. [Only 5 out of 26 people at the meeting said that they had received the proposals.]
- 💬 All the documents I have received have no mention of The Roundway closing. Is the Roundway closing or not? I'm confused? This is confusing and stressful?
- 💬 I did receive the info but I did not understand it and the information given by Haringey Council has not been filtered down.
- 💬 What does Social Enterprise Model mean anyway?
- 💬 Everyday our resident looks forward to the day centre if he don't go he gets stressed.

- 💬 Even if there is an issue of double funding, some people have not been assessed for years.
- 💬 Some people will become socially isolated. At least here they meet different people.
- 💬 Most clients would say yes and no to the same question. So we need to speak up for them. Is this a deprivation of liberty? Haringey are discriminating against those who do not have a voice. They have a vote but most of them can't use it. Get ignored.
- 💬 The Council will end up getting cheap labour and losing good staff.
- 💬 The new Care Act is coming in and support will have to be taken into account as well as the needs of carers.
- 💬 I'll go absolutely doolally!
- 💬 The impact on us as parents will be death! Can't go the Doctors. Can't do anything. The mental strain on us as a parent is bad enough. Places like this maintain our loved ones health and wellbeing as well as ours. I can't see how I can cope. I will run back to Nigeria and leave her here.
- 💬 Time scale is very rushed.

Why do you feel that way about the plans?

- 💬 I live on my own with my daughter. I have hospital appointment. If she is at home with me I can't go because of her stress. She would be up all night.
- 💬 He loves the staff. He loves the day centre. I'd hate to think that Haringey Council will close a place like this.
- 💬 2 areas affect my daughter because of double funding. There is nothing in the community for her. She will not be safe.
- 💬 I am lost for words.
- 💬 The quality of support for these autistic people is being compromised once again.
- 💬 How many times can you take them to the same place? They get bored.
- 💬 These staff know these clients. If other people come along we'll have to start the long process all over again.
- 💬 If this is the strategy of Haringey with such a limited time to consult we as parents cannot do anything about this. We don't get the choice to do anything about this.
- 💬 Personal budgets are not allowing enough money. I don't feel they want to pay enough to support my daughter.

Session 3: Circle of Support, The Roundway Centre

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect the users of services day to day life?



Circle of Support – The Roundway Centre

“One of our service users used to go to Central. He had a particular routine. He never used to go out and when he did he used to abscond. We used social stories to show him that he was coming to this building. He now understands that he attends the Roundway. He has a set programme when he goes out. He has a named member of staff. He has particular routines which he must complete. He can now explore the local area. It has taken us from September 2013 until now to achieve this. If he feels he is going back or is going to Birkbeck Road he will deteriorate and exhibits challenging behaviour to show that he is not comfortable.”

- 💡 What sort of service will service users get if they are not able to access the day centre? This is a big respite facility for carers and families that enables them to go out and do their jobs and other things.
- 💡 Opportunities during the day are limited. This will have a huge impact on relationships – some service users only trust specific members of staff.
- 💡 Skill levels will go down. Learnt skills over the years will have to be relearnt. It takes time to build relationships most service users here are Autistic. It will be difficult for them to adapt to change especially as they've just been through a major one already. They have only just started to really settle down from that. It will affect their behaviour. It is a complete change to their routine. The process will need to be very slow. It will need to be in stages. To move them around again will only confuse them even more.
- 💡 Staff have the impression that day centre will close down and that they will not continue to support the clients. Uncertainty around the meaning of the loss of 96 jobs full time equivalent and that staff will no longer be employed by Haringey Council. Whatever the meaning, it will be a massive change in long term.
- 💡 There are other service users who will abscond if they feel unsafe. They won't go near dogs or public transport. We don't have massive community relationships.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

- 💡 Anxious and confused due to the vagueness of the proposals. There is an inability of the group to grasp the true concept of the proposals.
- 💡 Staff have been placed in a difficult situation with parent carers.
- 💡 Parents are stressed.

- 💬 This is a serious risk to the service user and their carers.
- 💬 Overall it's difficult to say how we feel if we do not know what effect this will have on services.

Circle of Support – The Roundway

“The impact will not be felt until after the fact. They live in the moment not the future. They are autistic.”



Why do you feel this way about the plans?

- 💬 Don't think impact of the proposals have really been understood by the people making the proposals.
- 💬 Service users have enough challenges in their day to day life as it is. How much stress must they keep on enduring?
- 💬 If we are not around the impact will have to be dealt with by the residential home and the parent carers who may not be equipped or ready for the fall out.

5.6 BIRKBECK ROAD SERVICES

29 users of service at Birkbeck Road were able to speak up for themselves.

Staff and family carers were also identified as 'Circles of Support'. They spoke up on behalf of the users of services too.

Based on the question: If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your day to day life? We asked people “What does the Day Centre mean to you?”

User of Service – Birkbeck Road

“I enjoy the centre. I look forward to coming here every day. What would I do if I couldn't come here?”



[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

- 💬 The centre is important.
- 💬 We love coming here.
- 💬 Please don't take it away.
- 💬 We would struggle to get through the day.
- 💬 I would be at home 7 days a week
- 💬 What will we do? Stay at home getting bored senseless?
- 💬 We would be bored not coming here.
- 💬 I think I will have to find a job to go to?

- ☞ Where would I go? Where would we go... nowhere to go?
- ☞ Tired, bored, at home – sleep all day.
- ☞ I do not want to stay at home I want to go to the centre.
- ☞ I would get bored I want to keep the centre open
- ☞ I'd like a job and come to the centre as well as.

Based on the question: How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question] we asked people “How would it make you feel if the day centre had to change your service?”

User of Service – Birkbeck Road

“We don’t like changes because it’s confusing.”



[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

- ☞ What’s going to happen?
- ☞ I’m hoping for the best.
- ☞ The worry is upsetting me.
- ☞ I can get money out of my bank – that can help them out?
- ☞ We chose the name of the centre ‘Always’ – we chose ‘Always’ because we thought we would always stay there.
- ☞ LEAVE IT ALONE!
- ☞ I think about the part of not giving anyone enough money to do things
- ☞ It’s bad
- ☞ Angry.
- ☞ I don’t want the centre to be closing. I do like it here I do gardening, bowling, and I work
- ☞ Prefer it here to Roundway. I was at Roundway before.

Based on the question: Why do you feel this way about the plans? We asked people “Why do you feel this way?”

User of Service – Birkbeck Road

“I would be bored doing the same thing every day like shopping.”



[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

- ☞ I will miss the staff
- ☞ It’s not fair on my carer
- ☞ I’m going to write to David Cameron, he’s the one doing the cut backs. I have written 3 letters.
- ☞ If I stay at home I will be upset
- ☞ Upset and annoyed I will lose my friends and key worker.
- ☞ Means so much to me I would get banners. I would get my friend and a banner to keep it open. I would go to the Civic Centre and protest.

- 💬 They're making cutbacks.
- 💬 I feel like a yoyo. Up and down, up and down?
- 💬 Sad.
- 💬 Angry and sad
- 💬 I'm very disappointed with council.
- 💬 I want it to be open here. I feel horrible.
- 💬 I have had the same staff for a long time
- 💬 When I get off the bus the staff make a cup of tea for us If we have been out in the cold. Helps us get warm
- 💬 The staff help me with my problems.
- 💬 staff help me to cross the road to help me be independent
- 💬 I have had lots of changes. I like it here
- 💬 Staff not just here to do activities they help me with my life. They are important.
- 💬 Staff comforted me when my mum died
- 💬 Staff helped me when I lost my sister. Staff help us in other ways.

Session 2: Carers, Birkbeck Road

Carers joined in the session with users of services. During and after the meeting they also said the following.

Carer – Birkbeck Road



"My son has been in the service since 19 years old? There have been so many changes and threats of changes. We do not know if we are coming or going?"

- 💬 All these changes. My mother in law does not speak English I support her and my sister. They need me to interpret on their behalf.
- 💬 I feel lost I don't know what to do. This is such a horrible feeling.
- 💬 My sister is aging and her mobility needs and care have increased. She's not only disabled, she is also elderly. I have to consider, on a daily basis what activities we do. I need the centre to lighten the load.
- 💬 I do not want them to close this place as my daughter is happy here despite the barriers. She is so happy.
- 💬 In holidays when centre is closed she can't wait for centre to open. She keeps asking.
- 💬 Staff supports us.
- 💬 I call on staff. We speak over the telephone if there is a problem.
- 💬 Who would help us?
- 💬 As a carer when my loved one is at the day centre it gives me time to do the things I need to do.
- 💬 It would tie me down if my sister was at home more. I will not be able to do those things.

Session 3: Circle of Support, Birkbeck Road

A Circle of Support for the users of services at Birkbeck Road also gave the following feedback.

Circle of Support – Birkbeck Road



“To communicate with our clients effectively plans need to be done way in advance. Some of this is not appropriate – some of the information is unacceptable.”

-  We do not know the impact this will have on Service Users until it happens. For those people who are non-verbal you do not know the impact immediately.
-  The day centre is great. It improves behaviour. We facilitate people to make choices. People already have the option of doing other things.
-  Lots of clients will go downhill. Lots of clients have been here between 15 – 25 years.
-  15 months ago people moved from the Roundway to here. People have just settled down.
-  Most of the people who come here are living in residential/ supported living. This is going to reduce the service from 75 people per day to 17 (approx.) If the residential homes don't provide a balanced service people will become deskilled. This will impact on this group the most as they will have to leave.
-  Let's pool resources – club together to get the work done. Get a support worker who can support 3 or 4 of them. There will be no central organisation to do this.
-  Lots of residential homes do not have staff during the day. A lot of the staff don't take part in or focus on personal and social development of the clients. They focus on personal care and cooking. Haringey are trying to save money but are they actually saving money in the long run?
-  For me it seems like going back to the olden days with people sitting at home all day. Clients now mix with people, make friends, do things they want to do. The community isn't all that and people don't want to be out all day, every day. Some people have less mobility than others, may not want to walk, struggle with the cold weather and have challenging behaviour in the community.
-  Our clients keep saying what's going to happen? When is it going to happen? It's confusing to keep on telling people “It's just an idea?” and that there's nothing concrete. However, there are some people who have understood about the changes, the possible closure of day service and the impact on them.



Circle of Support – Birkbeck Road

“Is there is a robust system in place for safeguarding? Is there going to be an auditing procedure to check safeguarding? Without any form of day service many will be feel very vulnerable, isolated and at risk. Many more people will be open to hidden abuse.

- ☞ There seems to be no alternative to the closure of the day service
- ☞ We pick up lots of stuff to support the family. We feed into the Social workers and health teams. Escorts are able to raise the alarm on issues at the home. If someone is just receiving day services we do the review. We chase the reviews. We deal with social, emotional, mental, wellbeing, safety, health, bus passes, blue badges, benefits etc. For some people we are their only point of call.

5.7 GENERAL COMMENTS

LDX has identified below relevant general feedback from users of services, carers, circles of support and stakeholders that was made at different times during corporate and specific consultation sessions.

Service Users – People First

“Society is not accessible or appropriate for people with LD. We are far away from being an inclusive society.”

- ☞ How did you work out the cuts of 30 million?
- ☞ Stop giving financial answers to moral questions. You do not have to prescribe the 3 year plan now. Don't make a stronger Haringey of the weakest people. Wait until after election. Have a holding budget instead.
- ☞ Holiday periods and religious festivals should be avoided when having Council consultation (Government policy).
- ☞ Have political parties considered sharing salaries of top paid counsellors/officers in order to preserve places like Ermine Road?
- ☞ I think this is a sad day. It's a cut down for me. You can go 2 days, you can go 1 day. Haringey loves to be in the news. They love ITV. Haringey is waiting for something to kick off. People with learning disabilities have views but they cannot speak for themselves. Cutting all services means everyone locked up in their homes with nowhere to go. It will be like the little girl Climbie? I can see it happening again. I'm waiting for something to happen after you shut down the day centre. People with learning disabilities may not be able to think straight but leave us alone.

- ☞ Only the mild to moderate can utilise reablement support. Other core groups will not be able to increase burden of care on families. It will be a breakdown of families and services.
- ☞ Older people homes have previously been closed and are now sitting empty. Why can't you re-open them and use them? You've not explored all of the options open to you.
- ☞ Osborne Grove is a health issue. What explorations are being made about beds? The partnership between Health and Social Care is an important issue. Osborne Grove is an important facility to have and we should be working together to get health to fund it.
- ☞ Saving money should be the furthest thought away.
- ☞ What extra services will be put in place?
- ☞ If the day centre closes $\frac{3}{4}$ of the clients will lose friendships overnight. It will have devastating consequence.
- ☞ Accessible, appropriate, safe access life opportunities not often cut by society. Essential in people accessing society.
- ☞ Lots of bad things out there for people with Learning Disabilities. Lots of Hate Crime.
- ☞ Somewhere along the line we need people like Mencap. I've been bullied all my life and my parents died suddenly. They helped me.
- ☞ No one thinks people will be more lonely. It's a vulnerable position to be in. The centre can make a difference.
- ☞ We are very worried as a group about if the day centres are closed. We are the Speak Up group. We say 'No' to cuts. The group holds up our cards to say 'No'.
- ☞ Council responsible for behavior of providers. Difficult line to draw. How are monitoring this?
- ☞ The Council are building a stronger Haringey but not off the backs of the weakest/vulnerable people.

6 OTHER INFORMATION

In addition to the information that LDX has collated, users of services, carers and stakeholders gave us letters, emails, statements and written documents to deliver to Haringey Council about their concerns.

LDX has forwarded these to the named person at Haringey Council.

6.1 Contact

For all matters concerning the outcomes in this report and anything in relation to the Haringey Council Adults Social Services consultation please contact:

Haringey Council Social Services

40 Cumberland Road, Wood Green, London N22 7SG

- Donna Simeon, Transformation Project Manager
donna.simeon@haringey.gov.uk

HARINGEY COUNCIL ADULTS SOCIAL SERVICES CONSULTATION - BUILDING A STRONGER HARINGEY TOGETHER

**[Priority 2: Empower all adults to live healthy
long and fulfilling lives]**

**Learning Disability Experience [LDX] Independent Advocacy
Support and Facilitation Outcomes Report**



Project Title	<i>Haringey Council Adults Social Services Consultation – Building a Stronger Haringey Together – LDX Independent Advocacy Support and Facilitation</i>
Version	<i>Version 1</i>
Date of Issue	<i>22nd January 2015</i>
Project ID	<i>HCASS/LDX1</i>
Consultation Period	<i>17th December 2014 – 18th January 2015</i>
Author	<i>Ann S Weekes, Chief Executive Learning Disability Experience [LDX]</i>
Author Contact	<i>Email: aweeke@ldx.org.uk</i>

GLOSSARY

Advocacy	An independent service which takes action to help people say what they want, secures their rights, represent their interests and obtain services they need. Advocates and advocacy schemes work in partnership with the people they support, promote social inclusion, equality and social justice.
Advocate	The member of staff who supports the user/s of service to have their needs and wishes met and carried out in such a way as if they had spoken for themselves.
Carers, Family Carers or Parent Carers	A carer is anyone who cares, paid or unpaid, for a family member, a friend or other person who is in need of assistance and/or support with their daily living due to illness, disability, a mental health problem, an addiction or other ailment and cannot cope without their support.
Council or Local Authority	Haringey Council or other Borough Councils
Customer	Resident or User of Service
LDX	Learning Disability Experience [Independent Advocacy Service]
Proposal	A plan or suggestion, especially a formal or written one, put forward for consideration by others.
Service [Service Provider]	A person or organisation that provides any form of health, social and/or community care service.
Service User	Anyone who receives any form of health, social and/or community services. Also known in this report as the User of Service, the Customer or the Resident.
Staff	The employee, worker, contractor and volunteer who carries out the service provision.
Stakeholder	A stakeholder is anyone with an interest or concern in Haringey Council services and business. Stakeholders can be any individuals, groups or organisations that are affected by the activity of these services or the management of the Council's business affairs.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Learning Disability Experience [LDX]

Founded in 1964, Learning Disability Experience [LDX], formerly known as Waltham Forest Mencap, is the lead provider of community learning disability support in Waltham Forest and the surrounding areas.

LDX is a well-established organisation providing holistic outcome-based opportunities for children, young people and adults with learning disabilities and other disabilities.

Based across 3 buildings and in the community, LDX employs 14 permanent members of staff, 40 sessional staff and 10 volunteers.

LDX's services are based around the 3 key structures of Information, Advice & Independent/Group Advocacy, Social & Leisure and Campaigning & Influencing. Within these structures we provide significant support in many areas.

Our **Vision** is of a world in which people with learning disabilities experience their basic human right to be fully empowered and included in society. We strive to achieve this by making it our **Mission** to exist in order to maximise quality of life and improve life chances for people with learning disabilities and those who care for them. We do this by:

- Providing information, advice and advocacy support
- Creating social and leisure opportunities and;
- Developing an attitude of effective change through campaigning and influencing

Our strengths show a commitment to making a difference to the lives of people with learning disabilities and their carers by maintaining the following **Values**:

We are:

- Efficient: we show value for money
- Accessible: we include everyone
- Empowering: we maximise choice and control
- Trustworthy: we are reliable and responsible
- Innovative: we are creative and imaginative
- Experienced: we are knowledgeable experts in our field
- Objective: we provide fairness and equality

1.2 Haringey Council Adult Social Services [HCASS] – Building a Stronger Haringey Together: Three Year Plan and Budget Consultation for Residents and Businesses [draft plan]

The Present:

Currently Haringey Council's Corporate Plan, **One Borough, One Future 2013 – 2015** sets the Council's priorities and outcomes, which are underpinned by five principles:

- One Borough Focus
- Investing in prevention and early intervention
- Promoting equality
- Empowering communities
- Working in partnership

These principles have been used over the last 3 years to inform service aims and objectives, delivery and outcomes.

The Future:

Priority 2 of the new Haringey Draft Corporate Plan **Building a Stronger Haringey Together** requires Adult Social Services to: 'Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives'.

The current service delivery model must be transformed to ensure compliance with the Council's statutory obligations within their financial targets, ensuring services operate as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Haringey Council's vision is to create greater focus on self-management, prevention and early intervention for their customers. The core principle is to deliver services based on putting the service user, family and carers at the centre of their solution. This requires the redesign of existing service delivery models to facilitate:

- Recent legislative changes that provide opportunity for further integration of care and support services to improve outcomes and maintain people in their communities for as long as possible.
- New National policy directives which are aimed at empowering people to be independent.
- The growing demand for Adult Social Care services within the borough.

Proposals for the transformation of Haringey Council's service delivery model have been submitted and were open to consultation from 17th December 2014 to 18th January 2015. The Council did this to ensure that their users of services are aware of the proposed changes, how the proposals would affect them and to gather their views.

Haringey's Council Cabinet will meet on February 10th 2015 to recommend a budget to Full Council which meets on February 23rd 2015. Once the budget is agreed on February 23rd detailed plans and proposals will be drawn up over the next three years. Where they have an impact on service users or groups of service users, they will be subject to more detailed consultation before any final decisions are made.

2 PROJECT DETAILS

2.1 Summary Project Specification

LDX were commissioned by Haringey Council Adults Social Services to provide independent advocacy and facilitation to help explain anything that is unclear and provide expert advocacy assistance to their less abled customers/residents in responding to the above consultation at the following corporate sessions **[Fig 1]** attended by Councillor Peter Morton (Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing) and Beverley Tarka (Interim Director of Adult Social Services) and specialist sessions **[Fig 2]** attended by users of services, carers and supporting staff.

The independent advocates will be expected to help people to express their wishes and feelings, support them in weighing up their options and assist them in making their own decisions regarding the service proposals.

The individual advocacy arrangements were agreed at a preliminary meeting between Haringey Council and LDX where the requirements of the brief and the service provision were fully explained. The specification did not determine a set or minimum period of advocacy provision for each individual and was flexible and responsive to need regardless of person or care group.

A full breakdown of the outcomes [which include details of the feedback and comments of customers, residents, users of services, carers as represented at the consultation sessions] is provided by LDX to Haringey Council Adult Social Services in the form of this report.

Fig 1: Corporate Consultation

Dates	Event 1	Event 2	Event 3	Hours
Monday 6 th January 2015	2:00pm-4:00pm Ermine Road DC 2 Ermine Road N15 6DB	5:00pm-6:30pm Ermine Road DC 2 Ermine Road N15 6DB		3.5 hours
Advocates/Facilitators	Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	Ann S Weekes		
Friday 9 th January 2015	8:30am-12:00pm The Roundway 20b Walthef Garden N17 7DX	12:00pm-4:00pm The Haven DC 20a Walthef Garden N17 7DX	5:00pm-7:00pm Osborne Grove Nursing Home 16-18 Upper Tollington Park N4 3EL	9.5 hours
Advocates/Facilitators	Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	Ann S Weekes	
Total hours				13 hours

Fig 2: Specific Consultation [specialist sessions for users and carers of services]

Dates	Event 1	Event 2	Hours
Monday 12th January 2015 Advocates/Facilitators	9:00am-2:00pm Ermine Road DC 2 Ermine Road N15 6DB Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	3:00pm-6:30pm Lindon House 10 Linden Road N15 3QB Ann S Weekes	8.5 hours
Wednesday 14th January 2015 Advocates/Facilitators	10:00am-2:00pm Birkbeck Centre 2 Birkbeck Road Hornsey N8 7PF Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	3:30pm-7:00pm Osborne Grove Nursing Home 16-18 Upper Tollington Park N4 3EL Ann S Weekes Louise Adams	7.5 hours
Total hours			16 hours

Total Advocacy Hours Provided	29 hours

2.2 Scope and Beneficiaries

The commissioned independent advocacy and facilitation was made accessible and accountable to all vulnerable people and carers who approached LDX and Haringey Council to engage, who are residing in Haringey Council and who may come from all wards within the borough.

Approachable recipients did not need to meet the FACS eligibility criteria for adult's health and social care services as the Council has taken into account those groups that did not meet the criteria but required support such as those identified as low or moderate or people with Aspergers.

Individuals and groups were assisted to:

- Understand the proposed changes to Haringey's Adult Social Services and involved spending considerable time with people, considering their communications needs, their wishes and feelings and their life story, and using all this to assist them to be included and where possible to make decisions.
- Communicate their views, wishes and feelings during the consultation.
- Challenge a decision or process made by the local authority; and where a person cannot challenge the decision even with assistance, then to challenge it on their behalf.
- Decide what outcomes/changes they want

- Understand what advice and help they can expect from others.
- Understand what parts of the process are completely or partially within their control.

2.3 Haringey Council Adults Social Services Consultation Audience

Haringey Council sought the views, experiences, comments and concerns of customers, residents, users of services and carers of those using adult social care services in relation to **Priority 2: Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives.**

In spite of any possible challenges, timeframes and the consultation exercise itself, LDX has most certainly sought to give a voice to vulnerable adults within Haringey's diverse borough paying particular attention to hearing from those who may be seldom heard, as well as those who may be isolated.

LDX supported the remit to hear from as many individuals as possible within Haringey Council and paid particular attention to people with learning disabilities, the elderly, those living with dementia and their carers as per the requirements.

At any one time the support LDX provided focused on accessibly reaching out to those identified above. This was done in the format of wider consultation and specific discussions.

To support people with non-verbal communication and/or limited understanding LDX also accessed people identified as 'circles of support' such as family members, carers, residential care support, programme coordinators, team leaders, care workers, assistant managers and managers. This was to stringently seek their views [as individuals who know the users of services best] for the sole purpose of speaking up on their behalf. This was done through group meetings and 1:1 conversations.

LDX user engagement was robust and credible and we have fully demonstrated our professionalism, knowledge, appropriate skills level and competencies throughout the process; required to deliver the requested functions to the highest possible level to achieve the Haringey Council specification.

2.4 Independent Advocacy

An advocacy service is provided by an advocate who is independent of social and health services. Being independent means they are there to represent people's wishes without giving their personal opinion and without representing the views of the local authority or any other services.

Many local councils and some hospitals fund local advocacy services to support people, particularly those who are vulnerable in the community. For wider issues which impact on all people, groups and services from the same community the assistance of external independent advocacy may be required.

Independent advocacy should always be separate from any service provision, its staff, users of services, families, carers and any stakeholders directly or indirectly involved with or affected by service provision.

Therefore any advocacy support or facilitation must be independent and free from possible conflicts of interest.

Independent advocacy providers (individuals or organisations) should not be involved in the welfare, care or provision of other services to the individual for which they are providing advocacy.

Independent advocacy should be provided by an organisation whose sole role is independent advocacy or whose other tasks either complements, or do not conflict with, the provision of the independent advocacy requested.

As such, Haringey Council Adults Social Services seeking external independent advocacy and facilitation has been a good action and best practice as it protects everyone involved against any probable implications.

For the purpose of the Haringey Council Consultation, LDX has been utilised as an external independent advocacy service to autonomously provide individuals or groups with the information they need so they can make real choices about their circumstances.

LDX Independent Advocacy:

- Puts people first.
- Is accountable.
- Is as free as possible from any conflicts of interest.
- Is accessible.

LDX:

- Supports individuals or groups to put their choices and wishes across to others and to speak on their behalf when they are unable to do so for themselves.
- Represent the views of individuals or groups.
- Protect individuals or groups who are particularly vulnerable to make informed decisions.
- Feedback an issue raised by individuals or groups to service providers as part of any decision-making process and so that services can be constantly improved to meet the needs of the growing market.

In addition and where appropriate independent advocates may also:

- Support an individual/group in seeking resolution to issues which concern them.
- Help to safeguard the rights of individuals or groups.
- Empower individuals or groups to make informed decisions and to take greater control over their lives.

2.5 Contact

For all matters concerning the outcomes in this report and anything in relation to the Haringey Council Adults Social Services consultation please contact:

Haringey Council Social Services

40 Cumberland Road, Wood Green, London N22 7SG

- Donna Simeon, Transformation Project Manager donna.simeon@haringey.gov.uk

3 EQUALITY MONITORING

LDX met with 85 people with a range of abilities either individually or as part of a group. A summary of participant profiles is set out in the tables below.

Identification

User of Services	52
Carer [in their own right]	33
Total	85

Gender

Male	21
Female	64
Total	85

Age Group

18-25	1
26-30	1
31-35	5
36-40	4
41-45	3
46-50	11
51-55	6
56-60	1
61-65	2
66-70	7
71-75	4
76-80	3
81-85	3
86-90	2
90+	3
Unspecified	27

Ethnicity

White British	12
White Irish	5
Caribbean	9
Black British Caribbean	4
Mixed White British/Black Caribbean	1
African	1
Asian	1
East African/Asian	1
Arab	1
Italian	1
Greek Cypriot	2
Turkish	1
Turkish Cypriot	1
Turkish/Kurdish	3
Indian	1
Philippines	1
Unspecified	40

Religion

Christian	3
Roman Catholic	9
Church of England	4
Seventh Day Adventist	3
Methodist	1
Muslim and Non Practicing Muslim	5
Greek Orthodox	2
Presbyterian	1
Non-Conformist	2
Alevism	1
Unspecified	54

Post Code

N4	4
N8	4
N10	4
N15	11
N17	16
N22	4
E3	1
E5	1
Lives outside of the borough	1
Unspecified	39

In addition to the above, 78 people were identified as 'Circles of Support' for users of services as they helped individuals and groups of people with learning disabilities, older people and other vulnerable groups to speak up for themselves and/or they spoke up on their behalf during the consultation sessions.

Circles of Support

Family/Carer	25
The Roundway Staff	13
The Haven Day Centre Staff	3
Ermine Road Day Opps Staff	14
Birkbeck Road Staff	9
Linden House Staff	7
Osborne Grove Nursing Home Staff	5
Residential Home Support Worker	2
Total	78

4 REVIEW OF INDEPENDENT ADVOCACY AND FACILITATION OUTCOMES

4.1 Council Proposals

People who attended the consultation sessions were very focused on expressing their views about specific services that were identified in the Haringey Council draft plan as proposed for closure or significant change. People wanted to talk about New Pathways for:

- Older People [Osborne Grove Nursing Home]
- Learning Disabilities [Linden House and Shared Lives]
- Day Opportunities Learning Disabilities [Reduction of building based day care]
- Increased reablement Physical Disabilities [The Haven Centre]
- Increased enablement Mental Health [Osborne Grove Nursing Home]

No person who LDX consulted with appeared to have prior understanding or knowledge of the broader picture of planned proposals for Haringey Adult Social Services up until their attendance at these sessions.

The proposals for the following did not come up as areas of immediate concern when addressed by LDX at the corporate or specific consultation:

- New Model for Care Management
- Care Purchasing Efficiencies
- Care Package Reductions
- Voluntary Sector Budget
- Healthy Life Expectancy
- Substance Misuse – Public Health/other
- Sexual Health
- Improve Public Health Efficiency

It was very clear that people wanted to talk about proposed closures and significant changes to service provision as the bulk of the feedback will show. As such, the outcomes from the consultation sessions are set out by affected services with general comments at the end.

Figs 1 and 2 of the Summary Project Specification [2.1] identify the timetables for the corporate and specific consultation exercises.

All people who LDX consulted with agreed the following:

- ✓ I have learned something about the consultation that I did not know before.
- ✓ I enjoyed the discussion.
- ✓ I have been able to say what I wanted to say.
- ✓ I have felt listened to.
- ✓ I felt respected during the sessions.

4.2 Questions

LDX asked individuals and groups that came to the consultation sessions [in various accessible formats] 3 questions:

- If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your day to day life?
- How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]
- Why do you feel like this?

5 FEEDBACK FROM HARINGEY COUNCIL ADULTS SOCIAL SERVICES CONSULTATION – PRIORITY 2: EMPOWER ALL ADULTS TO LIVE HEALTHY, LONG AND FULFILLING LIVES

The following comments are the acquired independent views and opinions of residents, customers, service users, carers and stakeholders living in Haringey or accessing services from Haringey Council Adults Social Services.

Unless explicitly stated, the independent views, opinions and/or comments from and of the above individuals or groups **do not** reflect those of the organisation Learning Disability Experience [LDX] or any of its staff members.

5.1 THE HAVEN CENTRE DAY CENTRE



Service User – The Haven Day Centre

“I am diagnosed with dementia. I didn’t want to accept it at first. It was rough. Professionals came and went and they did what they did. You followed what was being done to you.

I came to England from Africa. I was training to be a nurse but had to stop because my father arranged my marriage.

I go to the Haven 2 days a week Thursdays and Fridays. I learned how to read, sew, crochet, knit, embroidery; all at The Haven. Drivers take me Door to Door. I get a 2-course meal. I don’t need to eat again when I get home.

In the past I hurt the people who were looking after me because I didn’t understand what they were doing. I didn’t realise people were monitoring me to help me. I learnt how to respect others more than myself. I learnt this at the centre.

My daughter is my carer but she has a husband who is very ill and doesn’t have the time to look after me full-time. Elderly people have families who cannot support them because their families have their own problems too.

It’s very nice to come here. If we don’t come we’ll go back to square one. If the centre closes I’ll be on my own most of the time and I’m scared because I have mental health problems.”

Users of Services General Comments – The Haven Day Centre

User of Service – The Haven Day Centre



“This day centre means the world to me. My mother came here and that’s why I came here. Where is it going to put me? Out on the street?”

-  What exactly are the proposals as they are not very clear?
-  Will new services be more expensive to run?
-  Will it be possible for Haringey Council to look at other Councils to see how they use their budget?
-  What about the people who can’t get out and walk? This is what places like The Haven is for.
-  We come here to socialise.
-  Everybody in this room has worked all their lives. Now that we are non-productive you want to throw us to one side.
-  Everyone keeps telling us that we worked too long.
-  I don’t think it’s worth listening to you Councillor.
-  I’ll stand out in the street.
-  The day centre is family.
-  Why don’t you do away with one Councillor per ward and use the money to save services? You’ve already made lots of staff cuts so maybe it’s time to cut Councillors.
-  This is very devastating news. I was very active until my accident on the building site. I had to give up my allotment and most of my activities. I don’t like to be indoors. I would lose my social life.
-  The Haven is a nice place. I wouldn’t like to lose it. Not one bit.
-  All my friends are here. I love it here.
-  I wouldn’t like to leave here. They are good to me. They pick me up and take me home. I wouldn’t be able to get around if they didn’t do that kindness for me.
-  It has made such a difference to my life being here. My wife and I used to come here. She died last year. She was my beautiful flower. I would be at home on my own if I didn’t come here. I have my friends. I like getting together and socialising.

- 💬 I'm a very happy lady. Very grateful for my life. My main thing – why are we being cast aside? We are old people and they think that they can do what they like with us.
- 💬 You don't want people coming to your home? Majority of us can't come or get out on our own. Makes me feel like I am not human anymore.
- 💬 Not happy, I like coming here. I enjoy the company. I come twice a week. Rest of the week I am at home. Keeps me occupied. I buy second-hand things here.
- 💬 I look forward to coming here. I come four days a week. Such a nice crowd. If I did not come here I would be a little depressed. I gave up driving, I use a walking frame I won't go on the bus on my own. I would not be socializing.
- 💬 This is the only bit of enjoyment that I have.

Users of Services Individual Comments – The Haven Day Centre

User of Service – The Haven Centre



"I feel sad about the proposals. I feel sadness. I am sympathetic to the views of everyone, as I understand how they feel. I would feel cheated if they closed the Haven because I would have nothing to look forward to. I come here 2 days a week. Thursdays and Fridays. That's not a lot, is it? I don't think the reasons for closure are good enough. The financial reasons for making savings are not good enough.

The Council could rent the building out to make more money. Don't they have empty buildings and assets that can be rented out to generate money? Being on your own makes quite a difference to the way you think."

💬 Service User 1

I was really ill. I went to a private doctor at The Priory for a long time. I then went to a day centre at St Anne's Hospital. It was horrible. I then went to Woodside Day Centre for 6 years and then they closed it down. I became very depressed. When I was really ill I never left the house. I lost my skills. My son did everything for me.

I have now been at The Haven for 4 years. I come here 5 days a week. I have settled in. The Haven opening was like winning the lottery. I am very aware of things now. I have lots of confidence.

When I come to the day centre I play dominoes and tri-ominoes. I mix with other people. I go on trips. I love going to Ikea.

If The Haven closes I'll go back to square one. I'll end up like a cabbage again. The panic attacks and depression will come back. Some of the homecare workers are useless. The Haven is the best care in the world and I look forward to it. It will be really sad. We're like a family here. They are my family.

It will be the death of some of us.

Service User 3

I lived on the settee for 5-6 years. My son had to leave work to look after me. I came to this centre. This is my second home. Who will look after me? If you do close it down I will be back where I was. I was at Woodside. It took me time to get used to this place. I won't be able to leave the house again. My son has bills to pay. No one will look after me.

Service User 4

If I feel sick they make me feel better. I won't eat – I have diabetes, they make sure I eat regularly. It will kill me. It will make me ill again. I get very panicky. Wonderful staff, wonderful management. The Haven gives our children peace of mind knowing that we are coming here.

User of Service – The Haven Centre Day Centre



"I appreciate everything the council has done for us. Please don't close the centre – I have learnt so much here, please do not close this. Many of us need this without this we cannot survive. When I get home I am very lonely. The manager encourages us. Please Sir, I am asking you to help us – without this we have nowhere."

Service User 6

If people don't want to listen they will listen to me. Staff has been good to me. Everybody here has been good to me. I think the world of this day centre. I'm telling you this much the other week I left this centre it was really cold, I ended up in hospital. People from this centre did not know where I was. I was nearly on my deathbed if it was not for these people and these drivers. This day centre means the world to me – more than anything. I know a lot of people here and they are all kind to me. What will happen to me? Please, please I want this day centre to stay open.

Service User 7

If you are going to keep a place open then keep this one open. Everyone here loves coming. It is a big family. It will be sorely missed if you get rid of it. My family have been in Tottenham for over 100 years and this is what you are doing to us. We pay our taxes. When I came here it absolutely changed my life. I had two days. I could socialise.

It's not the same at home and talking to someone on the phone is not the same as seeing someone. We might be old – but we are still human. This is a lifeline.

 Service User 8

My daughter and granddaughter are my carers. When I am here they can relax knowing I am OK. We are constantly hearing about the aging population. I thought I would be settled here for the rest of my life. I love coming here. When I am at home I am very lonely.

 Service User 9

I come here once a week so it won't affect me much. I listen to the radio at home on my own. At home I have meals on wheels they are not very nice. The food here is good. I enjoy the food. I meet other people. I have a home help at home twice a day. She talks to me. If I didn't see her I would not talk to anyone. I would miss this place if it closed. Makes me feel sad because it is such a good service.

 Service User 10

Be a shame if they close this place. I come here 3 days a week because I am lonely at home. Bus picks me up I don't go out on my own anymore. Walking is a struggle. I enjoy the company. I worried about this because I will have no one to talk to during the day. I would be very sorry if they close this place. They encourage us to go to the Doctors. They keep an eye on us if we are not well.

Carers – The Haven Day Centre

Carer – The Haven Day Centre

"Can we not share this building? You have an extension there. Why can we not share the building? How many people out of hospital do you think you will be getting? I understand people need rehabilitation. Give us an alternative. Let's leave these people a little bit happy. Let's share this building. At least these people will have somewhere to go and to keep warm and to have a proper meal."

 This centre is amazing. My mother comes here. Have you thought about the people who come here?

 Cuts have previously been made and adult social services frontline services should be protected.

 I'm representing my parents. If my dad didn't come here it would kill him. It would also kill us. You're using people, children with disabilities or adults with learning disabilities. People sold houses and pensions to pay for their care. What are you going to do with all these people? Who's going to pay for staffing to care for these people? They will be stuck in their homes?

I've come out today because it's so important. Mum suffers from Alzheimer's and before coming here for a long time. I am her sole carer. She hardly spoke a word before then. Mum attends 3 days a week and she's made friends. My mum joins in as much as she can, she will regress again. I've been able to go to work and I pay my taxes. My mum loves this place. For lots of people their main meal is here. I'm still a carer for my mum, some people have nobody. What I am grateful to Haringey Council for is bringing my mum back to me. Give them an alternative. If you want more money I will pay more money. Keep these services open. We don't want you to close this place. Not 6 months or 3 years down the line.

My mum comes here. I would have loved her to come here twice a week. She comes once a week. This is the legacy of overspending over many years; how people in government have dealt with the finances of the people.

5.2 LINDEN HOUSE

Linden House residents are unable to speak up for themselves. One resident did not want to talk and the others were unable to. Another resident is also affected by possible changes within another service and had spoken with us during the day.

Staff and family carers were identified as 'Circles of Support'. They spoke up on behalf of the residents.

Session 1 – Circle of Support Linden House

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect the resident's day to day life?

Circle of Support – Linden House



"No one has shown anxiety or distress as yet because they don't understand what is about to happen to them and their home. How can they understand? The explosion will happen if and when they move. It will be a tremendous explosion. It will happen in a matter of days. Only then will the impact really be felt."

We explained to the residents that there may be some changes happening but it meant absolutely nothing to them. This group has no understanding of what's going on. There has been little immediate reaction because they had no idea about what we were telling them.

The residents have been here a long time and they are settled. Some residents have been here for over 7 years. They can't speak up for themselves.

The move from agency to permanent staff was an excellent move. The home has come on leaps and bounds. The permanent staff team have been here for 4 years. We've worked hard with the residents to help them settle and learn about their needs and choices.

We have significantly reduced their challenging behaviours. All staff took beatings, bites, spitting, smearing and cursing from the residents to get them to where they are now and we'd do it all again because we know what has been achieved for the residents so that they can have an excellent quality of life. They get social interaction from us that they won't get anywhere else because no one else will want to work with them in the way that we do.

- 💡 Because of their autism and challenging behaviour, some residents will only accept support and personal care from specific staff. They go to staff who they recognise. It's taken a very long time for them to build trust with us. It's taken years for some residents to get to where they are now.
- 💡 The changes will have a profound detrimental effect on the resident's health and well-being. It's going to be very hard for all of them. Some residents have been passed around and they have now settled. There will be extreme challenging behaviours. They will digress. They will be put through unnecessary hell.
- 💡 Noise levels and certain behaviours of the residents are unmanageable in the community. Some individuals can be a danger to themselves and to others if they are not carefully supported. They are not suitable candidates for Shared Lives/Supported Living. These residents need 24 hour care support and bespoke services. Safeguarding is a real concern.
- 💡 If Shared Lives doesn't work residents will get forgotten. They may get chucked in an older people's home, a mental health unit or sent home to unmanageable situations.
- 💡 Some residents have physical needs. Some are not able to get around like others.
- 💡 This will have a negative impact on family orientations. All families will suffer. The clients will feed off their anxieties. Families depend on good staff to care for their loved ones.
- 💡 Some clients have known each other since childhood. They went to school together and have gone through the 'system' together.
- 💡 If the home closes it won't be good for everyone involved.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services?

Circle of Support – Linden House



"Residents will be devastated when they realise what's going on. They may feel abandoned when they don't see any of the staff and they realise [in their own way] that we're not coming back or not there anymore. Residents will withdraw and their mental health will deteriorate.

- ☞ The council is taking away the resident's experience in exchange for profit or savings. It will have a detrimental effect on their health and well-being.
- ☞ It is difficult to say much else without more information. There are not enough details and a lot of speculation. The information coming through is vague and inconsistent. Staff feel unsettled for the residents and closer to the time we will have to draw on all our skills to try and help people to understand. For the resident's sake we really hope the Council doesn't go ahead with the closure.

Why do think the residents will feel this way about the plans?

Circle of Support – Linden House



"It will take a very long time for residents to resettlement; if they do at all?"

- ☞ It will be a huge learning process for any new staff team working with residents. They will need to be very experienced.
- ☞ The neighbours have become accustomed to the residents. The manager has worked hard with the neighbours to manage peace controls, as they sometimes get upset about the noise levels. Residents can be extremely loud. They need to be in an environment where they can be free to express themselves. They need space when their behaviour becomes challenging and when they are no longer able to manage their own behaviour. The new neighbours won't know what has hit them.
- ☞ The residents are not going to experience real choice and control because they are being 'sent' to a new place. They don't get to choose where they go. They don't get to choose their new home.
- ☞ Residents will digress. It will be too hard for many. They need consistency.

Session 2 – Carers Linden House

If Haringey Council go ahead with their plans ... How would it affect your loved ones' day to day life?

- ☞ Try to be realistic [staff have told me]. They look out for me as a carer. When Linden House closes will the same staff go to Muswell Hill? Will staff lose their jobs? The staff has a risky job. For the work they do they should be paid more money not losing their jobs? They are not being paid their worth.
- ☞ There were lots of problems in the beginning at Linden House. The agency staff caused so many problems. We were always worried. It took years for the clients to settle. The new staff that came in is much better. The clients are now happy. I have seen a big change in my son.



Carer – Linden House

“The previous manager and staff were not very good. Now it’s wonderful with the new staff and manager. It’s much better now there is full-time staff. The staff at Linden House is perfect. They do everything. I’m too old now and can’t look after my nephew.

You will take my nephew somewhere he doesn’t know. He will become very aggressive like before. He’s used to his current surroundings. Why destroy him? I understand that savings have to be made but leave Linden House alone.

My nephew knows staff and staff know him. He will be confused and will start hitting people again. I am concerned that staff who do not know him and who are not trained will start hitting back [when no one is looking].”

-  The people who live here need 24-hour supervision. They can’t understand and will become very aggressive. People have bespoke complex service needs.
-  There should be a way to make the cuts that does not include our loved ones. The Council is making cuts but it’s our loved ones and us who will be bleeding. We pay our taxes so why can’t they find another way to make savings? Haringey doesn’t have money but they have lots of managers.
-  I went to see the proposed building at Muswell Hill. It looks totally unsuitable. It will not be familiar surroundings. How does the Haringey evaluate who is suitable for shared lives? Will the new home be monitored? What will happen if Muswell Hill is not suitable? Are there any other places?
-  I read somewhere that if the worst comes to the worst people will be sent home to live with their families. Parents will have to give up work. We would lose our jobs. We cannot depend on benefits. No one helped me when I needed the money now they want to take it away. I would not be able to look after my son at home. He is too strong for me. My health would deteriorate. My family would suffer.
-  Staff work very hard to achieve the quality of service. The old staff team was very inconsistent in the past, it has been a hell of a job for me.
-  Why the consultation is so short and why was it during the Christmas Holidays? I think the proposals should be challenged. We can’t allow this to happen.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

Carer – Linden House

"Impossible! I won't accept it. Leave Linden House alone."



-  We feel stressed and distressed.
-  Frightened.
-  We will have to give up our jobs.
-  We don't trust the Council.
-  We feel that there is no room to challenge Haringey.

Why do you feel this way about the plans?

Carer – Linden House

"We are annoyed because the Council keeps doing this to us and to our loved ones."



-  The clients won't be able to do the things that they do now. They find it hard to meet new people. They are strange faces. They will have real problems settling. Our sons would lose their friends they've been with all their lives.
-  It would be criminal if something happened. People should not be moved until death. I would like my son to stay here as he is.
-  I believe that Haringey Council has already made up their mind. They are in the habit of making promises but they couldn't care less. The council are not thinking about the people who live at Linden House.

5.3 OSBORNE GROVE NURSING HOME

User of Service – Osborne Grove Nursing Home

"The dissemination of information is very poor. There is an assumption that because we are service users we are not intelligent and we don't understand what's going on. That may be the case for some of the people who live here but not for everyone. Not for people like me. I understand."



Users of Services – Osborne Grove Nursing Home

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your day to day life?

-  I'm concerned that if you're going to bring in a mixed population the service will be diluted. If it's gradually going to change its nature how are they going to manage this?
-  My wife has been here since 2008, since it opened. She has to be here. She was a bed blocker in hospital. Her needs cannot be met in the community. I used to care for my wife for a number of years. I can't now due to ill health. I come to see her almost every day. She requires nursing care, nursing home.
-  There are 4 units all high dependency and some with higher needs than others. The people who live here, will they continue to get the same high level of care as what is currently received? What about redundancies? Will all the staff be made redundant?
-  My sister helped me to look at untold amounts of nursing homes before we settled for Osborne Grove. Most of them were not suitable for my needs and others would not take me.
-  The staff here are very willing and caring. Osborne Grove is an example of best practice. It would be tragic if Haringey Council let Osborne Grove close.
-  I do not know where people like me with high support needs will go? The private sector does not want high support needs like me. I had lots of care in the community but I still had to come here in the end?
-  My wife and I live at Osborne Grove. We were at another home but my daughter did not like it there. The hospital felt that I needed to come here. My wife has dementia. She has to be on her own. I see her every day.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

User of Service – Osborne Grove Nursing Home



"This place is good to me. This place is nice. The staff is nice. The food is nice. I do not remember who brought me here?"

-  I am very nervous for my future.
-  I have mixed feelings about being here. I don't care about me but I am very worried about what will happen to my wife. She's only alive because she's here. She will die if she has to leave.
-  I'm really worried about the timeframe for when all of this is going to happen. It's like having the sword of Damocles hanging over me.

- ☞ I would like a clear timeframe that lists all the different things that are happening and when. I'd like to know when decisions will be made and if changes are agreed, when those changes will come in to effect?

Why do you feel this way about the plans?

User of Service – Osborne Grove Nursing Home



“People are living longer. Carers in the community don’t have enough time to support people like us. They have appointments back to back. They cut short their appointments with us so that they can make time to get to their next appointment.”

- ☞ If they plan to use the same staff for reablement services, management at Osborne Grove will be split in their responsibilities. As the Osborne Grove residents gets smaller and patients leave or die what will happen to those left behind? Will we be left in a back room somewhere?
- ☞ According to the hospital I cannot stay at home or look after my wife because of my own health needs. As far as I’m concerned I just make up the numbers. My daughter speaks up for me but she couldn’t make it. I have nowhere else to go. This is my home but it’s not the same as your own home.

Carers – Osborne Grove Nursing Home

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your loved ones’ day to day life?

Carer – Osborne Grove Nursing Home



“I would like to stress what a hard and upsetting experience it has been. Haringey nursing care provision is not great but it is home to many. Day services are as ‘cheap as chips’. You don’t need to close them. There’s going to be nothing left. I don’t care what Party people support you all need to get together and sort this out.”

- ☞ People at Osborne Grove have high dependency needs. If they’re not going to stay here where are you going to house them? The residents’ lifestyles are being threatened. It is unsettling for everyone. It’s all a bit vague.
- ☞ The demographics won’t change. People will still be ill. There are only 2 other residential nursing homes in the borough and both have failed their CQC. People will have to be shipped out of the borough.
- ☞ I’m very hands on with my mum and the staff. This helps everybody pick up what’s required to support her. If you move people out of their environment it will bring on mental stress. No one is prepared for this and it’s a medical fact that once you move sick people they die. Haringey Council would not be able to provide what is medically required for our loved ones out in the community.

They have higher needs and require specialist medical care. Most relatives have had to fight tooth and nail to get their families in to Osborne Grove. The home has all the potential to stay without loss of money. Everyone's supposed to be working as a team instead of at loggerheads. It is a good home it has all the pluses. Where's the contingency plan. How are you going to look after these people in the community?

-  You haven't done re-evaluation of all residents involved. You're going to decide the budget first and then try to organise the services.
-  This makes a mockery of consultation. This should have started months ago.
-  People like my sister are going to need somewhere to be looked after.
-  Care homes providers are obliged to accept what the council gives. Services suffer as a result. Some care homes are business orientated.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

-  Concerned and worried. If less people are here there will there be fewer nurses? It is very stressful looking after someone with dementia.
-  I'm scared. Not only for my family but for everyone – they should not close Osborne Grove. It's a great facility.

Why do you feel this way about the plans?

Carer – Osborne Grove Nursing Home

"I have gone round homes here and in Yorkshire somewhere pretty grim. People do not understand the implication."



-  Publicity about this consultation is lacking. Whole thing is rushed. We've been off for Christmas for 3 weeks. This has been pushed through by the Council. Very few people in this home have people who are able to speak up for them.
-  This place was purpose built and opened by the health minister for people with dementia. What happens if you are not well after the 6 weeks?
-  The staff always has to consider the safety of the people who live here. Everybody bar one person needs care in a place like this. How are they going to look after those people who remain? Will they have the correct facilities? No one knows when they will die but the Council is banking on people dying quickly. If the people here are not here they will be in hospital.

5.4 ERMINE ROAD DAY OPPORTUNITIES

Most of the Ermine Road Day Opportunities users of service were unable to speak up for themselves. LDX was able to identify 10 people to have a discussion with.

Staff and family carers were also identified as 'Circles of Support'. They spoke up on behalf of the users of services.

Session 1 – Users of Services, Ermine Road Day Opportunities

Based on the question: If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your day to day life? We asked people “What does the Day Centre mean to you?”

User of Services – Ermine Road Day Opportunities



“I like it here because it makes me happy. I enjoy myself. I like the people.”

[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

- ☞ Got nowhere else to go
- ☞ Develop friends.
- ☞ Daily routine, I will lose it.
- ☞ Big change. Have routines.
- ☞ I will lose my self-confidence.
- ☞ Happy.
- ☞ Trust the people at Ermine Road.
- ☞ Come in for 2-3 days but better services.
- ☞ I like to come to the day centre to see my friends.
- ☞ It's my routine.
- ☞ Will affect my confidence and health.
- ☞ No one understands cant? ... what this will look like.
- ☞ Research about outings and activities.
- ☞ I like it here.
- ☞ I like to come here – I do different things – I enjoy going out.
- ☞ I go from home to here for 5 days.
- ☞ Not happy to have change.
- ☞ 1 or 2 good sessions but rest of the time babysitting
- ☞ I like coming here, I lost weight, I go swimming, I go cycling.
- ☞ (a drawing of a house)
- ☞ I would not be happy if I was at home all of the time. I get upset if I can't come.

User of Services – Ermine Road Day Opportunities



“If I don't come to Ermine Road I would have to stay at home.”

Based on the question: How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question] we asked people “How would it make you feel if the day centre had to change your service?”

[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

-  Sad
-  It makes me feel sick, sad and angry.
-  I will fight [gestured fighting].
-  [Gestured] tears – sad.
-  [Gestured] I feel sick.
-  Pointed to picture of Ermine Road. I feel upset and unhappy. [arms raised]
-  Makes me feel bad.
-  I would feel angry.
-  I don't want to lose my friends.
-  Lonely.
-  Not fair up and down. Keep on making changes. Every time I get used to it they change things again.

Based on the question: Why do you feel this way about the plans? We asked people “Why do you feel this way?”

[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

-  I want to stay here – I love all the things I do here.
-  I want to stay where I am – it's all I know.
-  Being at home is like being in a cage.
-  I'm used to being at home, nowhere else to go.
-  It makes me feel unwanted and used. The staff mean a lot to me.
-  I've been coming for 16 years – it's a part of my life.
-  I was very unhappy took 5 years to settle.

Session 2 – Circle of Support, Ermine Road Day Opportunities

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect the users of services day to day life?

Circle of Support – Ermine Road Day Opportunities



“People need to take a holistic view when looking after the health and wellbeing of the service user. There are such high needs here. A lack of consistency affects deterioration of behaviour. It's not that simple for people with learning disabilities being out in the community.”

-  The day centre will need skilled, motivated staff to continue to co-ordinate the sessions for service users and who will facilitate them? i.e. Hydro pool + rebound therapy, sensory support, cycling and art scope etc.
-  How will service users have access to personal care in the community?

- 💬 We cannot reassure our client groups who have some understanding because we don't have enough information. Everything is too vague. It would be nice to have more concrete information to make available to parent carers.
- 💬 What appropriate community services will be available? The local community is still not as accessible as people think it is for people with learning disabilities. Clients may become de-skilled if they get less support to be independent.
- 💬 Safeguarding - We are the first port of call for service users and carers. We can identify concerns with clothing, bruises, not eating, health deteriorating, money not being paid etc.
- 💬 Carers are very concerned that the model works for them and their loved ones. For some of the parents this is all too much for them, they are asking what does it really mean?
- 💬 Parent carers need as much support as the service users do? Some of them are really elderly. They physically can no longer do things anymore. As a gesture of good will and beyond the call of duty we support them with many things during the day including taking clients to the foot clinic, the dentist, picking up prescriptions, keep a check on health and well-being issues and remind families of important dates and appointments etc. Parent carers have confidence in staff and there are longstanding relationships that would be hard to recoup.
- 💬 How will the community be regulated to make sure that people are safe? Safeguarding will be a huge issue. Who will be responsible for checking DBS in the voluntary sector?
- 💬 There will be a huge impact on behaviour with clients hitting themselves and others.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

Circle of Support – Ermine Road Day Opportunities



“Regulation – how do you know people are doing what they say they do? Safeguarding needs to be put in place around the ‘model of social enterprise’. In the voluntary sector who will be responsible for co-coordinating/ checking DBS?”

- 💬 Care in the community – It doesn't feel a lot of financial planning has gone into this?
- 💬 Feel that Haringey council is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the parents/ carers.
- 💬 Service users' self-esteem and health will suffer.
- 💬 Bit by bit would have been better than cuts all at once.

Parents/ carers are being dragged through the system again.

Why do you feel this way about the plans?

- Vulnerability – Concerns for the future, the unknown. People are hyper vulnerable.
- Sustainability – This will happen, this is just the start
- Health will deteriorate – unhealthy impact on health and wellbeing.
- Constructive vulnerability – Making people more vulnerable than what they are already.
- Collateral damage – people will deteriorate and possibly die if their care package is not there anymore.
- Fearful – unknown for the S/U uncertainty. What will happen to them?
- This is unfair, why? – because these kind of changes are unfair.
- Stress and strain on all staff will manifest itself in the service users in other ways. We will feel the pressure
- Abandonment – because it feels like everything the service worked for, has achieved and produced will be gone. Resources will disappear.
- We are here because we like to look after the needs of our service users. It's never been about the money. If our jobs go we'll get another one but what about the people with learning disabilities? We do it for them. We do it because we care.
- It's going to be hard to be positive until we see the action plan and outcomes.
- There is still a lot of negativity and barriers in the community. Many people and services still have a negative view of people with learning disabilities.

Carers – General Discussion

Carer – Ermine Road Day Opportunities

"My son has spent 6-7 years in the care home. He was active before this. My daughter asked the home "What activities does he do?" Besides the cinema he doesn't have any other activities. It is a nice clean home but no activities."

- It is important that my son has access to social and day opportunities including going out with groups.
- They want to close down Ermine Road. My daughter went into residential care. She had no day services for 4 years. She needs more assessment.

The residential home do not help her during the day. They make excuses i.e. have not got staff or transport etc.

-  Would it not make sense to have a 1 year instead of 3 year plan? The Council should wait for outcome of general election before making any decisions?
-  I take offense to the consultation being done over the Christmas period. We don't have time to consider these things during this period.
-  The documents we received don't explain what Beverley Tarka explained today at the consultation. The wording is confusing. It doesn't say "Day Service" it says "Day Centre". It's misleading (consultation document).
-  Carers are not supported enough to support my son whilst in care home. This is neglectful. There is not enough day centres for people like my son. I don't have peace of mind about my son. I am very disappointed.
-  My son is in Ermine Road. He knows how to do work. He can file etc. The social workers keeps saying they will help him in 1 year. I call and nothing changes. The Council have spent time and money for him to go to college etc. but 4 years later no change. He goes to Ermine Road and then he comes home. Every day is the same thing. He's not doing anything. He has forgotten how to do things. He is getting lazy. He could easily, with support, do 2 hours a day working. He can work.
-  I had a lot of trouble getting my son social activities. If this proposal goes ahead it will be very difficult.
-  My son loves to come to come out during the day. I am 69 years old. It will kill me if he can't come here anymore. He is in his room when he is not coming here. My son does not sleep at night so I get to recover when he comes to the day centre. I want more services not less.

5.5 THE ROUNDWAY SERVICE

LDX spoke to 6 users of services at the Roundway. The remaining users of service were unable to speak up for themselves.

Staff and family carers were identified as 'Circles of Support'. They spoke up on behalf of the users of services.

Session 1: Users of Service, The Roundway Service

User of Service – The Roundway Service

"Oh no why? ... If you cannot, please don't. It's not fair – I won't be happy. Don't want to miss the centre."



Based on the question: How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question] we asked people “How would it make you feel if the day centre had to change your service?”

[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

-  I feel sorry
-  I love my activities. I don't want to stop doing them. I loves cooking.
-  It can't be happening – why?
-  They help me go out.
-  I'm afraid it's going to happen
-  I would feel stressed

The users of service did not want to answer any further questions.

Session 2: Carers, The Roundway Service

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your loved ones day to day lives?

Carer – The Roundway Service



“My daughter was taken out of services for a while. Staff had to call the police because they could not deal with her. If staff who knows her well can't cope how are strangers going to manage?”

-  When a stranger comes to pick my child up I would not allow it.
-  My daughter lives in at residential home. Will she lose her day service? Structure meaning routine to her day.
-  My one would think she could go into the shops and help herself to things. She doesn't understand that she has to pay? If she has to stay at home it will have a negative impact on her. It's another change to her routine.
-  We won't be able to go anywhere. It will restrict our movements. My son becomes destructive when he is affected by change.
-  All clients are different they are not all the same. They all get tarred with the same brush. My daughter does not understand. When things are very bad she ends up spending time in a Psychiatric residential home. The last time she spent 9 months there.
-  My daughter has been a part of these services for 11 years she is used to this. It should be replaced by something better not worse. What will she do if she can't come here?
-  If they close the day centre I will have to take my son out of services.

- 💬 Very stressful
- 💬 Maybe it was not appropriate after all for these service users to be at this meeting but I won't allow anyone to consult with my daughter without me being present.
- 💬 These people can be a bit challenging, need structure and routine. They will run rings around them.
- 💬 I don't like the idea of volunteers taking them out in the community. Are they going to have DBS checks?
- 💬 I have two disabled sons. I am worried that I won't be able to do anything anymore. It will stop me going to the Doctors or going to work.
- 💬 If my daughter is at home and is not kept doing something she explodes. She would be up and down the walls driving me crazy with no day centre.
- 💬 He is always at the door waiting for the bus to come. My son would be lost without this place. If he doesn't see the bus coming he starts hitting himself.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

Carer – The Roundway

"My daughter was taken out of services for a while. Staff had to call the police because they could not deal with her. If staff who knows her well can't cope how are strangers going to manage?"



- 💬 I do not trust Haringey Council, they are not genuine. They've already decided what they are going to do. I am outraged
- 💬 How can we give you feedback if we do not know what we're consulting on? How can we be consulted on what we do not know about?
- 💬 We have only learnt about what's going on because of the staff. [Only 5 out of 26 people at the meeting said that they had received the proposals.]
- 💬 All the documents I have received have no mention of The Roundway closing. Is the Roundway closing or not? I'm confused? This is confusing and stressful?
- 💬 I did receive the info but I did not understand it and the information given by Haringey Council has not been filtered down.
- 💬 What does Social Enterprise Model mean anyway?
- 💬 Everyday our resident looks forward to the day centre if he don't go he gets stressed.

- 💬 Even if there is an issue of double funding, some people have not been assessed for years.
- 💬 Some people will become socially isolated. At least here they meet different people.
- 💬 Most clients would say yes and no to the same question. So we need to speak up for them. Is this a deprivation of liberty? Haringey are discriminating against those who do not have a voice. They have a vote but most of them can't use it. Get ignored.
- 💬 The Council will end up getting cheap labour and losing good staff.
- 💬 The new Care Act is coming in and support will have to be taken into account as well as the needs of carers.
- 💬 I'll go absolutely doolally!
- 💬 The impact on us as parents will be death! Can't go the Doctors. Can't do anything. The mental strain on us as a parent is bad enough. Places like this maintain our loved ones health and wellbeing as well as ours. I can't see how I can cope. I will run back to Nigeria and leave her here.
- 💬 Time scale is very rushed.

Why do you feel that way about the plans?

- 💬 I live on my own with my daughter. I have hospital appointment. If she is at home with me I can't go because of her stress. She would be up all night.
- 💬 He loves the staff. He loves the day centre. I'd hate to think that Haringey Council will close a place like this.
- 💬 2 areas affect my daughter because of double funding. There is nothing in the community for her. She will not be safe.
- 💬 I am lost for words.
- 💬 The quality of support for these autistic people is being compromised once again.
- 💬 How many times can you take them to the same place? They get bored.
- 💬 These staff know these clients. If other people come along we'll have to start the long process all over again.
- 💬 If this is the strategy of Haringey with such a limited time to consult we as parents cannot do anything about this. We don't get the choice to do anything about this.
- 💬 Personal budgets are not allowing enough money. I don't feel they want to pay enough to support my daughter.

Session 3: Circle of Support, The Roundway Centre

If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect the users of services day to day life?



Circle of Support – The Roundway Centre

“One of our service users used to go to Central. He had a particular routine. He never used to go out and when he did he used to abscond. We used social stories to show him that he was coming to this building. He now understands that he attends the Roundway. He has a set programme when he goes out. He has a named member of staff. He has particular routines which he must complete. He can now explore the local area. It has taken us from September 2013 until now to achieve this. If he feels he is going back or is going to Birkbeck Road he will deteriorate and exhibits challenging behaviour to show that he is not comfortable.”

- 💬 What sort of service will service users get if they are not able to access the day centre? This is a big respite facility for carers and families that enables them to go out and do their jobs and other things.
- 💬 Opportunities during the day are limited. This will have a huge impact on relationships – some service users only trust specific members of staff.
- 💬 Skill levels will go down. Learnt skills over the years will have to be relearned. It takes time to build relationships most service users here are Autistic. It will be difficult for them to adapt to change especially as they've just been through a major one already. They have only just started to really settle down from that. It will affect their behaviour. It is a complete change to their routine. The process will need to be very slow. It will need to be in stages. To move them around again will only confuse them even more.
- 💬 Staff have the impression that day centre will close down and that they will not continue to support the clients. Uncertainty around the meaning of the loss of 96 jobs full time equivalent and that staff will no longer be employed by Haringey Council. Whatever the meaning, it will be a massive change in long term.
- 💬 There are other service users who will abscond if they feel unsafe. They won't go near dogs or public transport. We don't have massive community relationships.

How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question]

- 💬 Anxious and confused due to the vagueness of the proposals. There is an inability of the group to grasp the true concept of the proposals.
- 💬 Staff have been placed in a difficult situation with parent carers.
- 💬 Parents are stressed.

- 💬 This is a serious risk to the service user and their carers.
- 💬 Overall it's difficult to say how we feel if we do not know what effect this will have on services.

Circle of Support – The Roundway

“The impact will not be felt until after the fact. They live in the moment not the future. They are autistic.”



Why do you feel this way about the plans?

- 💬 Don't think impact of the proposals have really been understood by the people making the proposals.
- 💬 Service users have enough challenges in their day to day life as it is. How much stress must they keep on enduring?
- 💬 If we are not around the impact will have to be dealt with by the residential home and the parent carers who may not be equipped or ready for the fall out.

5.6 BIRKBECK ROAD SERVICES

29 users of service at Birkbeck Road were able to speak up for themselves.

Staff and family carers were also identified as 'Circles of Support'. They spoke up on behalf of the users of services too.

Based on the question: If Haringey Council goes ahead with all their plans ... How would it affect your day to day life? We asked people “What does the Day Centre mean to you?”

User of Service – Birkbeck Road

“I enjoy the centre. I look forward to coming here every day. What would I do if I couldn't come here?”



[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

- 💬 The centre is important.
- 💬 We love coming here.
- 💬 Please don't take it away.
- 💬 We would struggle to get through the day.
- 💬 I would be at home 7 days a week
- 💬 What will we do? Stay at home getting bored senseless?
- 💬 We would be bored not coming here.
- 💬 I think I will have to find a job to go to?

- ☞ Where would I go? Where would we go... nowhere to go?
- ☞ Tired, bored, at home – sleep all day.
- ☞ I do not want to stay at home I want to go to the centre.
- ☞ I would get bored I want to keep the centre open
- ☞ I'd like a job and come to the centre as well as.

Based on the question: How do you feel about the plans for Haringey Adult Social Services? [Based on the responses given in the first question] we asked people “How would it make you feel if the day centre had to change your service?”

User of Service – Birkbeck Road

“We don’t like changes because it’s confusing.”



[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

- ☞ What’s going to happen?
- ☞ I’m hoping for the best.
- ☞ The worry is upsetting me.
- ☞ I can get money out of my bank – that can help them out?
- ☞ We chose the name of the centre ‘Always’ – we chose ‘Always’ because we thought we would always stay there.
- ☞ LEAVE IT ALONE!
- ☞ I think about the part of not giving anyone enough money to do things
- ☞ It’s bad
- ☞ Angry.
- ☞ I don’t want the centre to be closing. I do like it here I do gardening, bowling, and I work
- ☞ Prefer it here to Roundway. I was at Roundway before.

Based on the question: Why do you feel this way about the plans? We asked people “Why do you feel this way?”

User of Service – Birkbeck Road

“I would be bored doing the same thing every day like shopping.”



[In the users of services own words and supported by staff]

- ☞ I will miss the staff
- ☞ It’s not fair on my carer
- ☞ I’m going to write to David Cameron, he’s the one doing the cut backs. I have written 3 letters.
- ☞ If I stay at home I will be upset
- ☞ Upset and annoyed I will lose my friends and key worker.
- ☞ Means so much to me I would get banners. I would get my friend and a banner to keep it open. I would go to the Civic Centre and protest.

- 💬 They're making cutbacks.
- 💬 I feel like a yoyo. Up and down, up and down?
- 💬 Sad.
- 💬 Angry and sad
- 💬 I'm very disappointed with council.
- 💬 I want it to be open here. I feel horrible.
- 💬 I have had the same staff for a long time
- 💬 When I get off the bus the staff make a cup of tea for us If we have been out in the cold. Helps us get warm
- 💬 The staff help me with my problems.
- 💬 staff help me to cross the road to help me be independent
- 💬 I have had lots of changes. I like it here
- 💬 Staff not just here to do activities they help me with my life. They are important.
- 💬 Staff comforted me when my mum died
- 💬 Staff helped me when I lost my sister. Staff help us in other ways.

Session 2: Carers, Birkbeck Road

Carers joined in the session with users of services. During and after the meeting they also said the following.

Carer – Birkbeck Road



"My son has been in the service since 19 years old? There have been so many changes and threats of changes. We do not know if we are coming or going?"

- 💬 All these changes. My mother in law does not speak English I support her and my sister. They need me to interpret on their behalf.
- 💬 I feel lost I don't know what to do. This is such a horrible feeling.
- 💬 My sister is aging and her mobility needs and care have increased. She's not only disabled, she is also elderly. I have to consider, on a daily basis what activities we do. I need the centre to lighten the load.
- 💬 I do not want them to close this place as my daughter is happy here despite the barriers. She is so happy.
- 💬 In holidays when centre is closed she can't wait for centre to open. She keeps asking.
- 💬 Staff supports us.
- 💬 I call on staff. We speak over the telephone if there is a problem.
- 💬 Who would help us?
- 💬 As a carer when my loved one is at the day centre it gives me time to do the things I need to do.
- 💬 It would tie me down if my sister was at home more. I will not be able to do those things.

Session 3: Circle of Support, Birkbeck Road

A Circle of Support for the users of services at Birkbeck Road also gave the following feedback.

Circle of Support – Birkbeck Road



“To communicate with our clients effectively plans need to be done way in advance. Some of this is not appropriate – some of the information is unacceptable.”

-  We do not know the impact this will have on Service Users until it happens. For those people who are non-verbal you do not know the impact immediately.
-  The day centre is great. It improves behaviour. We facilitate people to make choices. People already have the option of doing other things.
-  Lots of clients will go downhill. Lots of clients have been here between 15 – 25 years.
-  15 months ago people moved from the Roundway to here. People have just settled down.
-  Most of the people who come here are living in residential/ supported living. This is going to reduce the service from 75 people per day to 17 (approx.) If the residential homes don't provide a balanced service people will become deskilled. This will impact on this group the most as they will have to leave.
-  Let's pool resources – club together to get the work done. Get a support worker who can support 3 or 4 of them. There will be no central organisation to do this.
-  Lots of residential homes do not have staff during the day. A lot of the staff don't take part in or focus on personal and social development of the clients. They focus on personal care and cooking. Haringey are trying to save money but are they actually saving money in the long run?
-  For me it seems like going back to the olden days with people sitting at home all day. Clients now mix with people, make friends, do things they want to do. The community isn't all that and people don't want to be out all day, every day. Some people have less mobility than others, may not want to walk, struggle with the cold weather and have challenging behaviour in the community.
-  Our clients keep saying what's going to happen? When is it going to happen? It's confusing to keep on telling people “It's just an idea?” and that there's nothing concrete. However, there are some people who have understood about the changes, the possible closure of day service and the impact on them.



Circle of Support – Birkbeck Road

“Is there is a robust system in place for safeguarding? Is there going to be an auditing procedure to check safeguarding? Without any form of day service many will be feel very vulnerable, isolated and at risk. Many more people will be open to hidden abuse.

- ☞ There seems to be no alternative to the closure of the day service
- ☞ We pick up lots of stuff to support the family. We feed into the Social workers and health teams. Escorts are able to raise the alarm on issues at the home. If someone is just receiving day services we do the review. We chase the reviews. We deal with social, emotional, mental, wellbeing, safety, health, bus passes, blue badges, benefits etc. For some people we are their only point of call.

5.7 GENERAL COMMENTS

LDX has identified below relevant general feedback from users of services, carers, circles of support and stakeholders that was made at different times during corporate and specific consultation sessions.

Service Users – People First

“Society is not accessible or appropriate for people with LD. We are far away from being an inclusive society.”

- ☞ How did you work out the cuts of 30 million?
- ☞ Stop giving financial answers to moral questions. You do not have to prescribe the 3 year plan now. Don't make a stronger Haringey of the weakest people. Wait until after election. Have a holding budget instead.
- ☞ Holiday periods and religious festivals should be avoided when having Council consultation (Government policy).
- ☞ Have political parties considered sharing salaries of top paid counsellors/officers in order to preserve places like Ermine Road?
- ☞ I think this is a sad day. It's a cut down for me. You can go 2 days, you can go 1 day. Haringey loves to be in the news. They love ITV. Haringey is waiting for something to kick off. People with learning disabilities have views but they cannot speak for themselves. Cutting all services means everyone locked up in their homes with nowhere to go. It will be like the little girl Climbie? I can see it happening again. I'm waiting for something to happen after you shut down the day centre. People with learning disabilities may not be able to think straight but leave us alone.

- ☞ Only the mild to moderate can utilise reablement support. Other core groups will not be able to increase burden of care on families. It will be a breakdown of families and services.
- ☞ Older people homes have previously been closed and are now sitting empty. Why can't you re-open them and use them? You've not explored all of the options open to you.
- ☞ Osborne Grove is a health issue. What explorations are being made about beds? The partnership between Health and Social Care is an important issue. Osborne Grove is an important facility to have and we should be working together to get health to fund it.
- ☞ Saving money should be the furthest thought away.
- ☞ What extra services will be put in place?
- ☞ If the day centre closes $\frac{3}{4}$ of the clients will lose friendships overnight. It will have devastating consequence.
- ☞ Accessible, appropriate, safe access life opportunities not often cut by society. Essential in people accessing society.
- ☞ Lots of bad things out there for people with Learning Disabilities. Lots of Hate Crime.
- ☞ Somewhere along the line we need people like Mencap. I've been bullied all my life and my parents died suddenly. They helped me.
- ☞ No one thinks people will be more lonely. It's a vulnerable position to be in. The centre can make a difference.
- ☞ We are very worried as a group about if the day centres are closed. We are the Speak Up group. We say 'No' to cuts. The group holds up our cards to say 'No'.
- ☞ Council responsible for behavior of providers. Difficult line to draw. How are monitoring this?
- ☞ The Council are building a stronger Haringey but not off the backs of the weakest/vulnerable people.

6 OTHER INFORMATION

In addition to the information that LDX has collated, users of services, carers and stakeholders gave us letters, emails, statements and written documents to deliver to Haringey Council about their concerns.

LDX has forwarded these to the named person at Haringey Council.

6.1 Contact

For all matters concerning the outcomes in this report and anything in relation to the Haringey Council Adults Social Services consultation please contact:

Haringey Council Social Services

40 Cumberland Road, Wood Green, London N22 7SG

- Donna Simeon, Transformation Project Manager
donna.simeon@haringey.gov.uk



Building a Stronger Haringey *Together*

CORPORATE PLAN

2015 - 18



Haringey Council



INTRODUCTION

This is Haringey's Corporate Plan for the next three years. It explains our priorities for the borough, and what the council will do to help achieve these. It sets out how the council will spend our budget in support of these priorities and how we will know what progress we are making. However, we cannot achieve the priorities in the plan on our own – we hope that our partners locally and our residents will sign up to working together with us on them. We want to set out the vision for the whole Borough, working with our partners to put in place everything that is needed to ensure that all our residents can lead fulfilling lives.

Context and challenges

Haringey is a place of great opportunity, with enormous potential for growth – a growing economy, more and better housing and flourishing communities. We are part of one of the world's greatest cities and benefit hugely from that – but more than this, we believe that, with our potential for growth, we are the future of London. We are already home to institutions of national and international significance including Tottenham Hotspur and Alexandra Palace. There are many great businesses, fast transport links into central London and to the M11 corridor. Our residents come from many different cultures, but our communities are comfortable with one another and get on well together. We are home to some of London's most desirable neighbourhoods, but the variety of housing available means that people who cannot afford other parts of the city have been able to make Haringey their home. All of this means Haringey is already a great place for families.

To enable all our residents to participate in this success and benefit fully from these assets, we need to address some significant challenges. Haringey is more affordable than some London boroughs, but much of our social housing needs substantial improvement and there are still many people who live in overcrowded and poor quality homes. Many residents have good, sustainable employment but there are still too many employed in insecure, short-term jobs that don't pay well enough for a decent standard of living. There is significant inequality in the borough, with substantial differences in household incomes and life expectancy between the richest and poorest parts. Too many children still live in poverty. Our education system is making faster improvements than anywhere else in the country, but our children are still not all receiving a world class education



Foreword from the Leader

Our vision: To work with communities to make Haringey an even better place to live

Our approach: To encourage investment and create opportunities for all to share in

This document sets out an agreed vision for what kind borough we want Haringey to be. The words “Corporate Plan” may be stamped on it, but for me it is a whole lot more. It is a plan for the borough, a plan which sets out how we will work together to make Haringey an even stronger place than it is now.

Over the last few months we have been talking to our residents, businesses and partners to help inform its contents. You have told us the things that are important to you: a consistent quality of education and more support for younger people, stronger networks of support for older and more vulnerable people, cleaner and safer streets, more affordable housing, a healthier Haringey and greater investment in our town centres. These are our priorities and what we are working to deliver as you see in the pages that follow.

We have set ourselves 5 key targets that are particularly important and will help define the success of this plan over the next three years and beyond:

- Every child and young person is able to attend a good or outstanding school or early years setting
- To deliver £1bn of inward investment into the borough
- Increase average household earnings in Haringey to align with the London average by 2030 and to have made clear progress towards that goal by 2018
- Ensure that people are able to have as much social contact as they like, reducing the number of people who feel isolated to less than 12% which is the current national average
- Increase the number of people satisfied with the area as a place to live to over 80% (compared with the current national average of 75%)

Some people have, quite understandably, expressed concerns about the reduction in council funding and believe that many of these things will be difficult to achieve. In no way do I underestimate the challenges ahead. In setting a three-year budget alongside the Corporate Plan, we face many difficult decisions and there will be things that the Council does not want to do. However, this only serves to remind us why having a long-term plan is so important which not only takes into account council resources but also harnesses the wealth of talent that we have across our communities. So how can you maintain and improve quality of life while taking out £70 million from system? It will require innovation, ambition and, most of all, team work.

“Ambition” in the sense that we are committed to securing £1 billion of extra investment in Haringey, building new homes, securing new jobs and providing residents and businesses new opportunities to succeed. Growth pays for services and the buildings that they are housed in. Innovation in that we have and will change the way services are delivered, with a much stronger focus on prevention rather than spending greater sums on problem solving. “Prevention” is inextricably linked to growth because one form of prevention is to help more people, particularly younger people, build the skills and confidence to succeed.

“Team work” is fundamental to this plan because we cannot, nor would we want to, deliver it on our own. Everyone who has a role to play in our borough is crucial to its success, our schools, the voluntary sector, police, health partners, businesses and residents. Working much closer together, despite the difficulties ahead, we can and will succeed.

Claire Kober



Foreword from the Chief Executive

The three-year Corporate Plan and budget proposals that come with it is a landmark moment because it ushers in a new era of change in the way that we do things, not just as a Council, but in our relationship with partners, businesses and residents.

The Leader has said very clearly that, despite the grim financial outlook, she is not prepared to manage decline. That is a very bold statement given the Herculean battle facing local government over the next three years and beyond.

We have, in many ways, the perfect storm – rising demand for services, particularly in social care, and shrinking budgets because of the reduction in Government grants. Yet we have a responsibility to our communities to face-up to this challenge rather than bury our heads in the sand. That is why setting a three-year budget and vision is so important. We can start a proper debate about what people can expect from their council and the step change that is needed if we are to fill the gaps and grow our communities.

I am confident it is a change that we can make. For too long local government has thought that we have all the answers. We have acted like a big machine dispensing services, but not always very well and not always in unison with the very people who can benefit from them. And often those services have been delivered at the wrong point in time, trying to solve a problem at far greater cost rather than preventing it from happening in the first place.

We have also been stuck in the mud for far too long with poor customer services and out-dated transactional methods which means that people have to wait too long, either in virtual (on the phone) or physical queues – and at greater cost to the taxpayer.

The Council of the future will be very different. It will be a Council where people can access services and information seamlessly and easily at a time that pleases them, not us, with everything available online (at lesser cost to the taxpayer). It will be a Council where we recognise that the solutions to many problems do not lie in the Civic Centre but in our communities. We have a huge amount of talent, expertise, knowledge and willingness in

“ *This plan is a landmark moment because it ushers in a new era of change in the way that we do things, not just as a Council, but in our relationship with partners, businesses and residents.* ”

our communities. Our job will be to facilitate, encourage, enable and support that talent to flourish. And the services that we do provide or commission need to be concentrated far more acutely on preventing problems from occurring rather than dealing with the problem. Our residents will be far better served by that approach. We have got a big job to do to create more opportunities for people to get on in life and that is why we are concentrating on bringing in an extra £1bn of investment through regeneration over the next three years.

Also as devolution from Whitehall becomes a reality we must be an organisation ready to take in the additional risk and responsibility that will come alongside the freedoms and flexibilities we have long sought. I strongly believe that we have both the potential and desire to really benefit from this.

I realise that our three-year plan will require a big step change within the council and within our borough. We will require new skills and we will need to change our thinking. This Corporate Plan is the start of that journey - a journey of facing up to the challenges that have been set and supporting our communities to grow rather than managing decline. We will need the help of everybody who has an interest in our borough to achieve it, but I am confident that if we work together the future for our borough will be very bright.

Nick Walkley

The transformation journey

The economic challenges the UK has faced over the last few years have had a significant impact on organisations across the whole of the public, private and voluntary sectors. In Haringey, we do not want to manage decline but ensure that as an organisation, we have the capacity to tackle all the challenges we face in a planned and pragmatic way with a focus on improving outcomes for our residents.

The organisational change required to deliver a new future for Haringey Council is huge and should not be underestimated. The council has already taken out over £100m from its budgets since 2010 with smaller scale revisions to services and reductions. We need to take a further £70m out over the next three years and to do this requires radical change.

Building better partnerships

We are aware of the need to redefine the council's role and purpose in response to continued austerity - in terms of what we deliver and how we deliver services. This has meant reviewing our partnership arrangements which need to be more strategically planned. Up until now there has been a significant reliance on the council to lead, to manage and to resource local partnerships. The time is right for us to move away from this way of working and towards shared accountability.

Making the most of community skills

As part of exploring different delivery models we have started to examine how to talk and work more effectively with local communities. Communities have assets and relationships that can provide mutual support beyond the reach of council services. In many cases when people help themselves and

each other, better outcomes are achieved.

Engaging with residents differently

Resident engagement is an essential mechanism for checking if we are delivering services that residents want and that the services are focused on their needs. As well as engaging with our residents on key issues such as the budget cuts, we are also developing new approaches to resident engagement, focused on building community capacity.

Building service capacity where needed

We have created new teams and brought in experts to help drive our change agenda. Examples include:

- The creation of the Corporate Delivery Unit which supports sustained improvement in delivery in areas that have been identified as a priority by the Chief Executive and the Leader such as temporary accommodation, street cleanliness and children's safeguarding
- iMPower which has been brought in as our strategic partner to support our 54,000 transformation programme
- Creating the Haringey Academy approach to identify and develop our best in-house talent.

Delivering better services

We are working hard to ensure that we deliver the services that matter to residents in a timely, effective, efficient and satisfactory way. Performance has improved significantly across all customer service indicators in 2013/14. In addition we have

seen improved services in a number of key areas including:

- Number of secondary schools judged as good or outstanding by Ofsted
- Street cleanliness and recycling rates
- High quality parks and open spaces
- Timely processing of planning applications
- The most improved borough in the country for GCSE performance since 2010

Over the last 18 months, the council has embarked on a significant and ambitious modernisation programme of transformation and change. We have identified six areas that need to be prioritised in order to achieve the best possible outcomes for the borough and ensure residents are receiving excellent service. These are:

Tottenham

Our future vision for Tottenham is that by the age of twenty, a child born in Tottenham today will have a quality of life and access to the same level of opportunity that is at least equal to the best in London. The Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) sets out the vision and aspiration for the regeneration of Tottenham over the next 20 years.

Haringey 54,000

In Haringey, we want every child to be safe, able to thrive and achieve. Our children's services have been on an improvement journey and there are achievements to be proud of but we have a lot more work to do. In July, Ofsted judged our children's services as 'requires improvement', which is in line with or better than other London boroughs inspected so far but we are aiming much higher. Not only do

we need to continue to strengthen the quality of our practice in social care but we need to fundamentally re-think and re-shape how our services support children and young people in Haringey so that these are good and then outstanding.

Housing unification and improvement

This programme aims to integrate our services into a customer focused service in line with Corporate Priorities and programmes and deliver a housing strategy for the borough including capital investment programmes.

Health and social care integration

We will work with our NHS partners to bring health and social care together and create a more effective and efficient health pathway for patients with a bigger focus on prevention.

Business infrastructure

In order to deliver the priorities in the corporate plan, we need to be an effective and efficient organisation. This corporate programme will identify what needs to change, deliver and embed those changes and ensure we have the right internal infrastructure and culture to be a sustainable, customer-focused council.

Customer services

The Customer Services Transformation programme (CST) will fundamentally change and improve the way in which customers interact with the council to access services. We will ensure customers are able to interact with us in the way they choose to and that their experience is a positive one.

Our priorities

The following pages set out a summary of our objectives and are followed by outline delivery plans, which include how we intend to measure success.



We will do this by:

PREVENTION AND EARLY INTERVENTION

Preventing poor outcomes for children, young people and adults and intervening early when help and support is needed

A FAIR AND EQUAL BOROUGH

Tackling underlying factors of poverty and discrimination with a scale and intensity proportionate to the level of disadvantage.

WORKING TOGETHER WITH OUR COMMUNITIES

Building resilient communities where people are able to help themselves and support each other

VALUE FOR MONEY

Achieving the best outcome from the investment made

CUSTOMER FOCUS

Placing our customer needs at the centre of everything we do

WORKING IN PARTNERSHIP

Delivering with and through others

Priority 1:

Outstanding for all

Enable every child and young person to have the best start in life, with high quality education

Vision:

“We will work together with families to ensure that every child in Haringey has the very best start in life, including world class education.”

Objectives	The role of the council
All children will have the best start in life.	We will work with health service commissioners and health and education providers to ensure that there is access to excellent health care and that parents and families can access those services and have confidence in them.
Children and young people across Haringey excel at school, making the most of their potential.	We will ensure that all schools across the borough are good or outstanding, with school results in line with the best in the country.
All young people will have access to excellent employment or higher education opportunities.	We will work with partners to ensure that there are excellent training opportunities for young people to ensure they are able to achieve in line with the best nationally.
Children and young people will be healthier, happier and more resilient and those who need extra help will get support at the right time.	We will ensure parents can access the information they need and know where they can turn to for support. We will support and encourage community-led initiatives and our re-designed children's centres will provide early support, working with the whole family to help them to thrive.
Children and families who need more support will be helped earlier before issues escalate.	We will work with other agencies to build an early help model to support children and families with additional needs.
All children and young people will be safeguarded from abuse.	Children and young people at risk will be given the right support but where possible, we will work with families to help identify their own solutions.

Priority 2:

Outstanding for all

Enable all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives

Vision:

“We will support people to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives with control over what is important to them.”

Objectives	The role of the council
A borough where the healthier choice is the easier choice	We will work with partners and communities to create physical, social and cultural environments that encourage healthy lifestyles for all ■ People will have high quality information to make informed choices which will lead to improved health outcome
Strong communities, where all residents are healthier and live independent, fulfilling lives.	We will: ■ Work with communities, developing ways to build capacity and bring investment into the voluntary sector to provide support for one another
Support will be provided at an earlier stage to residents who have difficulty in maintaining their health and wellbeing.	We will: ■ Work with partners to identify those who may need help with their health and wellbeing, providing advice on support ■ Optimise the use of technology to keep people as independent as possible ■ Help residents make choices and decisions, before they enter formal care and support system
Residents assessed as needing formal care and / or health support will receive responsive and high quality services.	We will: ■ Work together with health partners to provide high quality person-centred services, while informing residents to help them to understand the level of service they should expect ■ Intervene (with the Care Quality Commission) when services fall below standard
All vulnerable adults will be safeguarded from abuse.	We will work with our partners to protect adults in vulnerable situations and ensure that residents will have increased awareness of the early signs of potential abuse.

Priority 3:

Clean and Safe

A clean, well maintained and safe borough where people are proud to live and work

Vision:

“We will strengthen communities and partnerships to improve our environment and reduce crime, enabling residents and traders to feel safe and proud of where they live and work.”

Objectives	The role of the council
We will work with communities to improve the environment, particularly by reducing anti social behavioural and environmental crime	We will work with our communities and partners to identify local needs and create action plans to encourage communities to take ownership of their local area. We will join up our enforcement teams and provide local performance information so with our communities we can identify and tackle issues more effectively.
We will make our streets, parks and estates clean, well maintained and safe	We will ensure that we deliver effective and efficient parks, parking, highways and waste management services and together through our community led approach we will make our roads safer and improve our local environment.
We will make Haringey one of the most cycling and pedestrian friendly boroughs in London	We will promote cycling and walking by introducing a 20 mph limit, increasing dedicated cycle lanes, and encouraging sustainable modes of transport through a smarter travel campaign.
We will prevent and reduce Violence Against Women and Girls	We will campaign with our partners and raise awareness on the unacceptability of this behaviour, increase confidence among victims to report incidents and develop interventions to tackle the problem effectively.
We will work with partners to prevent and reduce more serious crime, in particular youth crime and gang activity	We will work with our partners to engage with offenders by focusing on underlying factors, intervention and prevention, whilst effectively supporting victims and witnesses. We will encourage community leaders to help us to engage with gang members and reduce the impact of gangs on local communities.

Priority 4:

Sustainable Housing, Growth and Employment

Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit

Vision:

“Haringey is London’s future: a borough embracing growth to create thriving, more prosperous and more equal communities.”

Objectives	The role of the council
We will enable growth, by securing infrastructure - including transport, broadband, schools and health services.	We will lobby Government, the Mayor and others to plan for and invest in new transport, health and education facilities in the borough and use our planning powers to support growth.
We will deliver growth, by creating an environment that supports investment and growth in business and jobs.	We will promote Haringey to attract investment, and identify priority sectors and support businesses in locating, growing and creating jobs.
We will take advantage of growth, by ensuring that residents have the training, skills and support necessary to find and keep good quality employment.	We will improve the skills, information and support that people get, from primary school onwards, so that they can take advantage of London’s job opportunities.
We will manage the impact of growth, by reducing carbon emissions across the borough with the aim of meeting our 40:20 goal, while growing the green economy.	We will take active steps to reduce the council’s own carbon emissions, and lead efforts to reduce emissions across the borough. We will support green businesses - including those that help to make construction and existing buildings more efficient.
We will focus growth by prioritising new homes and jobs in Wood Green and particularly in Tottenham, where need and opportunity are greatest, and by bringing some of the borough’s key community assets into more active use.	We will continue to seek investment in Tottenham while extending that to Wood Green. We will ensure that the people and businesses in these areas benefit from the investment and change in their neighbourhoods, with improved education and employment prospects, better housing, better health and a greater say in the decisions that affect them.

Priority 5:

Sustainable Housing Growth and Employment

Create homes and communities where people choose to live and are able to thrive

Vision:

“Housing is about people and communities, not just bricks and mortar. This means mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods where residents can lead happy and fulfilling lives.”

Objectives	The role of the council
Achieve a step change in the number of new homes being built.	We will build more council owned homes while working with partners to provide greater numbers of affordable housing, while increasing the overall supply, including more shared ownership housing to help low and middle-income earners get on the property ladder. We will encourage owners to bring back into use more empty homes.
Prevent homelessness and support residents to lead fulfilling lives	We will provide realistic and achievable options for people to find housing or alternative housing and proactively help people avoid eviction and to sustain their tenancies. We will work with partners and landlords to secure good quality accommodation at reasonable prices, as a way to prevent homelessness and reliance on temporary accommodation.
Drive up the quality of housing for all residents	We will complete the current plans for bringing council owned homes up to the Decent Homes Standard. We will also provide new good quality, energy-efficient and affordable homes for rent and sale.

We will do this through...

Outcomes	Role of the council

Prevention and early intervention

We will shift our focus from problem solving to preventing problems from occurring

Prevention and early intervention approaches will be built-in into everything that we do. This will mean much more effective signposting of support and working with our partners to identify people more likely to need support and delivering that support earlier.

A fair and equal borough

We will tackle underlying factors of poverty and discrimination with a scale and intensity that is proportionate to the level of disadvantage.

All children will have the best start in life and, with young people, able to maximise their capabilities, including their ability to find and keep good quality employment.

We will work with our communities to tackle the underlying factors that lead to poverty and discrimination and develop healthy and sustainable places and communities so that all residents can live healthy, successful and fulfilling lives.

Working with our communities

We will work as a team with everybody who has an interest in our community to improve our neighbourhoods and increase skills and capacity around local problem solving

We will play a major role in facilitating, enabling and connecting our communities with resources, skills and capacity to make things happen.

This will be done through a strategy which encourages community participation, signposts local resources and connects skills and willingness with where it can really make a difference.

We will aim to create a 'community chest' with investment from across our community to help fund local ideas and innovation.

Outcomes	Role of the council

Working in partnership

We cannot, nor would we want to, deliver this on our own. We want to work with our partners on shared objectives and delivery plans

We will agree objectives with partners and then map across the borough how we can more effectively work together, looking at the effectiveness of existing partnership boards and establishing new ones where gaps exist. We will agree a common set of principles around shared working and jointly set targets and milestones.

Customer focus

We will make better use of technology to ensure that the council is far more responsive to individuals, communities and local businesses

We will implement digital one stop shops and make better use of council buildings to ensure that customers can access council services quickly, easily and more efficiently.

We will roll out new customer standards, while using data and insight to tailor information in a way that enhances the customer experience.

Value for money

We will get better value out of every pound spent by integrating a value for money culture in everything that we do

There will be a much stronger focus on measuring cost and performance, while ensuring that efficiency targets are built into all council contracts.

Delivery Plans

PRIORITY 1 - ENABLE EVERY CHILD AND YOUNG PERSON TO HAVE THE BEST START IN LIFE, WITH HIGH QUALITY EDUCATION

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
1 All children will have the best start in life supported by strong relationships and be ready for school	1. We will strengthen the support provided to young children (0-5) by making it better co-ordinated and more accessible to parents, including provision of and access to universal elements of the Healthy Child Programme. In future we will adopt a family focus to build a holistic response to families with children up to 19 (up to 25 where there are special educational needs or disabilities), bringing together health, voluntary and community services and other support parents need to give their children the best start in life	1. We will increase the quality and accessibility of childcare across the borough 2. We will work with parents and carers, families and communities. We will work closely with statutory partners and voluntary and community providers to integrate health and other services for families through our early help model and re-designed children's centres. The council will work with stakeholders to develop the changes to children's centres and oversee quality improvements in childcare across the borough
2 Children and young people across Haringey excel at school, making the most of their potential	1. We will ensure that all schools across the borough are rated Good or Outstanding, with school results in line with the best in the country 2. We will ensure schools have the support they need to work closely with families and the wider community to achieve this	1. Schools and governors will lead on delivery, supported by the council and the wider community
3 There will be excellent education and training opportunities for young people aged 16 plus, enabling all to develop the right skills and experience for good quality, sustainable employment	1. We will ensure that there are excellent opportunities in education, employment and training for young people by working with schools and other providers 2. We will identify young people not in education, employment or training (or whose status is unknown) to enable them to access the best support for them 3. High quality information, advice and guidance will be available to help young people make the right choices for their future	1. Schools, colleges, training providers and employers. The council will commission and co-ordinate as well as tracking performance for young people



We will work together to ensure that every child in Haringey will have the very best start in life, including through world class education, delivering the best outcomes for our children, young people and families, which are sustainable and designed around their needs



How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Parents feel that they can access the right health and other services for their children in the early years 2. Parents feel that they can access high quality and affordable childcare 3. Children will be confident in communicating and building relationships in their early years 4. A child's background whether ethnicity, household income or special educational needs, will be less important in determining their confidence in building relationships and whether they are ready for school	1. [Target % - to come] children achieving expected score on Early Years Foundation Stage, especially personal, social and emotional development and communication and language by 4 years old
1. Parents across Haringey feel this is a place of aspiration and opportunity with excellent schools 2. A child or young person educated in school in Haringey can expect to achieve in line with the best nationally 3. A child's background whether ethnicity, household income or special educational needs will be less important in determining their results than is the case today	1. All schools in Haringey will be Good or Outstanding by 2016 2. Key Stage 1 (age 7) and Key Stage 2 (age 11) results are among the best in the country 3. GCSE results are among the best in the country 4. Closing the attainment gap for groups of children who typically do not achieve as highly as others, including looked after children and different ethnic groups
1. Young people feel that they can chose the best option for them, and have high aspirations 2. There is excellent provision available so young people can make the most of their potential whether in continuing education, employment or training 3. All young people progress into higher education or employment	1. Young people entering employment remain in employment 2. Increase in the number of young people entering Higher Education 3. Increase the proportion of young people entering Russell Group universities 4. Reduce the number of young people not in education, employment and training and young people whose status is unknown

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
4 Children and young people will be healthier, happier and more resilient, supported by stronger families	1. We will support children and young people to thrive in strengthened families. To do this we will invest in better information and signposting to help families access services and connect with other community members and groups that can support them 2. We will help community led support to thrive through the use of council assets (like buildings) where possible. Our children's centres will focus on improving outcomes for families, providing early support and working with the whole family to help them to thrive. Youth services will be re-focused to support young people to access the right choices at 16 as well as address emotional health and wellbeing and sexual health 3. We will continue to promote healthy living, including through healthier neighbourhoods for our children	1. The Council will invest in the Family Information Services Directory; re-design children's centres to support families more effectively; and re-focus our youth support. Schools will promote the health of their children and young people as we continue to strengthen the Healthy Schools programme. We will work with the services that families already access such as schools, leisure, libraries and healthcare to make sure that they are aware of the support available. We will work with a wider group of partners such as local businesses and voluntary and community organisations to create and sustain healthy environments for our children
5 Children and families who need extra help will get the right support at the right time to tackle issues before they escalate	1. We will build an early help model to support children and families with additional needs. This will involve more effective multi-agency support attached to our universal services, in particular our clusters of schools, which will provide much stronger support before needs escalate. Family support service will work with families experiencing difficulties and our youth service and youth offending service will work with young people at risk of offending or participating in gangs.	1. The Council is setting up an early help offer and pathway, working with schools and other services including health, mental health and other specialist providers. We will work with families to design this pathway. The Council delivers family support service and youth services and works directly with the Youth Offending Service. If your family has multiple and complex needs the Council will work with families earlier through targeted services that prevent needs from escalating
6 All children and young people will be safeguarded from abuse and offered the best possible care if they cannot remain with their own family	1. We will work with families to achieve their own solutions whilst continuing to support children who need protection. We are strengthening safeguarding for children at risk of child sexual exploitation or on the edge of care. We are improving support for children in our care, including more effective help to achieve at school and stay healthy. We are building the quality of fostering and other placements whilst also planning for children and young people to be able to leave care at the right time with the right support around them	1. The Council is strengthening children's social care. We will work with families, foster carers, adopters and settings such as children's homes so placements, when necessary, are stable and support children and young people in care. Partners including health, police and the Youth Offending Service will help to ensure vulnerable young people are healthy, safe and well supported

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Parents can easily access the information and advice they need 2. Parents know where to turn for early support, including in the community 3. Children are measurably healthier and happier 4. Young people are less likely to engage in risky behaviour 5. Schools, colleges and sixth form centres promote the health of their children and young people	1. Halt the rise in overweight and obese children in Year 6 (10-11 years) 2. Reduce STIs among young people 3. Continue to reduce teenage pregnancy 4. Increase number of schools obtaining Healthy Schools status 5. Ensure that children receive their appropriate immunisation 6. Ensure all women to have early access to a midwife so that they receive information and tests for the best start for their child
1. Families experiencing difficulties are able to ask for the help they need, and are identified quickly to receive support at the earliest possible point 2. Families receiving additional support are able to build strong, trusting relationships with a key member of staff supporting them effectively 3. Young people at risk of offending or participating in gangs are given positive opportunities and supported to make good decisions	1. More families know where to go to access Early Help services 2. Reduce the number of referrals to social care 3. Reduce the number of young people offending for the first time 4. Children's attendance at school is high and exclusions from school is low 5. Proficient early reading is promoted, where good reading at 7 years of age correlates to good GCSE outcomes at 16. We are working on further measures of success
1. Children and young people at risk are quickly identified and given the right support 2. Children and young people needing protection are supported by excellent social workers they can trust and who provide continuity of support 3. Children in care are offered excellent support and moved into a permanent arrangement as quickly as possible	1. Reduce the numebr of re-referrals to children's social care 2. Reduce the average length of time children are in care before being adopted or achieving 3. Deliver school results for care leavers in line with the best in the country We are working on further measures of success

PRIORITY 2: A BOROUGH WHERE THE HEALTHIER CHOICE IS THE EASIER CHOICE

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective	Who will be involved in delivering the objective
1 All residents will be as healthy as possible for as long as possible	1. We will work with partners and communities to create physical, social and cultural environments that encourage healthy lifestyles for all 2. People will have high quality information to make informed choices which will lead to improved health outcomes	1. All residents, (individuals and families); local communities; the council, and Community and Voluntary sector, partners, will work together
2 Strong communities, where all residents are healthier and live independent, fulfilling lives.	We will: 1. Work with residents and communities to seek community solutions rather than council-led solutions 2. Invest in a partner to develop innovative ways to build capacity and bring investment into the voluntary and community sector 3. Support people in communities, including through the voluntary sector, to provide support for one another 4. Work with the voluntary sector so that they are more able to support residents to be engaged in their communities.	1. All residents, (individuals and families); local networks (friends and communities), the voluntary and community sector, the council and partners will be involved in encouraging investment in our local communities 2. The council and residents will work together to achieve agreed outcomes 3. The council and partners will advise residents and make it possible that those who are most vulnerable and at risk in local communities, are supported to live independent, healthy lives



We will support people to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives with control over what is important to them.



How will we know we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-18
1. The difference in life expectancy across the borough will be reduced 2. More people will have healthy lifestyles	1. Health related quality of life will improve over time (including mental health and wellbeing) 2. The life expectancy gap across the borough will reduce 3. A reduction in the prevalence of unhealthy lifestyle behaviours
1. There will be more inward investment for the community and voluntary sector 2. Residents and local communities will be more involved in supporting each other 3. More residents will be volunteers 4. Residents will have better access to and make better use of information and advice 5. Older residents and those with disabilities will be more included and engaged in leisure, education, employment or health 6. Residents' mental health and wellbeing will improve 7. Fewer residents will need formal care and support services 8. Fewer residents will live in social isolation	1. Fewer residents will live in social isolation 2. The numbers of people involved in volunteering will increase 3. The mental health and wellbeing of residents will improve 4. Increased financial investment into the voluntary and community sector 5. An increase in older residents and those with disabilities engaged in leisure, education, employment or health

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective	Who will be involved in delivering the objective
3 Support will be provided at an earlier stage to residents who have difficulty in maintaining their health and wellbeing	We will: 1. Work with partners to identify those who may need help with their health and wellbeing, providing advice on supportOptimise the use of technology e.g., telehealth/telecare to keep people as independent as possible 2. Have someone to help residents make choices and decisions, before they enter formal care and support systems	1. All residents, (individuals and families); local networks (friends and communities), will take more responsibility for their own health and wellbeing 2. The council will make it possible for local community solutions to be developed to help vulnerable residents make informed choices 3. Partners, especially the NHS
4 Residents assessed as needing formal care and / or health support will receive responsive, high quality services	We will: 1. Work together with health partners to provide high quality person-centred services 2. Work with people who use services and their carers (and local residents) to agree what 'good' looks like for services we commission 3. Encourage and inform residents to help them to understand the level of service and quality of service they should expect, and to know what to do when things go wrong 4. Through high quality advocacy services support those residents who are less able to give their views and to engage with the Council and other statutory organisations 5. Intervene (with the Care Quality Commission) when services fall below standard	1. The council will work together with the NHS and other organisations to ensure that residents receive high quality responsive services; 2. The council will directly help people to stay in their communities and live in secure tenancies 3. Health Watch and The Care Quality Commission will play a key role in helping residents monitor the quality of any services they receive

How will we know we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-18
1. Residents will tell us that they feel they are listened to and enabled to make their own choices and decisions 2. Residents will live in their own homes and their communities for longer, even when they reach the point when they need more support 3. Residents will feel that they have been treated with dignity and respect 4. Less people will require social care intervention 5. Less people (aged 18+) will be admitted to hospital as an emergency	1. Reduction in emergency hospital admissions 2. Reduction in admissions to residential and nursing homes 3. The number of people in a normal place of residence 91 days after discharge from hospital will increase 4. More people will remain at home longer 5. Increase in people supported to live in their own home
1. Outcomes identified by users and carers will be achieved 2. Residents will confirm that those who are assessed for and in receipt of services are treated with dignity and respect 3. The council will help residents know what 'good' looks like for services they receive and support residents to do something about it if things go wrong 4. When people need more support for mental health problems they will achieve improved outcomes	1. The numbers of residents who tell us that services are 'good' will increase 2. The numbers of residents who tell us they were treated with dignity and respect will increase 3. The number of services rated as good by the Care Quality Commission will increase

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective	Who will be involved in delivering the objective
5 All vulnerable adults will be safeguarded from abuse	1. The Council and its partners will work with residents to agree how best to protect adults in vulnerable situations 2. The Council and its partners will put the individual at the centre of safeguarding interventions 3. The Council and its partners will work to develop good outcomes for those residents involved in safeguarding interventions 4. Through the provision of good information and advice the Council and its partners will ensure that residents will have increased awareness of the early signs of potential abuse	1. Through the multi agency Adult Safeguarding Board the Council will work with its partners to help residents identify abuse, to respond appropriately to incidents of abuse and work to enable vulnerable residents to feel safe

How will we know we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-18
1. Residents will be more aware of how to spot abuse at an earlier stage and how to report their concerns 2. Positive outcomes will be achieved for vulnerable residents who are subject of safeguarding interventions 3. Those residents involved in safeguarding interventions will tell us they have been at the centre of the process	1. Potential incidences of abuse will be identified at an earlier stage 2. Outcomes, which have been defined by the resident who is subject to a safeguarding intervention, will be met 3. Individuals won't slip through the gap because of poor communication between different agencies



PRIORITY 3 - A CLEAN, WELL MAINTAINED AND SAFE BOROUGH WHERE PEOPLE ARE PROUD TO LIVE AND WORK

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
1 To strengthen partnerships, and together work with our communities to improve their environment, enable people to feel safe and proud of where they live and work, particularly through reducing anti social behavioural and environmental crime.	1. We will work with partners and communities to share intelligence and information to prevent and reduce environmental and anti social behavioural crime. We will support the community to lead, working with local people to give them confidence to identify local needs and work with the council, the police and other partners to resolve them. This will lead to the development of local ward-based action plans, which will allow communities to take ownership of their street or area by changing behaviours 2. The council will join up its enforcement teams so we can tackle anti social issues more effectively including fly tipping, litter, noise, street drinking, drug dealing and our ability to enforce licensing conditions and health and safety standards on landlords 3. We will publish our performance data, celebrate success and share good practice	1. The council will work more effectively with existing community networks such as Neighbourhood Watch, Friends of Parks, traders and residents associations to increase their numbers and support them to take action themselves 2. We will help further develop groups such as Environmental, Winter and Cycle Champions and introduce a network of Young Environmental Champions 3. A key partner will be our local police force and we will share intelligence and undertake joint tasking to effectively deal with issues for our shared communities 4. Other key partners will include Homes for Haringey, other registered social landlords, mental health trusts, Haringey Clinical Commissioning Group and our existing waste and highways contractors




Strengthening communities and partnerships to improve our environment and reduce crime, enabling residents and traders to feel safe and proud of where they live.



How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Successful partnerships and working more closely with our communities will ensure that Haringey will be a place that residents and traders will be proud of and a point of destination for others who will want to live and work here 2. We will see a reduction in environmental crime and anti-social behaviour 3. Haringey residents, traders and other network groups will have the confidence to resolve environmental and anti social problems themselves or commission other agencies to resolve local issues 4. There will be improved confidence in policing 5. There will be an increase in the percentage of residents and traders who feel safe and proud of where they live and work	1. Improved confidence in policing 2. Improved percentage of residents who are proud of where they live 3. Improved percentage of traders who are proud of where they work

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
2 To make our streets, parks and estates clean, well maintained and safe	1. We will work with partners and local communities within our community led approach to jointly deliver improvements to our local environment. These improvements will include decluttering streets, providing black boxes to contain street sweepers' bags, revised timed collection service for trade waste and flats above shops and redesigning our residential street cleansing services, based on need 2. We will continue to review our parks grounds maintenance and cleansing to ensure we deliver effective value for money services 3. By investing in our roads, pavements and lighting we will further improve the safety of our roads and the flow of traffic 4. We will review how we deliver parking enforcement, parks and highways services to make sure they are customer focused and operated in the most effective and efficient way possible	1. The council will be working together with: 2. Traders associations, community groups and networks, Homes for Haringey and other registered social landlords, Friends of Parks and other users to understand their needs, co-designing solutions and developing their role in helping delivering improvements on the ground 3. Our highways and waste contractors to effectively deliver the improvements and redesigned services 4. Other council services such as Regeneration and Housing to support the delivery of the borough's growth ambitions 5. TfL to provide funding, co design and deliver future schemes together 6. User groups representing cyclists, pedestrians and motorists, to understand needs and co-design solutions together



How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Because of the excellent look and feel of our parks, estates, town centres and residential roads existing residents and traders will want to stay, and for others Haringey will be a point of destination where people will want to live and work 2. Increased resident satisfaction for cleansing on our streets, parks and estates 3. Improved condition of our streets, pavements and street lighting 4. Safer roads with fewer accidents for pedestrians and other road users 5. Less congested roads, improving the overall traffic flow, especially for buses. 6. Investment in planned works for roads and pavements to prevent and reduce the future resources required for reactive maintenance e.g. potholes	1. Improved resident satisfaction for cleansing on our streets, parks and estates 2. Reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured on our streets



Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
3 To move to more sustainable modes of transport by making Haringey one of the most cycling and pedestrian friendly boroughs in London	1. We will promote and improve cycling and walking in the borough, by: ■ Introducing a borough wide 20mph limit, ■ Providing more cycle racks, ■ Increasing the network of dedicated cycle lanes, ■ Providing more cycle training, ■ Improving signage, ■ Improving safety measures on priority pedestrian crossings, and ■ Providing a smarter travel campaign to change behaviours, getting more people to use sustainable modes of transport.	The council will work with: 1. Cyclists, pedestrians and community groups to further understand their needs and design solutions together 2. TfL to identify funding streams 3. Our highways contractor to implement schemes 4. Schools and Public Health to promote the health benefits of cycling and walking 5. Regeneration to meet aspirations for cycling and pedestrians
4 To prevent and reduce Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG)	Together with partners, we will: 1. Raise awareness of the issues and scale of VAWG, campaign on the unacceptability of this behaviour and increase confidence among victims to report incidents 2. Ensure that agencies deliver the best outcomes for victims by improving and sharing data and by jointly designing effective pathways for all across the borough 3. Develop further interventions to tackle wider gender-based offences such as female genital mutilation, forced marriage and child sexual exploitation	The council will be facilitating and working closely with: 1. Schools to educate young people about healthy relationships. 2. Community and voluntary organisations to build trust, provide support, give advice and, where required, provide shelter 3. The police to help enforce when required and support victims through the criminal justice process 4. Haringey Clinical Commissioning Group, GPs, Public Health, Adults and Children's Services to spot any early signs, refer cases and continue to offer support

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. More people will be cycling, walking and or using public transport 2. There will be an improved network of dedicated cycle routes 3. Improved satisfaction with our footways 4. Cycling and walking will be safer	1. Increased km of dedicated cycle lanes and quiet ways. 2. Increase in the number of people who cycle or walk
1. Violence against women and girls will be seen as unacceptable within all communities 2. Victims will feel empowered, have the confidence to come forward and know where to turn to for early support 3. Key services will be able to identify signs of abuse and signpost support 4. All agencies will share information and data and have a clear understanding of their role and approach to support victims	1. A reduction over time in all forms of violence against women and girls 2. A reduction in repeat incidents of violence against women and girls

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
5 To work with partners to prevent and reduce more serious crime, in particular youth crime and gang activity	1. To increase the number of offenders we work with by building on the work of the established and co-located Offender Management Team, which includes the police, council and probation officers 2. We will work with partners to identify and successfully address underlying factors that contribute to offending, such as mental health and or drug / alcohol misuse 3. Align youth reoffending work and practices with the new integrated offender management model ensuring that all partners work together in dealing with the transitional period between youth and adulthood The council and partners will focus on early intervention and prevention projects which will include: 1. Communicating with children and young people on the dangers for them and their families if they get involved in gangs or become gang members 2. Communicating with young women on how to stay safe from the risk of sexual, physical and mental abuse by gangs 3. Identifying community leaders and influencers to help the Council and partners to engage with gang members to change behaviours and reduce the impact that gangs have on local communities 4. Providing exit opportunities with partners for gang members We will provide effective and targeted support to victims and witnesses of gang related crimes.	The council will be facilitating and working closely with: 1. The police to take enforcement action as appropriate 2. The Probation Service and the new community rehabilitation company to provide support to those offenders who are on licence 3. Public Health and community based partners to identify health needs and provide effective drug and substance misuse interventions 4. Economic development, Job Centre Plus and the voluntary sector to improve employment opportunities and access to education and training 5. Housing to provide access to suitable accommodation 6. Schools, contractors, businesses, Children's Services and the voluntary sector to work with young people to stop offending and help them to live more positive lives through leisure, sport, education, training or employment

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
7. An increase in the number of offenders finding meaningful employment or re-entering education 8. Overall there will be a reduction in crime levels in the borough 9. A reduction in gang-related offending 10. An increase in gang members making positive life choices and leaving gangs to enter employment or educational training 11. Increase the awareness of young people about the detrimental impact that gangs can have on them and their families 12. Young people will consider being a gang member as a poor life choice. 13. Victims will be confident in reporting gang-related crimes.	1. Reduce the level of re-offending of those aged between 16 and 24 2. Contribute to the reduction in youth violence



PRIORITY 4: DRIVE GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT FROM WHICH EVERYONE CAN BENEFIT

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
1 Enable growth, by securing key infrastructure - including transport, broadband, schools and health services - and providing a great planning service	1. We will lobby Government, the Mayor, their agencies and others to plan for and invest in key new transport, health and education facilities in the borough including Crossrail 2 and the West Anglia Main Line 2. We will use up to date planning policy to make timely planning decisions accompanied by Community Infrastructure Levy/Section 106 agreements to attract additional funding and invest in the infrastructure needed for growth	We will work with: 1. Key public bodies including the Mayor of London, Transport for London and the NHS to prepare plans and support delivery of new transport, schools, health and community facilities 2. Developers, housing associations, charitable trusts and our in-house teams to coordinate investment 3. Homeowners and business owners looking to make improvements to their premises 4. Voluntary and community groups supporting the management and improvement of community facilities 5. Charities and grant providers able to provide funding for improvements to infrastructure



Haringey is vital to the future of London: a borough embracing growth to create a thriving, more prosperous and more equal community, with a particular focus on Tottenham where the need and opportunity are greatest of all.



How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. The Borough has a clearly understood and shared plan setting out how, when and where new homes and jobs will be created 2. The plan will also show where planned investment in transport, education, health and community provision will take place, and will be supported by new funding programme (using planning decisions) that will help to deliver the facilities at the right time 3. Homeowners, businesses and developers who are looking to undertake development in the borough will be helped to understand and feel confident in a planning process that provides for and involves communities	1. An investment programme for enhanced/new infrastructure is in place and being actively managed and monitored by the Council 2. TfL/Network Rail and the Government will have committed to fund Crossrail 2 implementation and the West Anglia line upgrade 3. Plans and funding in place for new health and education facilities in Tottenham 4. At least £2m of S106/CIL money secured from developers and invested in the borough, including in community infrastructure 5. The planning service is recognised as a “top quartile” planning service for speed, cost and quality in London

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
2 Deliver growth, by creating an environment that supports investment and growth in business and jobs	1. We will take the lead in creating and promoting a distinctive 'Haringey story' - a clear message that explains Haringey's unique character and qualities as a place to live, work, visit and invest - which can be used by the council and its partners to attract investment, raise ambitions and focus our efforts and the efforts of others 2. We will identify priority sectors, and help firms in those sectors to locate, grow and create jobs in Haringey, recognising in particular the importance of small and medium-sized businesses to the borough's economy, the need to create secure, highly skilled jobs and the role that higher education institutions could play in attracting investment and raising aspiration 3. We will include the cultural industries as one of our priority sectors, recognising that jobs, skills, investment and consumer spending in this sector also have wider benefits for Haringey's community. 4. We will ensure that our approach to culture makes the borough a more enjoyable place to live for everyone 5. We will use the council's own commercial property to support businesses in our priority sectors 6. We will ensure that council regulatory services (e.g. licensing) support businesses to grow	1. Council economic development, regulatory and property services will commission support and advice services for businesses, ensuring that all Haringey services operate in a collaborative way that supports the business community, and considering local business growth when making decisions about Haringey's own property portfolio. The council will also take the lead in creating and promoting the 'Haringey Story' 2. The Mayor of London and London Enterprise Panel will commission advice and investment to support business growth in priority areas and sectors, and provide intelligence on emerging and growing sectors in the London economy 3. We and neighbouring London boroughs will work jointly on cross-border projects and to grow and retain businesses within the wider North East London economy 4. The Haringey business community, voluntary sector and the council will work together to identify priorities for, and barriers to, growth, investing jointly (with money or time) in schemes to improve the borough's business environment. In the cultural sector, the council will work particularly closely with Jackson's Lane and the Bernie Grant Arts Centre to support growth in this field, alongside its own cultural facilities at the Bruce Castle Museum 5. Business bodies (e.g. Federation of Small Businesses, Chamber of Commerce, traders associations) will advise the council of business priorities and concerns, representing businesses on council advisory bodies and commissioning groups for business services, and helping disseminate information on council services to business 6. The London Stansted Cambridge Consortium will bring Haringey together with other councils, the wider public sector and businesses - including Stansted Airport - to promote the 'corridor' between London and Cambridge and make the case for further investment in it

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
We will have made progress towards our long-term aims that, by 2030: 1. The number of jobs in Haringey has increased by 20,000 from the 2011 London Plan baseline position 2. the profile of Haringey-based jobs changes so that retail and public sector employment are less dominant, and there is a better range of jobs, including a greater proportion of jobs in the more highly-skilled sectors, such as sustainable technology, digital design and skilled/craft manufacturing 3. The number of jobs per square metre of employment land has increased by 20%, reflecting a shift to more intensive and productive employment	Success in the Corporate Plan period can be measured through achievement of the direct outputs listed below 1. 50 new businesses established in Haringey 2. 1,235 new jobs created in Haringey 3. 1,000 businesses benefiting from superfast broadband technology 4. We should also observe a positive trend on the key long-term indicators with: 5. 8,000 more jobs in Haringey, measured against the 2011 London Plan baseline 6. The expansion or establishment in the borough of at least 10 knowledge/technology-led businesses

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
3 Take advantage of growth, by ensuring that residents have the training, skills and support necessary to find and keep good quality employment	1. We will improve the skills, information and support that people get, from primary school onwards, so that they can take advantage of London's job opportunities 2. We will do what we can to broaden people's horizons and help them develop contacts to help them break down some of the unseen barriers to finding the best possible employment 3. We will lead and co-ordinate all the organisations working on training, skills and employment in Haringey, including in creating and promoting apprenticeships 4. We will only use the council's own commissioning budget to plug gaps, improve take-up of other services or to attract more investment	1. Council economic development, schools and adult learning services will directly deliver some skills and employment services to residents, and commission/advise on design of services delivered by other partners 2. The Mayor of London/London Enterprise Panel will commission and fund employment and skills support services to residents through investments in Tottenham and across the borough, providing economic and labour market intelligence to guide commissioning 3. JobCentre Plus/Department for Work and Pensions are statutory providers of employment support services and will commission similar work from other partners and advisers 4. College of Haringey, Enfield and North London is a core provider of further education and vocational training for the borough, and will advise others on similar work 5. The Tottenham Hotspur Foundation is a major provider of employment support and skills provision in the borough, with strong outreach capacity for some priority groups in particular linked to the attraction of the football club. It also advises others on similar work 6. Private companies and voluntary sector bodies will provide commissioned services and advise on service design, future needs and priorities based on their own experience

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
We will have made progress towards our long term aims that, by 2030, we will see: 1. 75% of Haringey's working age population is in work 2. An increase in the proportion of working age residents qualified to NVQ Levels 3 and 4 from 65% (2013 figures) to 70% 3. Haringey residents' average full-time earnings are in line with London averages, for bottom quartile and median earners (in 2013 Haringey median full-time earnings were 93% of London average)	Success in the Corporate Plan period can be measured through achievement of the direct outputs listed below). 1. 1,100 Haringey people supported into work 2. 400 Haringey people increasing their skills levels and earnings 3. 200 Haringey young people taking up apprenticeship opportunities We will also be monitoring our long-term key indicators (employment, earnings and qualifications levels) to assess the initial impact of our strategic interventions. During this Corporate Plan period we would look for positive changes of 0.3-0.6% points for each indicator

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
4 Manage the impact of growth, by reducing carbon emissions across the borough with the aim of meeting our 40:20 goal, while growing the green economy	1. We will take active steps to reduce the council's own carbon emissions, and lead efforts to reduce emissions across the borough, most significantly from buildings and transport 2. We will support green businesses - including those that help to make construction and existing buildings more efficient 3. We will work with experts, researchers and business to put Haringey at the forefront of innovation in reducing carbon through behaviour and technology	We will work with: 1. Community groups, homeowners, businesses and landlords looking to make energy efficiency improvements to their premises and become more sustainable 2. RetrofitWorks: The Good Building Cooperative, to carry out pilot projects, grow and fully commercialise their operation and develop a network of specialist building professionals and retrofit installers in the borough 3. Local Small and Medium Enterprises to access new opportunities and take advantage of the growing demand for home energy efficiency retrofit in the borough 4. The University of Durham and other partners to access leading research capability with the ambition of making the borough a living laboratory of low carbon innovation 5. The Mayor of London and London Enterprise Panel, working with large-scale public and private sector bodies in the borough and low carbon technology providers, to help transform their businesses and nurture innovation 6. Department for Energy & Climate Change, Mayor of London, and other London boroughs to bring in outside expertise and funding, and undertake joint working for low carbon and green economy programmes 7. National policy makers, as a supportive national policy framework is required to fully realise the 40% reduction in carbon emissions and associated economic benefits

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Haringey will be regarded as a leading low carbon green economy borough 2. We will see residents and businesses continuing to become more energy and carbon efficient 3. We will see a change in the profile of Haringey-based jobs with more people employed in the green economy sector 4. We will see an increase in businesses participating in the green economy and innovation sector in Haringey 5. Longer term measure of success will be that we have become a more equal, more prosperous and greener borough	1. Reduction in carbon emissions across our operational estate towards a target of 50% by 2018 2. Reduction in carbon emissions towards the overall target of 40% by 2020 3. Number of houses in Haringey supported to undertake retrofit works 4. Number of SMEs supported through Haringey's Low carbon supply chain interventions

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
5 Focus growth, by prioritising new homes and jobs in Wood Green and particularly in Tottenham, where need and opportunity are greatest, and by bringing some of the borough's key community assets into more active use	1. Building on the momentum of the last few years, we will continue to drive transformational change in Tottenham by investing in the area's housing estates and public space, promoting outside investment and driving substantial improvement in education, skills, employment and health 2. We will make and implement plans to support new homes and a rejuvenated town centre in Wood Green 3. We will ensure that the people and businesses in these areas benefit from the investment and change in their neighbourhoods, with improved education and employment prospects, better housing, better health and a greater say in the decisions that affect them 4. We will secure outside investment in Alexandra Palace and Hornsey Town Hall that improves public access while driving growth in visitor numbers and improved employment opportunities	1. Local communities and residents will be involved in shaping all our regeneration programmes and projects 2. The Mayor of London will offer financial support and help through his own planning policy 3. Private landowners and developers will invest in creating homes and jobs and in rejuvenating important buildings 4. Alexandra Palace and Park Trust will drive - and deliver - the change and investment at the palace 5. Higher education institutions will, over time, use the borough as a base for teaching and research and help to inspire our own young people

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. We will have made progress towards our vision for Tottenham, that “by the age of twenty, a child born in Tottenham today will have a quality of life and access to the same level of opportunity that is at least equal to the best in London”, in line with the targets set out in the Strategic Regeneration Framework for Tottenham 2. We will have a vision and plan for the future of Wood Green which local residents, businesses and landowners are signed up to 3. We will have secured the investment necessary to make the most of, and improve public access to, treasured community assets at Alexandra Palace and Hornsey Town Hall, with a clear vision and timetable for doing so	1. We will secure over £1billion of outside investment in Tottenham’s growth by 2018 2. Number of residents in Love Lane re-housed as part of estate renewal programme 3. Number of businesses successfully re-located or purchased as part of High Road West regeneration programme 4. Development partner for High Road West programme will be appointed and early phase of re-housing will be underway 5. First phase of Tottenham Hale Housing Zone delivery complete 6. Wood Green Investment Framework and local planning policy completed 7. Heritage Lottery Fund investment secured for Alexandra Palace 8. Additional commercial investment secured for Alexandra Palace 9. External investment secured that will bring Hornsey Town Hall back into use

PRIORITY 5 - CREATE HOMES AND COMMUNITIES WHERE PEOPLE CHOOSE TO LIVE AND ARE ABLE TO THRIVE

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
1 Achieve a step change in the number of new homes being built	1. We will increase the supply of new homes to meet ambitious housing targets, working with a range of development partners 2. We will build more Council owned homes, alongside Housing Association/ Registered Provider homes - including those for social/affordable rent and low cost home ownership 3. We will deliver more shared ownership housing and support low and middle income residents to get on the housing ladder	1. The Council will have a number of roles in supporting, enabling and providing new homes. This will include the building of new Council homes, but also involve maximising other supply of new housing through partnership working, the use of its planning and enabling role and through effective work with funding authorities such as the Greater London Authority. Partners such as Housing Associations and Registered Providers of Affordable Housing are heavily involved in delivering the supply of new homes, with private developers increasingly central to this objective

Housing is about people and communities, not just bricks and mortar. This means mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods where residents can lead happy and fulfilling lives.

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. There will be more new homes, including affordable homes for sale and rent 2. There will be a rise in the amount of public and private land available for development	We will measure: 1. The number of additional homes provided 2. The type of housing being provided across Haringey, to establish a good balance of affordable and market tenures in each area

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
2 Prevent homelessness and support residents to lead fulfilling lives	1. We will provide realistic and achievable options for people to find housing or alternative housing 2. We will proactively help people avoid eviction and to sustain their tenancies 3. We will champion ways of helping people to help themselves through options like better online housing options advice and support; and proactive early intervention and prevention of homelessness 4. We will work in collaboration with partners and landlords to secure good quality accommodation at reasonable prices, as a way to prevent homelessness and reliance on temporary accommodation 5. We will work with housing associations, the voluntary sector and housing-related support providers to offer housing options advice and support to help people remain in their homes when they are at risk of losing them 6. We will improve access to renting privately, enforcing where standards fall below an acceptable level, developing good working relationships across the landlord sector and offering clear advice to renters 7. We will put in place the right housing-related support services, to maintain independence and to avoid failures of tenancy which lead to eviction	1. The council will work with housing and support providers, social care professionals, welfare benefit advisors, private landlords and advice agencies. In order to respond to the high demand for housing, and the relative shortage of supply, we will work with a wide range of housing providers to offer suitable homes. We will also work with specialist agencies so that people can obtain the advice and support they need to maintain their tenancies and avoid homelessness

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Fewer people will become homeless because they have received better information and advice about how to avoid becoming homeless 2. More people will live in settled accommodation in the private, affordable or social sector, meaning fewer people will need to live in temporary accommodation 3. More people, including vulnerable people and those with complex housing needs, will be able to maintain their tenancies successfully and have greater independence 4. There will be an increase in the number of vulnerable housing residents accessing employment services and opportunities	We will measure: 1. The percentage of cases where homelessness is prevented, as a proportion of people presenting at risk of losing their home 2. The number of residents helped into settled accommodation, whether in the private, housing association or council sector

Objectives	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
3 Drive up the quality of housing for all residents	1. We will complete the current plans for bringing council-owned homes up to the Decent Homes standard 2. We will improve some council-owned estates by building new good quality, energy-efficient and affordable homes for rent and sale 3. We, through Homes for Haringey, will bring about transformational improvement to the housing service, achieving a unified service that provides greater efficiencies and a better customer experience 4. We will deliver an efficient and effective responsive repairs service that provides value for money 5. We will deliver an efficient and effective responsive tenancy management service that provides value for money 6. We will deliver an efficient and effective responsive service to leaseholders that provides value for money 7. We will work with housing association/registered provider partners to maintain excellent standards across the sector 8. We will work with landlords to create a thriving, safe and secure private rented sector, developing a council owned lettings agency to offer a fair and affordable service 9. We will rigorously tackle the illegal sub-letting of council homes by tenants 10. We will introduce schemes to licence private landlords to reduce poor management and conditions in the borough's private rented sector 11. We will encourage owners to bring back into use more empty homes	1. The council will lead the way through the work on its own homes, setting standards for the rest of the housing sector. The council will work with other housing organisations to ensure standards are brought up to a good standard across all social housing

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Successful completion of the Decent Homes programme of works to council housing. 2. Increased number of new good quality, energy-efficient and affordable homes developed for rent and sale on council-owned estates. 3. A high and improved level of resident satisfaction with Homes for Haringey and registered providers. 4. An increased number of illegal sub-lets of council homes by tenants identified and action taken 5. An increased number of adaptations carried out to the homes of older people and those with disabilities 6. An increased number of private rented homes licensed through "selective licensing schemes" 7. A council-backed private rented lettings agency established through Homes for Haringey and significant number of homes successfully let and managed through this agency 8. An increased number of empty homes brought back into use through compulsory purchase orders	We will measure 1. The number and proportion of council-owned and housing association homes brought up to Decent Homes standard. 2. The overall customer satisfaction rating with Homes for Haringey and local housing associations

Cross-cutting themes

Prevention and early intervention

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?
1 Become an organisation focused on prevention and early help	1. We want to focus more of our work on preventing problems arising, and providing earlier intervention to stop issues escalating 2. We will ensure all new policies and strategies demonstrate how they contribute to a prevention and early help approach 3. We will work with partners to support people when they need it, avoid needs getting worse and build people's coping skills so that they can be more self-reliant in the future 4. We will create a culture where prevention and early help are incentivised and prioritised through how we decide to use our resources 5. We will deliver corporate wide programmes such as Making Every Contact Count to embed prevention and early help into all frontline services which come face to face with residents 6. We will adopt a prevention and early help approach in all council activity, including the delivery of services internally and externally to the council
2 Prevent needs arising by creating an infrastructure which supports residents into employment and improves their health and wellbeing	1. We will adopt a prevention approach throughout the council to build an environment that strengthens people's health, resilience and ability to be self-reliant 2. We will foster growth to support residents into employment 3. We will develop work experience opportunities within the council and across partners to support people into quality employment 4. We will work to ensure that all young people in the borough enjoy access to quality employment, learning and enterprise opportunities, including work experience in the council and other partners 5. We will build networks to support mentoring and peer support in accessing employment 6. We will instigate prevention in all areas of council activity, including smarter travel and fewer journeys by car to reduce congestion and increase physical activity, and greater use of parks and leisure to improve health and wellbeing



Prevention, early help and intervention means fundamentally changing the way the council works with residents so that we shift our focus from providing for to working alongside. The aim is to prevent needs arising by creating an environment where people can develop the skills and resources to be more independent.



Who will be involved in delivering the objective?	How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015 -2018
1. All areas of the council, partners, voluntary and community sectors, local residents and communities	1. We will be able to identify examples in every area of the council's work where prevention and early help is increasing resident satisfaction and independence and reducing need	1. Reduction in activity in specialist services: rate of homeless approaches and acceptance; emergency admissions for adults aged over 18; rates of children and families becoming known to social care
1. All areas of the council, partners including schools and further education colleges, voluntary and community sectors, local residents and communities	1. We will have higher rates of long term employment 2. We will have in place mechanisms to support those with greatest need to access employment opportunities	1. Reduced rates of unemployment in areas of greatest deprivation 2. Numbers of people taking up volunteering opportunities

	Objective	How will we deliver the objective?
3	Engage with residents and communities earlier to prevent need arising or escalating	1. We will work with residents, communities and services users to identify what outcomes we want to deliver together. We will work with residents and service users to design solutions together wherever possible 2. We will ensure residents can access high quality information, advice and guidance so that they can make informed choices and take control of decisions affecting their lives 3. We will work with the voluntary and community sectors to build community capacity to support an early help approach 4. We will make sure that residents are represented on relevant partnership boards so that their views are heard at all levels in the organisation 5. We will ensure that services that we deliver or commission from others support residents and communities to connect with each other
4	Foster innovative and experimental approaches to prevention and early help	1. We will test new ideas and concepts which can demonstrate prevention and early help at a service and corporate level 2. We will work with a wide range of stakeholders, including local residents, to implement different approaches to support prevention and early intervention 3. We will support local residents to take greater control of their local provision, including parks and open spaces, community organisations and other assets
5	Ensure that when we commission services, prevention and early help lie at the heart of delivering successful and sustainable outcomes	1. We will incentivise prevention and early help in our commissioning and procurement processes through outcome based specifications and contract requirements 2. We will proactively support frontline services in direct contact with local residents to identify need early and to signpost residents to appropriate support
6	Build the local evidence base for intervening early to demonstrate impact	1. We will develop tools to evaluate the impact of prevention and early help and set up a performance and evaluation framework for prevention and early help across the whole council and partners which builds the local evidence base for impact 2. We will use benchmarking and good practice in service design, which we will collate in an online forum so that all staff have access 3. We will develop a method of counting and tracking savings across budget boundaries and always acknowledge where there are savings to partners

Who will be involved in delivering the objective?	How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015 -2018
1. All areas of the council, partners, voluntary and community sectors, local residents and communities	1. Improved outcomes and enhanced wellbeing, greater resilience, capacity and independence	1. Availability of high quality information and advice. People able to live independently without support
1. The council, partners, voluntary, private and independent providers, local residents and communities	1. New models locally which work proactively with local communities and engage with wider range of stakeholders	1. Local residents involved in community activity. Reduction in levels of social isolation
1. The council, partners, voluntary, private and independent providers	1. All commissioning and procurement activity will reflect prevention and early help and incentivise activity supporting these approaches. Improved outcomes and enhanced wellbeing, greater resilience, capacity and independence	1. Reduction in activity in specialist services: rate of homeless approaches and acceptance; emergency admissions for adults aged over 18; rates of children and families becoming known to social care
1. The council, partners, voluntary, private and independent providers, local residents and communities	1. Evaluation and performance frameworks in place across the council and partners, not just in dedicated areas. Understanding of the impact of prevention and early help.	1. Clear trajectories of change over time 2. Understanding of how prevention and early help contribute to improving people's lives

A fair and equal borough

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?
1 All children will have the best start in life with strong relationships and be ready for school	1. We will increase the proportion of overall funding to the early years and ensure expenditure on early years development is proportionate to the needs of children from different backgrounds 2. We will support families to achieve improvements in early child development by making healthcare for 0-5s and children's centres better co-ordinated and more accessible to parents 3. We will increase the quality and accessibility of childcare for children from different backgrounds
2 Enable all children and young people to maximise their capabilities and have control over their lives	1. We will ensure that all schools across the borough are Good or Outstanding, with school results in line with the best in the country 2. We will ensure that there are excellent opportunities in education, employment and training for young people by working with schools and other providers. We will identify young people not in education, employment or training (or whose status is unknown) to enable them to access the right activity for them



Inequalities are a matter of life and death, of wellbeing or misery. Our actions to tackle underlying factors of poverty and discrimination must be universal, but with a scale and intensity that is proportionate to the level of disadvantage.



Who will be involved in delivering the objective?	How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. We will work with parents and carers, families and communities. We will work closely with statutory partners and voluntary and community providers to integrate health services for families through re-designed children's centres. The council will lead the changes to children's centres and oversee quality improvements across childcare providers in the borough	1. Children from different backgrounds (e.g. ethnicity, household income or special educational needs) will be confident in communicating and building relationships in their early years 2. Children from different backgrounds (e.g. ethnicity, household income or special educational needs) will be ready for school and ready to learn	1. Proportionately greater increase of young women and women from certain Black and minority ethnic groups meeting with their midwife early for the best start for their child 2. Increase in the take up of 2, 3 and 4 year old entitlement for childcare and early education across the social gradient 3. An increase in the number of children achieving their expected score on Early Years Foundation Stage, especially personal, social and emotional development and communication and language by 4 years old
1. Schools and governors will lead on delivery, supported by the council and the wider community 2. Schools, colleges, training providers and employers. The council will commission and co-ordinate as well as tracking performance for young people	1. Parents across Haringey feel this is a place of aspiration and opportunity with excellent schools 2. A child's background (whether ethnicity, household income or special educational needs) will be less important in determining their results than is the case today 3. All young people progress into higher education or employment	1. Closing the attainment gap across the borough/for pupils in low income families 2. Closing the attainment gap for groups of children who typically do not achieve as highly as others, including low income families, different ethnic groups and looked after children.

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?
3 Ensure that residents have the training, skills and support necessary to find and keep good quality employment	1. We will lead and co-ordinate all the organisations working on training, skills and employment in Haringey
4 Create and develop healthy and sustainable places and communities	We will: 1. Raise awareness of the harm of violence against women and girls (VAWG) so that this behaviour is seen as unacceptable by all and that people support intervention 2. Make Haringey one of the most cycling and pedestrian friendly boroughs in London 3. Make it easier for residents to make healthy lifestyle choices, with a new high street offer and food-growing strategy for the borough 4. Strengthen communities and reduce social isolation for children and older people from different backgrounds 5. Make new developments as attractive as possible with open space, community facilities, good transport facilities, and better education and health facilities 6. Address the needs of a growing older population by making sure all new homes meet Lifetime Homes standards and 10% meet wheelchair housing standards 7. Improve health and wellbeing and tackle fuel poverty by actively promoting energy conservation and efficiency in homes of all types 8. Help residents of all ages access employment opportunities as well as banking and other financial services 9. Work with the voluntary and private sectors to develop a wider range of housing options for those who are ready to move on from supported housing schemes

Who will be involved in delivering the objective?	How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Council economic development, regulatory and property services; the Mayor of London and London Enterprise Panel; council and neighbouring London boroughs; the Haringey business community; business bodies working together	1. Haringey's employment rate is in line with London averages 2. An increase in the proportion of working age residents qualified to NVQ Levels 3 and 4 from 65% to 70% 3. More residents will be supported into work	1. 1,100 Haringey residents supported into work 2. 400 Haringey residents increasing their skills levels and earnings 3. 200 Haringey young people taking up apprenticeship opportunities 4. No. of unemployed residents supported into work (link to wider PI - % of working population claiming Jobseeker's Allowance - JSA)
The council will work with: 1. Schools, communities and key agencies such as the police, NHS and a range of relevant voluntary sector and community organisations 2. Cyclists, pedestrians and community groups to further understand their needs, and with Transport for London and our contractors to implement the schemes 3. Communities and residents to improve access to healthy food 4. Residents, housing developers, the third sector and other housing organisations	1. Residents will feel that they belong to strong communities in which they thrive 2. Violence against women and girls will not be tolerated, adults and children will feel safe walking and cycling across the borough 3. A halt in the rise in childhood obesity, in particular in poorer areas and certain ethnic groups, which have higher rates 4. Fewer residents will feel socially isolated 5. The number of households in fuel poverty will reduce 6. There will be more residents assisted with banking and other financial services	1. Victims' safety improved; increased reports of VAWG; reduction in VAWG 2. Increase in children travelling to school by walking or cycling 3. A halt in the rise in childhood obesity, especially in those groups with higher rates 4. A reduction in the number of new fast food outlets and no new outlets close to schools. 5. % of new homes meeting Lifetime Homes standards 6. % of new homes meeting wheelchair housing standards 7. % of homes in fuel poverty 8. No. of unemployed residents supported into work (link to wider PI - % of working population claiming Jobseeker's Allowance - JSA) - No. of residents assisted with banking and other financial services

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?
5 Prioritise prevention of ill-health and tackle key causes of health inequalities	1. We will continue to support the reduction of smoking and alcohol abuse. We will enforce licensing and smokefree legislation – and explore further policies – to protect children and create a healthier environment; in addition, we will provide support to residents who want to stop, especially for those groups of residents who experience the greatest harm



Who will be involved in delivering the objective?	How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Council and partners working with traders, the voluntary sector and communities	1. Improvement in health and wellbeing in those groups more likely to experience harm	1. Reduction in the healthy life expectancy gap 2. Reduction in smoking and alcohol abuse in groups that experience the greatest harm



Working Together with our Communities

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?
1 Increase community participation for residents, by providing opportunities to connect people to their communities	1. We will listen to what communities would like and then help them to build social networks in a way which most suits them 2. We will support local people to build new communities and strengthen existing ones and work with voluntary and community sector (VCS) to achieve this 3. We will invest in better information and signposting to help families access services and connect with other community members that can support them 4. We will make new developments as attractive as possible with open space, community facilities and good transport facilities that promote connectivity
2 To deliver open customer-led services that enable residents to participate in the design and delivery of the services that support them	1. We will work with residents to design services that offer choice and ensure that every contact promotes independence. We will enable communities to design activities that, with help, can create an environment they want to live in 2. We will ensure that all council plans specifically refer to the voice of residents 3. We will look into ways to provide incentives that reward innovation by residents and desired outcomes e.g. community chest for neighbourhood improvements



Haringey will work with communities to achieve their ambitions, by making best use of the strengths of the borough and ensuring that we build capacity and foster independence and self-reliance.



Who will be involved in delivering the objective?	How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. The council will commission work to develop an approach to community development at scale. VCS and community leaders will lead on community assets mapping. Success of this objective is also reliant on meaningful engagement by members in their communities. We will also work in partnership with the local health sector to develop a joint approach to facilitate better networking and social connectivity	1. All residents across the borough will feel more connected, involved and confident to lead positive change that will transform neighborhoods 2. Problem solving will start first in the community and residents will be well informed on a range of options to support themselves, their families and friends.	1. Increase in voluntary and community organisations support for children, families, adults and older people 2. Number of people living independantly 3. Number of people feeling isolated 4. Number of people involved in voluntary work
1. The council will work in partnership with other local public services and VCS and widen its engagement by including other communities that have been less represented in past (e.g. young people and some ethnic minority groups)	1. There will be meaningful channels of resident's engagement in service planing and delivery that are inclusive and wide ranging. Services will be tailored specifically to our diverse communities' needs and delivered efficiently and effectively	1. Increased residents participation in service design (excluding consultations) 2. Increase in trust, pride and civic engagement (residents surveys). Increasing proportion of contracts considering social values

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?
3 Increase independence and self-reliance within communities through strong local leadership that supports aspiration and achievement e.g. education, employment, enterprise, health and well-being	1. We will lead and co-ordinate all organisations working on training, education and employment to ensure that there are excellent and equal opportunities in the borough for young people and adults 2. We will promote healthy choices and support residents to improve their health and wellbeing. We will facilitate a web-based, community focused information and signposting centre to help residents to make the right choices and make the most out of existing opportunities
4 Facilitate positive community conversations that support residents to make socially responsible and sustainable choices	1. We will enable local residents and communities to participate in improving their neighborhoods by establishing action plans led by communities for communities 2. Through the life stages, people will have enough good information to develop healthy relationships and lifestyles, and to make informed choices which will lead to improved health outcomes

Who will be involved in delivering the objective?	How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. The council will play a co-ordination role in establishing a good network of partners such as Tottenham Hotspur, NHS, schools and Colleges, JobPlus Centre etc. through which local opportunities for residents will be maximised. The council will work together with communities to come up with a best way of communicating, disseminating and matching existing opportunities to local needs. The council will also play a supporting role to building capacity within voluntary sector (new VCS Capacity Building Contract)	1. Young people and adults feel confident making choosing the best option for them 2. There is excellent provision available so people can make the most of their potential. Communities feel confident to lead on positive change and are feeling independent. Reduced unemployment rates for Haringey residents	1. Haringey people supported into work 2. Increasing skills levels and earnings amongst Haringey residents 3. Number of young people in education, employment and training 4. Number of young people in employment remain in employment
1. All residents, local networks, voluntary and community organisations will take responsibility for making responsible choices 2. The council will play a facilitating role in enabling communities to take responsibility for improving their environment and their own health and wellbeing	1. Residents will work together to keep their neighbourhood safe and improve their environment. 2. Increased volunteering by Haringey residents. Increased health champions and recovery champions 3. Increase in number of local people as business mentors and school governors	1. Reduction in flytipping, littering and untidy front gardens 2. Reduction in antisocial behaviour 3. Reduction in carbon emissions by increasing % of recycling and increasing % of walking and cycling 4. A reduction in the prevalence of unhealthy lifestyle indicators 5. Increased uptake in volunteering

Objective

How will we deliver the objective?

5

Becoming an enabling, collaborative organisation that creates the Haringey's culture where communities are confident to lead positive change and have a 'can do' approach to problem solving

1. We will invest in training and development internally to skill up our staff to lead by example
2. We will develop a 'Best Practice' resource and toolkit for staff to promote a culture where all services are designed together with residents
3. We will develop training programme as part of Haringey Academy for our staff and we will work with other partners to share our learnings across all local economy. We will create opportunities for training residents – chairing meetings, commissioning, mediation, advocacy skills
4. We will consider putting out some 'neighbourhood challenges' e.g. best idea for solving a parking problem, traffic congestion etc. (ideas that encourage local residents to contribute solutions)



Who will be involved in delivering the objective?	How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. The council will take a leadership role and work together with residents, other public, private, voluntary and community sector to deliver this positive change. Residents will work actively with the council and other public and voluntary sector organisations to create open and engaging culture	1. The council feels confident to engage with residents on service design and commissioning on a regular basis 2. Communities will feel confident to find solutions within their neighbourhood and wider social networks 3. Culture change programme is shared and owned across public sector partnership and voluntary and community sector; residents will feel respected and listened to 4. There will be consistent evidence on how residents views are represented and included in the council strategic planning and operational delivery 5. Trust between communities and public services in Haringey will increase. Residents will be involved in defining success at the beginning – what do they think it would look like in residents terms	1. Increased resident participation in service design (excluding consultations) 2. Increase in trust, pride and civic engagement (residents surveys); establish a baseline of current position and set some targets with residents for improvement including numbers contributing to surveys, attending area forums, volunteering etc.



Working In Partnership

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
1 Develop a single set of borough priorities for residents which is owned and bought into across different partners	1. The council will further develop its existing leadership role, working with partners across a wide spectrum to deliver the priorities identified in the Corporate Plan. Activity will include re-shaping the priorities of the statutory partnership boards; working with groups of partners such as business, NHS, voluntary and community sector and head teachers to deliver this objective	1. The council will facilitate the development of the vision, which will be driven by the ambitions, desires and views of members, residents and service users
2 Working with our partners to deliver joined-up and integrated services, that place residents at the heart	1. We will map the contribution and responsibilities of partners across each priority; working collaboratively on hard cases and learning lessons from each one. We will empower, support and challenge residents and partners, while investing in early help to achieve the best outcomes	1. Service providers - whether commissioned or in-house - will lead on this area of work. We will work closely with voluntary and community organisations to ensure effective delivery
3 Partnership boards will provide effective, efficient and strategic leadership	1. Multi-agency boards renewed by focusing on co-ordinating and assuring delivery against specific priorities with appropriate decision-making. The boards, and their associated operational work, will be linked to our shared priorities and vision. We will undertake a review of the governance arrangements for all statutory partnership arrangements to ensure there is no duplication and these partnerships deliver their stated aims. Working with partners, we will also deliver a new vehicle for joint strategic partnership work	1. The respective statutory partners will review the aims and work of their respective partnership boards, supported by the council. Priority owners, service users and the leadership of the respective boards will be involved in delivering the objective



Haringey's corporate plan for 2015-2018 sets out the council's vision and priorities for the borough over the next three years. However, we recognise that we cannot achieve the priorities in the plan on our own: working with local partners and resident is essential.



How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Borough stakeholders will sign up to a clearly understood and shared plan setting out how they will deliver against a shared set of priorities	1. We will have shared budgets, performance indicators and information and a shared approach to managing physical assets in the borough
1. Residents will feel more empowered, be more self-sufficient and require fewer services. They will develop a much stronger sense of ownership of their environment, and any support they need to call upon	1. Reduction in complaints. Improved customer service, measured through resident satisfaction surveys. Peer-to-peer support will increase and improve. Skills, employment and median earnings levels will increase
1. Partnership arrangements will have clear priorities and work programmes, with duplication reduced or removed. There will be clear governance routes for strategic boards, with accountability to key strategic partners	1. Progress across all priorities will take place at pace. The need for resident interaction across services and providers will be reduced and the resident satisfaction survey will indicate improved levels of satisfaction

Customer Focus

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
1 Customers will be able to access services and information quickly and easily at a time that is convenient to them	We will create: 1. simple to use digital 'one-stop shops' for all our residents 2. multi purpose face-to-face centres that combine, for example, libraries, housing and customer service centres 3. factual statistical analysis to measure our performance of all access channels and to target areas for improvement	1. The council will drive the change and involve residents in the design and testing of these solutions through resident panels
2 Customers will access information, advice and guidance primarily through digital and online mechanisms	1. We will make online and digital mechanisms the preferred channel for customers to interact with the council, by launching a user-friendly online account for residents - 'my account' - and dedicated website, plus creating a platform for a more mobile-based offering. Resident will be able to interact with the Council using their smart phones and other mobile devices on a growing selection of transactions.	1. The council will develop a new online platform and a residents panel will provide regular input to test its usability before it is launched
3 Services will be designed in partnership with customers and users, rooted in the community and joined up with partners to provide a more seamless customer experience	1. We will develop new customer care standards for council staff which will ensure staff combine the mindset, personal attitude and motivations required to be customer-focused in their work. We collect and analyse feedback and complaints from residents to target specific areas for improvement	1. The council will drive the change, using customer feedback to focus specific areas for improvement



How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Residents are highly satisfied with the level of customer service they receive 2. Libraries and customer service centres will be integrated where possible with costs reduced	1. Resident satisfaction targeted at > 85% by 2018 2. Consolidation of all front office customer services activities completed and new integrated libraries/customer services organisation in place with a cost base reduced by > 25% 3. Residents satisfaction with new face-to-face centres above 80% with queueing time reduced to less than five minutes by 2018
1. Residents will interact more with the council through online and mobile solutions and less through paper-based processes, which will be phased out	1. More than 80% of existing paper / manual based processes migrated and adopted into the digital platform over the next three years 2. Launch of at least two mobile applications per year jointly selected by residents and the council 3. Reduction of cost-base derived from automation and self service of at least 35%
1. Customers will tell us that their input and feedback is valued and that they feel more connected with the council	1. The number of complaints defined as controllable or avoidable will reduce by at least 40% with the trend showing positive direction of travel Customer and staff satisfaction score consistently above 85% 2. Increased year on year number of compliments received from residents

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
4 We will develop a shared customer service strategy with our partners, that will offer consistently high levels of customer service to residents	3. • We will work with partners to produce a shared vision for customer services across the borough 4. • We will identify the set of characteristics, strengths and opportunities in place across partners and the gaps to be filled through joint-working 5. • We will be leveraging our investment in the “resident account” web solution to make it the home for other non-council related digital services and transaction. Residents’ online experience can therefore be broaden and continuously improved across all providers of Haringey Public Services.	The council will work with partners to identify good practice approaches and policies that support customer services local visions. In particular we will work with: 1. Community groups and networks 2. Homes for Haringey 3. Our highways and waste contractors 4. Community and voluntary organisations 5. The police 6. Neighbouring local authorities

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. We will have a single customer service offer with our partners, meaning residents will have a consistently high standard of customer interaction with the Council and its partners	1. Convergent plan for future customer services delivery model signed off by Dec 2016. Road map towards customer services standard across partners organisations in place by March 2017 2. Haringey public services customer care standards launched by March 2018

Value for Money

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
1 We will take a more commercial approach to spending money, by making sure that: ■ the right people deliver services ■ outcomes are achieved ■ we have paid the right price	1. We will engage with and develop the market to provide broader options for commissioning services, put data at the forefront of understanding resident needs and desired outcomes and develop the commercial skills of our staff through structured training and development 2. We will negotiate fairly with providers and contractors to deliver high quality services at the right price	1. The council will lead on establishing the commercial approach, but will work with partners to ensure there is a consistent approach with the right skills and capacity
2 We will be clear about the outcomes we want to achieve from the services we deliver, through a new commissioning approach	1. We will seek to understand the needs and assets of local communities, mapping resources and need and analysing the range of data we have available 2. We will work with residents to identify the outcomes which are important to them and which will make a difference to their lives 3. We will identify best practice and commission services based on evidence of impact. We will use our resources creatively to ensure that we maximise what we can be delivered for local communities 4. Where possible, we will jointly commission with partners to increase efficiency and effectiveness 5. We will review the effectiveness of the services we commission to ensure maximum impact	1. The council holds the budget for delivering a wide range of services to residents and we will work with a broader range of providers to deliver these services, including the voluntary and community sectors, social enterprises, the statutory sector, NHS providers and the independent sector, as well as continuing to deliver some services ourselves



Good value for money is the best use of resources to achieve the best outcomes. It is about economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Economy is ensuring every penny we spend delivers the best outcome; efficiency is about getting things right first time and delivering outcomes as we know we can; and effectiveness is about having a strong grip on all the issues to make sure we are not wasting resources.



How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Service quality will increase and the unit cost of the services we deliver will reduce 2. Council managers will understand their business drivers, services will be commissioned from the right providers, outcomes will be achieved, cost of delivery will reduce	1. Reduction in the unit cost of the services we deliver 2. Completion of required training and development for council managers
1. Residents will receive better quality services at a lower cost to the council. 2. By commissioning more preventative activity with our partners, we will see a decline in the cost of acute intervention and therefore see a higher return on investment	1. We are developing a set of indicators to identify how we can measure success in this area

Objective	How will we deliver the objective?	Who will be involved in delivering the objective?
3 We will employ the right people with the right skills to ensure outcomes for residents are achieved	1. We will launch and new training and skills development programme for all staff, which will help staff focus on their career through support to develop skills and experience to fulfill their potential 2. We will have new, clearer staff terms and conditions with a strong focus on recognising good performance	1. The council will lead the development programme, with partners from other sectors supporting this through, for example, staff exchanges.
4 We will make our IT systems and processes better and faster, which will improve the customer experience	1. We will ensure that the IT, systems and processes used in the council make it easier for our councillors and staff to do their jobs better and faster. This will include establishing a support services centre where savings are driven through the use of digital technology, the development of digital technology across our services to improve the customer experience, and improving the organisational processes that make us work effectively	1. The council will lead the change through its business infrastructure and customer services transformation programmes

How will we know that we have been successful?	How will we measure success from 2015-2018?
1. Council staff will have a broader range of skills to move into jobs that the council needs, when it needs it	1. Staff productivity will increase, absence rates will reduce, staff will say they work in a happy environment
1. Customers will be able to access information, advice and guidance when they need it 2. The council will be able to respond to resident needs with speed and accuracy	1. There will be an increase in customers internal and external to the council serving themselves 2. There will be an increase in customer service agents being able to meet the needs of customers first time



Medium Term Financial Strategy 2015 – 2018

1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report finalises the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for the period 2015-2018 and proposes approval of the following constituent elements of the strategy to Council on 23rd February 2015:-
- Proposed summary revenue Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2015-2018 (Annex 1);
 - Proposed General Fund Capital Programme 2015-2018 (Annex 2);
 - Proposed HRA Capital Programme 2015-2018 (Annex 3);
 - Proposed HRA Medium Term Financial Plan 2015-2018 (Annex 4);
 - Proposed Dedicated Schools Budget 2015-16 (Annex 5); and,
 - Overview and Scrutiny Committee Recommendations and Cabinet Responses (Annex 6).

2 Introduction

- 2.1 The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) sets out the strategic financial issues for the three year planning period to 2017/18, and, in addition, the process for setting the Council's 2015/16 Budget.
- 2.2 In particular, the strategy considers the estimated revenue funding, from all sources together with estimated expenditure budgets, for each of the three financial years to 2018, setting out and seeking approval to the savings proposals that have been developed by officers taking account of the Corporate Plan and Council priorities. The MTFS and Corporate Plan also inform the Council's Workforce Plan which reflects the changing workforce needs of the Council.
- 2.3 This report considers all relevant components of the revenue budget including the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and the Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB). The Council's Capital Programme is also considered, bringing sources of capital funding together with prioritised projects that reflect the Corporate Plan priorities.
- 2.4 The report is based on the best available information but is still subject to significant uncertainty particularly in relation to later years. Since the last report in December, the Government announced the provisional local government finance settlement and the impact of this has been incorporated into this report.
- 2.5 Members have, since December, been reviewing the savings proposals taking into consideration the outcomes from public consultation and the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, as a result changes have been made, including, in particular, the removal of £5.7m of saving proposals relating to Adults' care packages. The financial effect of the changes made since December mean that over the three year period there is a need to use £4.3m of our reserves. This should be contrasted with the position in December where over the same three year period there was a net contribution to reserves. It should, however, be noted that by 2017/18 the MTFS is in a sustainable position, i.e. that projected spending is in line with income, going forward.

- 2.6 The date of the final finance settlement is anticipated to be on or around the 5th February and Members will continue to be updated on any changes to the position up to the Full Council meeting in February where Council Tax will be set for 2015/16.

3 Other options considered


- 3.1 This report recommends that the Cabinet should finalise its budget proposals, to be ultimately agreed at the final budget meeting at full Council on 23rd February 2015; which is a statutory requirement. Clearly there are a number of options available to achieve this and officers have developed the proposals in this report taking account of the Council's priorities together with feedback from residents and other partners.
- 3.2 A range of options for determining levels of both income and service provision have been considered taking into account the Council's Corporate Plan priorities, the extent of the estimated funding shortfall and the Council's overall financial position.
- 3.3 The proposals in this report rely on the strategic use of reserves over the three year period 2015 – 2018. A sustainable budget position is indicated in 2017/18 which will start to allow the replenishment of the reserves which have been used to balance the budget in 2015/16 and 2016/17. However, there remain significant uncertainties, particularly in the later years of the MTFS and so it is imperative that Members acknowledge and take action to manage identified and emerging risks.

4 Background information and the national context

- 4.1 The Council is operating in an environment of unprecedented change because the underlying system of funding has changed from one dependent on significant government support to one where the Council is exposed to the risks and opportunities presented by locally driven funding sources.
- 4.2 The interim report of the Independent Commission on Local Government Finance (Public Money Local Choice) highlights that by 2018/19 Business Rates and Council Tax revenues will exceed local government's projected funding (see figure 1 below). The Commission has been set up by the Local Government Association (LGA) and the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) to recommend changes to the system for funding local government as it is widely acknowledged to be in urgent need of reform.

Figure 1

Total council tax and business rate revenue will surpass total local government funding in 2018–19



Source: LGA

- 4.3 The early views from the Commission set out a vision for a largely self-sufficient funding system for local government including powers to set Council Tax bands locally alongside regular property revaluations and the ability to raise additional revenues; however, it also recognises a need to continue to exercise resource equalisation to recognise relative wealth levels within council areas.
- 4.4 The government provides forward financial planning information through its Spending Round (SR) announcements, the Autumn Statement and budget announcements. These relate to the Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA), which combines the Revenue Support Grant (RSG) and the local share of business rates together with a number of rolled-in grants, and fundamentally reflect the funding position for Local

Government. The last substantive announcements were:

- The draft 2015/16 Settlement (made in February 2014) indicated a further overall reduction in the SFA for 2015/16 of 14.4%;
- SR 2013 provided no new detailed information other than confirming the low priority status afforded to Local Government Services and reference to continuation of similar levels of reductions up to 2018.

4.5 At the time of the 2013 autumn statement the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) advised that, based on a continuing trajectory of cuts to Local Government Departmental Expenditure Limits (DEL), a cumulative reduction over the 3 years from April 2016 in the order of 10% was forecast. Despite the fact that there are now strong indications of economic growth through both output and employment measures and no sign of significant inflationary pressures it is not thought likely that there will be any significant relaxation of austerity measures for Local Government services. The Government has already set out plans to cut departmental spending by £8.7 billion in 2015/16. To achieve the longer term objectives of the deficit reduction programme, the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) believes that further savings of close to £38 billion will be required by 2018/19.

4.6 It is apparent that Local Government has borne the brunt of funding reductions since 2010. Analysis suggests that London local government could see a 60 per cent real terms reduction in core funding between 2010/11 and 2018/19, suggesting that local government is only half way through the total savings programme (fig. 2).

4.7 This position is also confirmed by the most recent working paper (WP 7 – Crisis and consolidation in the public finances) from the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR). They comment that:

The Coalition Government is currently aiming to eliminate the structural deficit so that the budget gets back to balance overall in 2018-19.

In order to achieve this, the current and previous Governments have announced spending cuts and tax increases that will be worth slightly more than 10 per cent of GDP by 2018-19, relative to the policies that were in place at Budget 2008. On our forecasts this would be sufficient to eliminate the 11 per cent of GDP budget deficit recorded in 2009-10 and move to a small surplus of 0.2 per cent in 2018-19, helped by the absorption of the remaining cyclical element of the deficit. About 50 per cent of the fiscal consolidation had been delivered by 2013-14, achieving about 40 per cent of the total planned deficit reduction.

On current plans, the burden of the fiscal consolidation – especially that part which has yet to be delivered – falls very heavily on cuts in day-to-day spending on public services.


4.8 The above illustrates that there have been no substantive long term funding announcements since SR2010 and, given the forthcoming General Election, the next definitive funding announcement is likely to be a Spending Round in the autumn of 2015. In the absence of definitive funding information the Council will continue to forecast using best estimates and independent analysis.

4.9 On 3rd December 2014 the Chancellor of the Exchequer made the coalition government's final Autumn Statement before the 2015 General Election. As expected no major funding changes for councils were announced which means that the conclusions reached in this report relating to the potential effects of austerity measures on Local Government remain valid. Indeed it was confirmed that, on the government's estimates, the national economy will not return to surplus until 2018 at

the earliest.

Figure 2

Local government has borne some of the largest reductions in funding since 2010/11



Source: HM Treasury; LGA: 2010-11 baseline as estimated in SR2010 and compares it to estimated spending in 2015/16 as per SR2013

- 4.10 Following the introduction of the Business Rate Retention scheme the Council is more dependent on local sources of income such as Council Tax and Business Rates. This is because the government's cuts can only be transacted through Revenue Support Grant (RSG), the remaining element of government funding. Additionally because London Boroughs are more dependent on the tiered funding elements within RSG London is the worst affected region from the cuts.
- 4.11 In February 2014 the Council approved its 2014/15 budget and MTFS for the period 2014 – 2017. At that time the estimated budget shortfall for 2015/16 was £31.3m with a further £22.8m in 2016/17 making £54.1m in total.
- 4.12 In 2014/15 the Council received £88m in RSG which represents 55% of the resources received through the Settlement Funding Assessment (RSG plus Business Rates). In 2015/16 RSG was projected to fall to £62m and on that basis would form around 45% of the SFA. By 2018/19 RSG will only represent around a quarter of the

SFA.

- 4.13 On 18 December 2014, the Government announced the Provisional Local Government Settlement for 2015/16. Although in overall terms the headline figures have remained broadly consistent with the indicative figures announced in January 2014, with Councils' Spending Power being reduced on average by 1.8%, there have been a number of changes that have impacted the overall position for the Council.
- 4.14 The key points of the settlement affecting Haringey's Medium Term Financial Strategy are as follows:-
- The Council's Revenue Support Grant (RSG) allocation has increased from the previous indicative allocation of £62m to £63.5m.
 - Haringey's Spending Power has reduced by 5.4% in comparison with the national average reduction of 1.8% and is close to the maximum permitted reduction of 6.4%. Our reduction in Spending Power is the fourth highest of all London Boroughs where the average reduction in Spending Power is 3.4%.
 - The Government has confirmed the value of the New Homes Bonus (NHB) for 2015/16 and this reflects growth in new houses being built in Haringey and consequent additional funding. However, the effect of the NHB 'topslice', which is only applicable to London, has the effect of reducing the amount of the NHB Haringey will receive in 2015/16.
 - We have recently been advised of the resources relating to the Housing Benefit and Council Tax administration grant which will reduce over the next few years; however the estimated position for 2015/16 has improved.
 - A deduction of £23.4m nationally has been made from Revenue Support Grant (RSG) to fund the Improvement and Development Agency.
 - A notional amount of £129.6m within RSG has also been identified for Local Welfare Provision. However, it is important to note that this funding is not new and in reality the resources for this have been cut.
 - The loss in funding as a result of the continuation of the 2% cap on the 2015/16 Business Rates Multiplier (announced in the Autumn Statement 2014) will be refunded to local authorities through a S31 grant payment (in the same way as the 2014/15 2% cap).
- 4.15 The impact of the above announcements have been incorporated into the MTFS, appended in Annex 1 and summarised in Table 3 in Section 8.

5 Current issues 2015 onwards

- 5.1 There are a number of changes in 2015/16 that will impact on the Council's resources including the proposed transfer in October 2015 of responsibility, from the Department of Health (DoH) to Local Authorities, for 0 – 5 year olds. Since the December report the DoH has published their provisional baseline figures suggesting an allocation of c£1.9m for Haringey for the 6 month period from October 2015 to the end of the 2015/16 financial year. This process raises broader questions about the long term funding of the service and the likelihood that funding allocations for this service will move towards a more needs-based methodology, however, at least in the

short term this allocation will be used to fully support the cost of the transferred Health Visiting contract.

- 5.2 The Council is also set to assume responsibility in June 2015 for the Independent Living Fund (ILF) which is currently a central government scheme to support disabled people to remain in their homes. There are clear synergies with the Council's Adult Social Care services and therefore opportunities for efficiencies. Whilst the decision to transfer this function to Councils has been taken, the precise level of funding to be transferred will depend on the number of clients at the point of transfer. This funding will be passported through to the Adults budget (Priority 2).
- 5.3 Perhaps the most fundamental change facing the Council arises from the implementation of the Care Act which received Royal Assent in May 2014. This attempts to bring all care and support legislation into a single statute and addresses many of the recommendations made by the Dilnot Commission into the funding of adult social care.
- 5.4 Implementation is in two phases, with the main impact of the funding reform starting from April 2016; however from 2015/16 there will be a range of implementation issues and associated costs. The government set out indicative funding allocations for Councils as part of the December 2013 Local Government Funding announcement and subsequently issued a further consultation on the basis for allocating funding in summer 2014.
- 5.5 The changes taking effect from April 2015 can be broadly summarised as follows:
 - New duty to arrange care for self-funders;
 - New duty to provide deferred payments (currently discretionary);
 - New duty of prevention and wellbeing to prevent or delay the need for care;
 - New duty to provide information and advice, including about paying for care;
 - Introduction of national eligibility criteria for adult social care;
 - Extension of eligibility criteria to include carers;
 - New duty to provide personal budgets for people with eligible needs;
 - The introduction of statutory Adult Safeguarding Boards and associated responsibilities for adult protection; and,
 - New duty to shape local care & support the market.
- 5.6 Sitting alongside the Care Act the government made better cooperation between local services a main objective of the 2013 spending round. The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that in 2015/16, the government would, for the first time, pool £3.8 billion into a single budget for health and social care services to work more closely together – the Better Care Fund (BCF). The BCF brings together (or pools) a number of existing funding streams across the Health Service and Local Government and, together with a range of existing and continuing duties, provides resources to assist with the implementation of the Care Act requirements. The Council's current indication of the size of its 2015/16 BCF allocation is £16.4m of which an assumed £884k is for Care Act implementation costs. A further grant allocation is also expected from the government to assist with the implementation costs and although an initial indicative allocation of £1.3m was announced in December 2013 the most recent consultation suggests an allocation for Haringey of £788k; so an adjustment has accordingly been made to our MTFS.
- 5.7 From April 2016, the Care Act will introduce a cap on care costs. The cap on care costs will provide protection from 'catastrophic' care costs for those with the most serious needs. It is intended that the cap will be £72,000 when it is introduced in April

2016. The estimated cost to London between 2016/17 and 2019/20 for paying for the care cap (weighted in 1st & 4th years) is £478m plus on-going costs of other duties within the Act over 4 years of £260m, although the allocation methodology has yet to be determined and will be subject to consultation in 2015.

- 5.8 Although the cost of this additional burden is likely to be substantially met from government funding, it is probable that the overall quantum of funding and the incidence of its allocation will not match individual Councils' actual costs. Nationally there are a number of research activities going on to estimate as accurately as possible the extent of the additional costs and the options for allocating funding equitably across Councils.
- 5.9 As set out above the government's indicative allocation of RSG for 2015/16 at the time of the 2014/15 settlement was £62m and the provisional settlement now indicates the amount of RSG for 2015/16 at £63.5m.
- 5.10 Within the Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) a 'top up' of £53.7m was received in 2014/15 and this is uprated by the increase in the small business rate multiplier (which is in itself generally determined by the September retail prices index).
- 5.11 The 2014/15 position on the Business Rates element of the Collection Fund indicates a deficit for 2014/15; which in the main is attributable to a rise in mandatory reliefs for small businesses and empty properties together with an increased number of successful valuation appeals and the need to make an increased provision in relation to future anticipated appeals.
- 5.12 Taken together these suggest that there is not currently any significant business rate growth taking place and, other than the additional yield from the (inflationary) increase in the multiplier, no further growth should be assumed. However, in his 2014 Autumn Statement the Chancellor outlined the intention to continue to restrict the increase in the Business Rate multiplier to 2% (rather than September RPI – 2.3%). When this approach was implemented in 2014/15 an additional S31 grant was made available to compensate Local Authorities for the loss of this income and this will now continue into 2015/16. Overall the expected S31 grant in 2015/16 as a result of the decision to cap the multiplier at 2% is £1.2m; a further £799k above that assumed in the MTFS in December.
- 5.13 Given that the Business Rate Retention scheme has now been in operation for 18 months it is worth reminding members that a number of the risks were transferred to Councils in this area (albeit on a shared basis with the Government and the GLA); in particular valuation appeals and business rate 'growth' and the experience to date suggests that these issues, and in particular the effect of NNDR appeals, is currently proving to be a significant burden rather than a benefit to the Council's finances.
- 5.14 There are also strong suggestions within the Public Money Local Choice report referred to earlier that increased devolution of the central share (50%) to Local Authorities is favoured by many and, until economic growth becomes a reality, these risks need to be acknowledged. In the 2014 Autumn Statement specific reference was made by the Chancellor to a 'review of Business Rates' and given the importance of this funding stream going forward we will be looking carefully at further announcements on this matter including any proposed timetables for changes to take place.
- 5.15 For Council Tax however, as reported in December, the 2014/15 Collection Fund performance continues to be positive. In early January, the Council set its 2015/16

taxbase under delegated authority, and this confirmed both an improved collection rate of 95% (from 94% in 2014/15) as well as an overall increase in the number of dwellings. The impact has been a small change to the assumed funding contribution from Council Tax in the MTFS for 2015/16. Around 500 new dwellings have been identified to be added to the list during 2016/17 therefore a small growth above this level has been assumed for that year. This is a relatively prudent approach however the position will be monitored on an on-going basis and adjustments made to our financial plans if that should prove appropriate.

- 5.16 Taking into account the performance of both Council Tax and Business Rates the 2014/15 Collection Fund is expected to show an overall deficit of c£1.2m which can be accommodated within the Collection Fund equalisation reserve created at the end of the 2013/14 financial year.
- 5.17 The government has previously confirmed that the Council Tax freeze grant will continue to be available to those authorities that do not increase their Council Tax in 2015/16. This should be seen alongside the continuing threat that excessive Council Tax rises above a threshold determined by the government would be subject to a referendum. In previous years the level at which a referendum would be triggered has been set at 2% and the government has now confirmed that it will continue at this level (i.e. 2%) for 2015/16. The Council Tax Freeze grant, assuming it remained at the 1% level, would be worth around £1m to the Council in 2015/16, whereas a 2% rise in the Council Tax would yield in the region of £1.6m, suggesting that there is only a £600k benefit to be gained from not accepting the freeze grant but rather increasing the Council Tax; at this stage no increase in the level of the Council Tax has been assumed.

6 Local Context

- 6.1 As already stated, the Council has estimated a budget shortfall of around £70m over the medium term taking into account all of the key variables outlined; a rigorous re-assessment of those variables that contribute to the shortfall has been on-going to this point and required changes incorporated into this report.
- 6.2 The shortfall reflects both the estimated funding reductions from all sources and the need for the Council to include provision for estimated inflationary pressures such as for pay and prices.
- 6.3 There is also a need to consider demographic pressures which have been identified in key service areas. Social Care services continue to face increased demand from the general growth in the Haringey population and other demographic changes, in particular from an ageing population and from increased numbers of people living with high levels of disability.
- 6.4 According to the “Poppi” and “Pansi” estimates provided by the Institute of Public Care, the number of people over 65 in Haringey is projected to grow by 3% in the next year and 14% by 2020 while the number with a severe learning disability will increase by 1.8% next year and 8.3% by 2020. Similar levels of growth are also forecast in people experiencing physical disability and mental health problems.
- 6.5 The Council has committed to not increasing its Council Tax but rather to accept the Council Tax Freeze Grant. It is also the case that the Council’s ability to increase its resources from Business Rates growth is constrained by the overall limited size of its Business Rate Taxbase and, as set out above, the indications are that the taxbase is currently showing a decline.

6.6 Taking all of these issues together it is evident that the strategic approach taken to setting our Medium Term Financial Plan and Strategy is supported by national and independent analysis and it is clear that this approach to eliminating the shortfall over the 3 year planning period is appropriate.

7 Savings and Investments 2015 – 2018

7.1 Officers have been identifying and developing savings proposals for consideration by the Cabinet, in the light of the Council's estimated financial position and the local context referred to above. Each saving has been assessed and is supported by an individual working paper highlighting the impact on workforce numbers, the contribution towards the overall saving target for each year and providing additional supporting information to inform members' decisions. These were included in the report to Cabinet in December 2014 and totalled £74.435m.

7.2 Since then, the following changes have been made:

- Removal of the Adults Care package saving of £5.7m;
- Addition of a minor growth item for Advocacy services (£20k); and,
- The inclusion of the revenue impact from additional borrowing proposed in the revised Capital Programme of an estimated £0.75m from 2016/17.

7.3 The impact of these changes can be seen in the updated tables below which include summary totals by priority.

Table 1 - Savings Proposals by Priority Area

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Total
Priority 1	(5,365)	(7,025)	(4,357)	(16,746)
Priority 2	(5,558)	(8,189)	(10,726)	(24,473)
Priority 3	(2,200)	(4,225)	(3,125)	(9,550)
Priority 4	(373)	(50)	(793)	(1,216)
Priority 5	(1,975)	(1,550)	(2,645)	(6,170)
Enabling	(4,356)	(3,707)	(2,517)	(10,580)
Total	(19,827)	(24,746)	(24,163)	(68,736)

Table 2 - Investment Proposals by Priority Area

	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	Total
Priority 1	0	0	0	0
Priority 2	20	0	0	20
Priority 3	0	0	0	0
Priority 4	460	(100)	0	360
Priority 5	475	200	(675)	0
Enabling	0	750	0	750
Total	955	850	(675)	1,130

8 Summary Revenue Budget Position 2015 – 2018

8.1 Taking all of the funding issues into consideration, and the changes since the December Cabinet report, the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) has been updated.

- 8.2 The Table below summarises the current position on the MTFS which is set out across priorities in detail in Annex 1. In order to ensure that the whole budget is included all corporate items such as debt financing, centrally held provisions, levies and contingencies have been incorporated into the Enabling Priority line in the MTFS.

Table 3 – Summary MTFS 2014 – 2018

£000's	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Priority 1	54,523	51,297	45,048	40,691
Priority 2	88,111	94,571	86,382	75,656
Priority 3	26,693	21,433	17,208	14,083
Priority 4	7,397	7,884	7,034	6,241
Priority 5	15,404	13,354	12,004	8,684
Enabling Priority	89,571	88,495	94,547	98,654
Sub-total service expenditure	281,699	277,034	262,223	244,009
Available Funding	(281,699)	(272,814)	(259,107)	(247,056)
Budget (Surplus)/Shortfall	0	4,220	3,116	(3,047)

- 8.3 The table above illustrates the current estimated gap across each of the three years covered by the Council's MTFS. In order to agree a balanced budget there are a number of options which have been applied to eliminate any remaining deficit in each of the years; including wherever possible services being required to bring savings forward into earlier financial years. At this stage it is proposed to manage the gap through the strategic use of reserves. This position will be kept under review as the budget cycle progresses particularly the outcome of the May 2015 general election and subsequent 2015 Spending Round which is expected around October / November 2015.

9 Consultation and Scrutiny

- 9.1 Details of the consultation processes that have been undertaken are outlined in the covering section of this report including statutory consultation with businesses.
- 9.2 Additionally, the Council's budget proposals have been subject to a rigorous scrutiny review process undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Panels and Committee during December and January, on a priority themed basis. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommendations along with the Cabinet response to them are included at Annex 6.

10 Fees and Charges

- 10.1 Each year the Council reviews the level of its Fees and Charges through consideration of a report by the Cabinet and its Regulatory Committee where it is a requirement that they are considered and approved outside of the Executive.
- 10.2 A separate report with the majority of proposed fees and charges is included elsewhere on this Cabinet agenda with the Regulatory Committee meeting on 3 March to consider and approve those outside the remit of the Executive.
- 10.3 Overall as previously agreed, the assumption has been for an increase in line with inflation as a minimum. Members will note that some increases above inflation have been included as part of the overall savings package outlined in section 7 above.

- 10.4 The overall level of additional income that is expected to be generated from these proposals is £243k; the majority of which is associated with savings proposals set out by services in the December 2014 Cabinet report.

11 Review of assumptions, risks and opportunities 2015/16 to 2017/18

- 11.1 The robustness of the Council's 2015/16 budget and its Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) is a key role for the Council's Section 151 Officer. Ensuring that the budget proposals are realistic will be achieved in a number of ways including consideration of the budget setting process itself, statutory and non statutory consultation, and the coherence of the working papers supporting budget proposals. The Council will also evaluate the impact of its proposals through its Workforce Plan and through the use of Equality Impact Assessments (EQIA).
- 11.2 Best practice demands that these drivers are also used to develop scenarios that will allow the Council to initiate the budget process whilst at the same time creating space to develop a strategic response to details of government policy as they become clearer.
- 11.3 The main risks and opportunities have been identified and these are summarised below; this gives an indication of the extent to which they support the achievement of a balanced MTFS.

Risks

- National economic uncertainty particularly around sustaining economic growth alongside the potential for inflationary pressures to have adverse financial effects on the Council's finances. Also, bearing in mind the Council's priorities for regeneration.
- The Council's Transformational Programmes do not deliver the required savings, do not deliver savings quickly enough, or are counteracted by demographic trends particularly in critical areas such as Children's and Adults Social Care.
- Non achievement of proposed budget savings over the MTFS period.
- The effects of Welfare reforms and the transfer of Continuing Health Care costs from the NHS to the Council add to funding pressures.
- Better Care Fund does not deliver the projected efficiencies and therefore creates further pressures.
- Existing funding pressures apparent in the current financial year, such as No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) clients continue to exert pressure on budgets.

Opportunities

- Haringey 54,000, delivers sustainable improvement in the outcomes for children and young people.
- Transformational regeneration programmes, such as Tottenham, deliver net growth in both business rate and council tax income, in addition to delivering better community outcomes.
- Customer Service Transformation delivering personalised and accessible services to our customers – the digital by default approach delivers fundamental channel shift and resulting economies.

- The Business Infrastructure Programme facilitating a one borough focus for service delivery, increasing public satisfaction and improving efficiency through the single service centre concept.
- A unified Housing programme and strategy that delivers additional and high quality housing for residents.
- The success of the programme focusing on delivering efficiencies in Health and Adult Social Care in a similar way to the Haringey 54,000 programme for Children's Services.
- The Capital Strategy facilitates a tighter focus on capital needs enabling the release of resources and optimisation of asset usage.

11.4 Following the changes to Local Government Finance in 2013 and in particular the introduction of the Business Rate retention scheme, the Council's reliance on Central Government grant as its primary funding source has now been replaced by a system that puts Council Tax and Business Rates as the main funding sources.

11.5 The new arrangements mean that the Council's taxbase for both Council Tax and Business Rates is a key funding driver and conversely exposes the Council to a number of risks such as collection rates, adverse changes in the size of the taxbase and negative cashflows.

11.6 Even allowing for the localisation of Business Rates, Haringey continues to receive support from the government in the form of a 'top-up' to its Business Rates; this demonstrates that it continues to be more dependent than many other types of Council on government support. Haringey's level of top-up in 2014/15 is £54m whereas the amount the government assumes it gets from its Haringey business ratepayers is c£19m. It can be seen, therefore, that even a relatively large increase in the Business Rates taxbase will only yield very small gains - e.g. a 1% increase in the baseline (due to new developments or business expansions for example) would result in an additional amount of around £200k – once the government and the GLA shares had been distributed.

11.7 Although the Council retains the ability to set its own Council Tax levels, subject to a number of government imposed constraints, it does not have the ability to determine the level of the Business Rate multiplier which continues to be set nationally by government.

11.8 One of the impacts of moving from a more centrally determined level of funding to one more dependent on local sources of funding is that policy decisions may have financial consequences not previously considered. In proposing action to Members, officers will need to be conscious that decisions may affect both the Council's funding levels and, in some cases, result in associated costs for Council services; all of these elements will need to be reflected in the MTFS.

11.9 There are three key issues that Members should be aware of:

- any net increase in Business Rates is shared between the government (50%), the Greater London Authority (20%) and the Council (30%) meaning that the net benefit to the Council is substantially reduced;
- the three main ways in which the Council can increase its level of Council Tax revenue are: increase the level of Council Tax; increase the council tax base; and increase the Council Tax collection rate. A 1% increase in Haringey's taxbase in 2014/15 is equivalent to a £0.8m increase in resources.

- The government tightly controls some of the key Council Tax variables – the Council Tax freeze grant restricts the council tax yield on an on-going basis and limits the additional resource to the value of the grant (equivalent to 1% Council Tax increase in recent years c£1m p.a.); it has also legislated for binding Council Tax referenda where proposed rises are ‘excessive’.

12 The Council’s Capital Strategy and Capital Programme 2015 – 2018

- 12.1 The Council is currently developing its first council wide Capital Strategy which will ensure that asset usage continues to align with the Council’s priorities in the same way that revenue resources are aligned through the budget framework. The strategy will identify those assets that are required for future service provision or other Council objectives and look to maximise the resources available to the Council through strategic asset disposal.
- 12.2 The Capital Strategy resourcing requirements, including the revenue implications of capital spending decisions, will also have to be incorporated into the MTFS.
- 12.3 Notwithstanding the fact that a 30 year long term Capital Strategy is being developed, there are a number of schemes that need to be considered by Cabinet for inclusion in the 2015/16 and later years’ capital programme. These schemes require consideration and, where supported, approval including the associated financing costs. The proposed schemes align with delivery of the Council’s priorities and in some cases are required to maintain the delivery of existing service priorities or enable the achievement of on-going revenue savings considered elsewhere in this report.
- 12.4 In recent years, the Council has resolved to finance its capital expenditure only from capital receipts or other sources of funding that do not require borrowing. Borrowing has an on-going impact on the Council’s revenue budget and must, under current accounting regulations, be affordable.
- 12.5 Members will remember that the original bids for inclusion in the 2015/16 programme significantly exceeded the available resources solely from capital receipts and grant. Since the December Cabinet, officers have reviewed the remaining bids, sought further updates on service plans and developments and considered how the revised proposals could be funded. As a result of this further review, the main recommendations are as follows:
- Business Improvement Programme – to recommend a budget of £3m expenditure in 2015/16 only pending further business case approval;
 - Existing IT systems upgrades – to recommend a budget of £1m expenditure in 2015/16 only, pending further business case approval;
 - Libraries and Customer Services Programme – an indicative budget of £2m in 2015/16 pending the proposed Cabinet report in March which will need to also identify the funding source;
 - Customer Services Transformation – revised profile of expenditure;
 - Street Lighting Investment Programme – to recommend approval of £3m for 2015/16 to secure the initial phase of the replacement programme pending further business case approval;

- Alexandra Palace annual infrastructure programme – an amendment to the proposed budget to include £400k per annum;
- Bruce Castle – show the budget requirement for Council match funding only of £2m pending the submission and approval of a grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund.

12.6 The impact of these changes has been reflected in the overall summary of proposed capital expenditure and funding sources is set out in the Table below. The potential borrowing requirement to support the proposed programme is £60.5m over the 3 year planning period, the revenue impact of the additions to the programmed made since December is estimated at £0.75m which has now been included in the base revenue budget from 2016/17. We will continue to take a prudent approach and the actual cost of borrowing will be minimised through the Council's Treasury Management Strategy, including maximising internal borrowing and minimising the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) contribution.

Table 4 - Capital Proposals and Funding Sources

General Fund Capital Programme financing	2015/16 £000	2016/17 £000	2017/18 £000	Total £000
Total proposed programme	54,568	50,682	52,410	157,660
Funded from:				
GLA capital funding	8,241	6,277	5,242	19,760
Capital receipts due in the future	9,300	1,000	31,450	41,750
Grants from central government	9,329	13,529	10,199	33,057
Reserves	2,149	200	200	2,549
Prudential Borrowing.	25,549	29,676	5,319	60,544
	<u>54,568</u>	<u>50,682</u>	<u>52,410</u>	<u>157,660</u>

12.7 The overall Council general fund capital programme for 2015/16 to 2017/18 is set out in Annex 2 and includes both internally and externally funded schemes.

13 Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programme 2015-2018

13.1 The proposed HRA capital programme seeks to make resources available to achieve council priorities by striking the right balance between investment in the current housing stock and new build initiatives including consideration of what is practically deliverable in 2015/16. To achieve this, a number of key principles have been applied and modelled over 30 years.

13.2 The most important of these is the general principle that operating surpluses arising from the HRA are prioritised for:

- Investment in the Council's existing housing stock, through the Decent Homes programme, its successor programme from 2016/17, planned maintenance, improvements, repairs and safety programmes.
- The provision of housing and related services to tenants and leaseholders.

13.3 The long term modelling shows that broadly this approach provides a balanced and

sustainable approach to meeting investment needs for the current stock, without the need to borrow.

- 13.4 The second principle is that any HRA funding of new housing is based on utilising HRA borrowing capacity, where it is appropriate for the HRA to do so - some development projects will have costs that would not be appropriate for HRA funding. However the option to use part of the borrowing capacity for investment in existing stock needs to be retained. Use of HRA borrowing for new housing should be seen as investment not subsidy and a return to the HRA made accordingly.
- 13.5 A third principle of this approach is HRA reserves are maintained at a minimum level of £10m, in line with current policy. However, at times it may be necessary to retain a higher level and careful planning over the long term is needed to ensure reserves are maintained at a prudent level.
- 13.6 The final programme is set out in Annex 3, and now includes GLA grant funding for the Decent Homes Programme.
- 13.7 The mainstream HRA capital programme should be considered alongside the HRA Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) which is set out in section 16 and Annex 4. The 2015/16 HRA capital programme considered previously by members in February 2014 amounted to £55.8m. Changes to existing work programmes have reduced the programme by £0.5m to £55.3m.
- 13.8 The overall mainstream programme for 2015/16 of £55.3m can be funded from the HRA's own resources, which includes utilisation of leaseholder receipts of £7.8m together with support from within the 2015/16 revenue account and the use of accumulated HRA reserves. These funding components are also set out in Annex 3 and those costs proposed as charges against the 2015/16 HRA revenue budget are also included in the MTFS (Annex 4).
- 13.9 Following adoption of the Housing Investment and Renewal Strategy by Cabinet in November 2013, significant capital funds are required to deliver new housing, both in-fill developments on existing Council estates and as part of wider regeneration projects. These schemes have been set out within the projects programme which is primarily funded from additional borrowing and capital receipts.
- 13.10 Since the December Cabinet report, the HRA Capital budget has been revised to reflect the latest cost estimates for Phase 1 of the Small Sites Infill / New Build programme. There has been a significant increase in costs and a consequent need to increase the Phase 1 programme by **£8m**. Final tenders for this element of the programme are expected during February 2015 and work is expected to commence in March 2015. Additional revenue budget is also required and provision has now been made within the HRA MTFP of £1m p.a. Over the three year period additional budget provision for Phase 1 (both revenue and capital) of **£11m** is therefore required and has been included in the budgets now to be approved.
- 13.11 Costs of Phase 2 of the programme are currently being assessed and budget for this phase will be added to the Programme subject to funding, affordability and consequent Cabinet approval at a later date. The estimated additional borrowing costs of these schemes have also been factored into the HRA MTFS.
- 13.12 A full review of the HRA Business Plan will be necessary in 2015. Updated stock condition data will be available and new housing and regeneration projects will be further advanced. This will provide an opportunity to reconsider the assumptions and principles currently being applied to HRA financial planning.

14 Housing Rent increases

- 14.1 Under the self-financing regime, rents are the main source of income for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and the Council is required to make decisions annually on the level of increases. For several years, the council has set rents based on the government's policy on social housing rents and it is proposed that the Council continues to be guided by the government's rent policy in setting its rents for 2015/16.
- 14.2 The government has changed its policy on rents for social housing from 2015/16 and published new guidance in May 2014. The key changes are:
- Rent convergence, whereby local authority rents were expected to match Housing Association rents, ends a year earlier than originally intended.
 - Annual rent increases will be based on an inflation uplift using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) at the preceding September plus 1% over a ten year period.
 - Rent caps will increase by CPI plus 1.5% annually.
- 14.3 The government still expects local authority rents to have reached their 'target rents'. However, individual rents in Haringey have not reached their target rents in the majority of properties. The changes in government policy mean that those rents will remain below their target until the property is re-let following a vacancy.
- 14.4 Cabinet is recommended, therefore, to continue to follow their established policy for rent increases in 2015/16 reflecting the September 2014 CPI announcement of 1.2% plus 1% giving a 2.2% overall increase, except for new tenancies where these rents move to target rent.
- 14.5 This recommendation, after applying rent caps and limits, will increase the average weekly rent by £2.36 from £103.13 to £105.49 with an estimated increased income of £751,400 in 2015/16 over 2014/15.
- 14.6 Subsequent to the December Cabinet report consultation has taken place with tenants and Cabinet is now recommended to approve the rent increase for 2015/16.
- 14.7 The additional revenue generated by this increase will be used to support the funding of the housing capital programme outlined elsewhere in this report.

15 Tenants' Service charges

- 15.1 In addition to rents, tenants pay separate charges for services they receive which are not covered by the rent. The Council's policy has been to set charges to match budgeted expenditure unless this would result in an increase of more than the limits used in rent calculations, in which case, charges are increased by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) at September 2014 + 1%. For 2015/16, this limit is equal to 2.2%.
- 15.2 The table below shows the proposed changes to the weekly tenant's service charges calculated according to this policy.

Table 5 – Tenants' Service Charges 2015/16

	Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	Change %	Projected Income £000
Concierge	£14.96	£15.29	2.2%	£1,572
Grounds maintenance	£2.95	£3.01	2.0%	£1,247
Caretaking	£4.16	£4.25	2.2%	£1,667
Street sweeping (Waste collection)	£3.55	£3.63	2.2%	£1,498
Light and power (Communal lighting)	£2.15	£2.15	0.0%	£865
Heating (Average charge)	£11.87	£9.37	-21.1%	£379
Integrated reception service (Digital TV)	£0.77	£0.77	0.0%	£357
Estates road maintenance	£0.48	£0.49	2.1%	£233
Bin and chute cleaning	£0.16	£0.16	0.0%	£65
Total Tenant Service Income				£7,883

Projected income is based on the number of tenants x weekly charge x 52 weeks x 98.8% (Recovery rate at 1.2% rent loss due to empty properties)

- 15.3 It is recommended that concierge, grounds maintenance, caretaking, street sweeping and estates road maintenance charges should be increased to ensure full cost recovery up to a maximum increase of 2.2%.
- 15.4 Tenants will benefit from savings in energy costs resulting from lower gas prices which should continue into 2015/16. A reduction in the average heating charge is therefore recommended.
- 15.5 Housing management service charges are not currently fully applied to 1,283 residents in supported housing schemes. Applying charges to these residents would generate additional annual income of £673k to the HRA. However, not all service charges apply to all of the supported housing schemes and it is recommended that tenants are charged for services they receive.
- 15.6 The potential increase in service charges for residents in supported housing could be up to £8.95 per week when fully applied; as shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6 Tenant Service Charges 2015/16 (Supported Housing Schemes)

Tenants service charge	Proposed Charge 2015/16
Grounds Maintenance	£3.01
Street Sweeping (Waste collection)	£3.63
Light & Power (Communal Lighting)	£2.15
Bin & Chute Cleaning	£0.16
Maximum increase in service charge	£8.95

- 15.7 Implementation of these charges would be achieved without significant adverse impact on affected residents, as most service charges are eligible for housing benefit. The vast majority of the affected residents are currently receiving full housing benefit (890 of 1,283). 61 tenants receive partial housing benefit while there are 22 self funders who do not currently receive any housing benefit.
- 15.8 Although the proposed service charges for 2015/16 would start, if approved, from 6 April 2015 for existing payers, the new charges would only be applied to residents in supported housing after a separate consultation with the affected residents and an Equalities Impact Assessment.
- 15.9 Consultation sessions will be held at each of the supported housing schemes in particular with those individuals not in receipt of full housing benefit. The implementation of new charges to residents in supported housing will be sensitive with discretion to waive charges in individual cases.
- 15.10 Following the consultation, a report will be prepared for Cabinet setting out the results and making any subsequent recommendation for change before approval.

16 Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Revenue Budget and MTFS 2015/18

- 16.1 The Council's strategy for delivering a unified housing service means that all housing activities, however delivered, have been considered together. In line with all other services the priority owner has identified a number of financial savings and efficiencies which are set out under Priority Five – 'Create homes and communities where people choose to live and are able to thrive'.
- 16.2 The savings proposed under that priority includes £3.4m, over the three year planning period which relates to HRA services and which replace the 5% target savings target previously agreed by the Cabinet. By bringing together all housing activities under a single priority and priority owner, it is now possible to deliver a holistic strategy for meeting the needs of residents in this area.
- 16.3 The HRA MTFS reflects the proposed increase in housing rents and service charges referred to in sections 14 and 15 above and also reflect the impact of additional borrowing arising from the proposed capital programme set out in section 13 above. These are the main components which, together with the savings proposals, for the basis of the MTFS and which are summarised in Annex 4.

17 Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB).

- 17.1 The DSB is made up of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), post 16 funding

provided by the Education Funding Agency (EFA) and the Pupil Premium. As the post 16 funding is calculated by the EFA and paid directly or pass-ported to schools and academies the Cabinet is not required to make any decision on this funding.

- 17.2 The Local Authority is required to consult with the Schools Forum on the Dedicated Schools Budget. A report on the proposed strategy for the year was presented to the Forum on 4th December and 15th January. A further report is planned for the Forum meeting on 25th February.

Pupil Premium.

- 17.3 The Pupil Premium reached its planned maximum in 2014/15 but the Minister for Schools has stated that the primary school allocation will be protected in real terms for 2015-16 and will increase by £20 to £1,320 per eligible child. There are no proposed changes in the rate of £935 per secondary age pupil and £1,900 for Looked after Children (LAC).
- 17.4 The actual Pupil Premium payable in 2014/15 for all Haringey institutions and Looked after Children (LAC) for 2014/15 is £16.9m. The total amount for 2015/16 will be affected by numbers of eligible children.
- 17.5 For the first time in April 2015 three and four year olds in nursery provision will be eligible for the Pupil Premium. This will be paid at the rate of £0.53 per hour per eligible child and it is estimated that this will generate a total of £317k for Haringey children.

Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

- 17.6 The DSG is a ring-fenced government grant covering pupils aged 2 to 15 that can only be used for the purposes of the Schools Budget as defined in the School and Early Years Finance Regulations. The DSG is calculated in three blocks: The Schools Block (SB), the Early Years Block (EYB) and the High Needs Block (HNB), which are considered separately below. Funding may be moved between blocks with the agreement of the Schools Forum.
- 17.7 The indicative DSG settlement was received in December.

Schools Block.

- 17.8 The Schools Block covers the cost of all funding delegated to schools and academies as determined by the local funding formula. It is calculated using pupil numbers recorded in the census for mainstream settings in October 2014.
- 17.9 There has been a technical change at the National level to the calculation of the Schools Block in that funding for all academies and free schools is now included in the overall grant. However this additional funding is matched by expenditure on these bodies so there is no net impact on funding for Haringey maintained schools.
- 17.10 Overall there will be an increase of £11.534m in the Schools Block (SB) made up of:
- £2.406m for growth in pupil numbers,
 - £0.28m in respect of Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) now reflected in a reduced School Block Unit of Funding.
 - £8.871m to fund free schools and non-recoupment academies
- 17.11 The £2.406m for pupil number growth is more than required to meet the increase in pupil led funding for the increase of 449 pupils and will leave a small headroom of

just over £0.1m within delegated budgets. In addition, a reduction in the Growth Contingency will enable a further £0.4m to be delegated through the funding formula.

- 17.12 Following two years of substantial change the Council is proposing only one amendment to the funding formula. This is to reduce the secondary school lump sum by £26,000 to £74,000 so as to create a centrally retained budget to fund in year placements through the In Year Fair Access Panel (IYFAP). The Council has consulted with schools on this proposal and this has now been endorsed by the Schools Forum. The funding formula is the responsibility of the Council and Cabinet are requested to approve this change. The Forum agreed that the funding of £338k released by this change will transfer to the High Needs Block to create the new IYFAP budget. In addition the Forum has agreed to transfer the £0.28m identified above freed up by the changes to Carbon Reduction Committee funding to the High Needs Block.
- 17.13 The Minimum Funding Guarantee (MFG) remains at the same level as last year (98.5%).
- 17.14 The Council's proposals for retained and de-delegated budgets within the Schools Block were discussed with and agreed by the Schools Forum. There were no significant changes.

High Needs Block

- 17.15 The High Needs Block is allocated nationally as a cash sum per local authority based on 2012/13 budget allocations adjusted for inter-authority movements. The block is not driven by census data and is therefore not as buoyant as the other two; although there may be some increase in funding based on national changes in planned numbers and the national funding envelope. The High Needs Block (HNB) has increased by £0.245m as Haringey's share of the available additional high needs block top-up funding to reflect increasing demand in this area.
- 17.16 The High Needs Block covers all funding for pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) other than that included in delegated mainstream school budgets. It includes funding for special schools, special units and alternative providers using the place-plus approach; funding for pupils placed in other local authority or private provision and centrally provided services. It also incorporates funding for the extended duty of providing for students in FE establishments with Special Educational Needs (SEN) up to the age of 25. A significant concern is the uncertainty around the costs of the new responsibilities for students up to the age of 25 with SEN which began in September 2013.
- 17.17 A working party of the Schools Forum met on 19th November 2014 to look at issues within the High Needs Block and will meet again in February. The High Needs Block will be finalised at the Schools Forum on 25th February.

Early Years Block (EYB).

- 17.18 The EYB funds in Haringey:

- The universal early years free educational entitlement for three and four year olds in nursery classes, nursery schools and the Private Voluntary and Independent sector. This includes the agreed number of full-time places.
- The targeted funding for the two year old entitlement.
- The childcare subsidy.

- A contribution to the cost of the Early Years Team and centrally retained budgets that have been delegated in the Schools Budget.

17.19 A significant change for 2015/16 is the move to participation funding for two year olds. In the last two years funding has been on an estimated basis and authorities have been allowed to carry forward underspends to use in subsequent years.

17.20 The Schools Forum and Cabinet have agreed to fund two year old places at the rate of £6 per hour; £0.72 per hour more than received in the grant funding. Our modelling shows that the roll forward of underspends will definitely allow this gap to be met in 2015/16 and is expected to do so in 2016/17 and perhaps 2017/18. Forum agreed to find savings within the EYB before the accumulated surplus is exhausted.

Longer Term DSB Strategy.

17.21 The longer term strategy has both internal and external drivers. The external ones can be only be surmised at this time; factors that may come into play in the future include:

- The introduction of a national funding formula at individual school level. If introduced this may either take the form of a specific allocation per school using the national formula or the aggregate of these sums allocation to local authorities with the final distribution being determined by schools forums.
- Further restrictions on centrally retained budgets.
- A redistribution of funding between local authorities if a national funding formula is introduced.

17.22 The internal strategy is to recognise an increasing emphasis on the school as commissioner with an incremental increase in funding delegated to schools or devolved to Network Learning Communities (NLCs). The incremental approach will enable the Council to restructure its service offer to ensure only the highest quality services are traded. A Traded Services Manager has been appointed to drive forward this process. We are not proposing new delegation at this time and if further arrangements are put in place during the year this would be via devolved rather than delegated arrangements.

17.23 The final Dedicated Schools Budget is attached at Annex 5 which has been updated following consultation with the Haringey Schools Forum.

18 Use of Appendices

Annex 1 – Proposed summary revenue Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2015-2018

Annex 2 – Proposed General Fund Capital Programme 2015-2018

Annex 3 – Proposed HRA Capital Programme 2015-2018

Annex 4 - Proposed HRA Medium Term Financial Plan 2015-2018

Annex 5 – Proposed Dedicated Schools Budget 2015-16

Annex 6 – Overview and Scrutiny Committee Recommendations and Cabinet Responses

	2014/15 £000	Pre-agreed & Unavoidable Growth £000	Pre- agreed Savings £000	New Savings £000	New Investment £000	MTRR & Other fund adj. £000	2015/16 £000	Pre-agreed & Unavoidable Growth £000	New Savings £000	New Investment £000	MTRR & Other fund adj. £000	2016/17 £000	Pre-agreed & Unavoidable Growth £000	New Savings £000	New Investment £000	MTRR & Other fund adj. £000	2017/18 £000
Expenditure																	
Priority 1	54,523	2,139	-	(5,365)	-	-	51,297	775	(7,025)	-	-	45,048	-	(4,357)	-	-	40,691
Priority 2	88,111	11,998	-	(5,558)	20	-	94,571	-	(8,189)	-	-	86,382	-	(10,726)	-	-	75,656
Priority 3	26,693	(2,860)	(200)	(2,200)	-	-	21,433	-	(4,225)	-	-	17,208	-	(3,125)	-	-	14,083
Priority 4	7,397	400	-	(373)	460	-	7,884	(700)	(50)	(100)	-	7,034	-	(793)	-	-	6,241
Priority 5	15,404	(400)	(150)	(1,975)	475	-	13,354	-	(1,550)	200	-	12,004	-	(2,645)	(675)	-	8,684
Enabling	89,572	6,262	(60)	(4,356)	-	(2,923)	88,495	7,110	(3,707)	750	1,900	94,548	5,600	(2,517)	-	1,024	98,655
Total Funding Requirement	281,699	17,539	(410)	(19,827)	955	(2,923)	277,034	7,185	(24,746)	850	1,900	262,223	5,600	(24,163)	(675)	1,024	244,009
Funding																	
Core Grants	32,907	16,473	-	-	-	(2,148)	47,232	-	-	-	(1,331)	45,901	-	-	-	(500)	45,401
New Homes Bonus	5,081	-	-	-	-	(825)	4,256	-	-	-	1,187	5,443	-	-	-	-	5,443
Revenue Support Grant	87,987	-	-	-	-	(24,497)	63,490	-	-	-	(17,479)	46,011	-	-	-	(13,667)	32,344
NHB returned funding - top slice	444	-	-	-	-	(201)	243	-	-	-	784	1,027	-	-	-	(385)	642
Council Tax	79,457	-	-	-	-	4,405	83,862	-	-	-	414	84,276	-	-	-	-	84,276
Retained Business Rates	19,524	-	-	-	-	(556)	18,968	-	-	-	436	19,404	-	-	-	446	19,850
Top up Business Rates	53,737	-	-	-	-	1,026	54,763	-	-	-	2,282	57,045	-	-	-	2,054	59,099
Surplus/(Deficit) on Collection Fund	7,519	-	-	-	-	(7,519)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contribution from/(to) Reserves	(4,957)	286	-	-	-	8,891	4,220	-	-	-	(1,104)	3,116	-	-	-	(6,163)	(3,047)
Total Funding Available	281,699	16,759	-	-	-	(21,424)	277,034	-	-	-	(14,811)	262,223	-	-	-	(18,215)	244,009

Priorities

Priority 1 – Enable every child and young person to have the best start in life, with high quality education

Priority 2 – Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives

Priority 3 – A clean and safe borough where people are proud to live

Priority 4 – Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit

Priority 5 – Create homes and communities where people choose to live and are able to thrive

This page is intentionally left blank

General Fund Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2017/18						
Priority	Name of Capital Scheme	Description	Planned spend 2015/16	Planned Spend 2016/17	Planned Spend 2017/18	Total
1	Riverside School - Art and Music rooms	Provision of independent facilities for Riverside School	570	0	0	570
1	Rhodes Expansion	Residual costs of completed expansion project	600	0	0	600
1	Bounds Green Expansion	Reserved budget for expansion pending conclusion of consultation.	800	2,180	0	2,980
1	St Mary's Expansion	Reserved budget for expansion pending conclusion of consultation.	580	2,500	100	3,180
1	Future permanent expansions	Fund for future primary school expansions	1,000	4,000	6,000	11,000
1	Future temporary expansions	Budget for temporary expansion costs	500	0	0	500
1	Provision for 2 year olds	Grants to maintained, private, voluntary and independent early years settings to provide additional 2 year old places	200	0	0	200
1	Planned asset improvement -primary estate	Condition works at community primary schools	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
1	School roof works	Roof replacements at various schools	1,000	500	0	1,500
1	School Kitchen enhancements	Grants to support provision of universal free school meals	200	0	0	200
1	Electrical rewires	Upgrades of electrical systems in primary schools	250	250	0	500
1	Programme Delivery costs	Costs of delivering schools capital programme	800	800	800	2,400
1	Carer Home Adaptations	Grants to support placements of large sibling groups	100	0	0	100
1	Contingency	Contingency to cover risks on schools programme	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
1	Devolved School Capital	Capital budgets devolved to schools	550	550	550	1,650
	Total Priority 1		9,150	12,780	9,450	31,380
2	Aids and Adaptations	Home adaptations to help disabled people live in their own homes.	949	949	949	2,847
	Total Priority 2		949	949	949	2,847
3	TfL - Corridors/Neighbourhood/Smarter Travel	TfL allocation for major schemes	2,155	0	0	2,155
3	TfL - Principal Road Maintenance	TfL allocation for principal road improvements	508	0	0	508
3	TfL - Bridges	TfL allocation for bridge safety works	1,806	0	0	1,806
3	TfL - Local Transport Funding	TfL allocation for local initiatives & safety schemes	100	100	100	300
3	Road safety and Highways	Annual programme of safety works	150	150	150	450
3	Parks Infrastructure	Annual planned maintenance	300	300	300	900
3	Street lighting investment programme	Annual maintenance of existing street lighting stock	400	400	400	1,200
3	CCTV	The purchase and deployment of 10 unattended type CCTV cameras	234			234
3	Drainage and Flood Management	Essential flood protection works	200	200	200	600
3	Planned carriageway and footway works	To secure commitment to highways upgrade	3,000	3,000	3,000	9,000
3	Tree planting programme	Planting of new trees	65	65	65	195
3	Street Lighting CMS and LED Investment Programme	Investment programme to upgrade street lighting and reduce electricity costs	3,000	0	0	3,000
3	Leisure External Fusion	Contractual commitment re Leisure Centre managed service	229	0	0	229
3	Borough Parking Plan	For the development of new parking zones	300	300	300	900
	Total Priority 3		12,447	4,415	4,415	21,277
4	North Tottenham Land Assembly	GLA funded land acquisitions to support regeneration in North Tottenham	200	2,622	5,242	8,064
4	North Tottenham District Heating	To bring forward District Heating/CHP in North Tottenham	400	2,100		2,500
4	Investment Framework for Wood Green	Wood Green regeneration - scoping and feasibility work	275			275
4	Technopark	To achieve vacant possession disposal	500	500	1,000	2,000
4	Ashley Road Depot relocation (feasibility)	Feasibility costs for depot relocation options.	600	0	0	600

General Fund Capital Programme 2015/16 to 2017/18					Proposals			
Priority	Name of Capital Scheme	Description	Planned spend 2015/16	Planned Spend 2016/17	Planned Spend 2017/18	Total		
4	Alexandra Palace annual Infrastructure programme	Annual planned capital maintenance	400	400	400	1,200		
4	Tottenham Regeneration Masterplanning	Agreed Tottenham programme contribution to area planning	300			300		
4	Tottenham Heritage Buildings	Agreed Tottenham programme to restore Heritage Buildings in North Tottenham	110	510	2,380	3,000		
4	Tottenham Opportunity Fund	Agreed Tottenham programme contribution to support opportunity acquisitions - match to GLA funding	1,604	1,470	600	3,674		
4	Public Space	Agreed Tottenham programme - new community space adjacent to Stadium			5,000	5,000		
4	Northumberland Park Accessibility and Parking	Agreed Tottenham programme - current GLA grant match funding to support highways works related to stadium development	1,193	685	300	2,178		
4	Alexandra Palace (HLF)	Match funding for HLF bid	500	3,900	2,400	6,800		
4	Homsey Town Hall	Delivery option appraisals for Town Hall refurbishment project	300			300		
4	Compulsory Purchase - empty properties	Funding to bring empty properties back into use and sell on to registered providers	500	500	500	1,500		
4	Bruce Castle	Project to restore Bruce Castle via HLF bid	20	1,000	1,000	2,020		
4	Holcombe Road Market	Additional match funding required to support GLA Growth on High Road funded project to upgrade market in Tottenham High Rd	300			300		
4	Strategic Acquisitions	For the strategic acquisition of land and buildings to support regeneration, balance of approved £50m	15,000	15,000	16,500	46,500		
	Total Priority 4		22,202	28,687	35,322	86,211		
BIP	IT capital programme	Annual refresh and maintain programme	150	150	150	450		
BIP	BIP	ICT investments to secure Business Improvement Programme	3,000	0	0	3,000		
BIP	Existing IT systems upgrades	Upgrades required to current systems	1,000	0	0	1,000		
Customer Focus	Libraries and Customer Services transformation	Remodelling of Customer & Library services as part of CSTP	2,000	2,000	1,000	5,000		
Customer Focus	Customer Services	New customer services platform - design and implementation costs	2,400	951	374	3,725		
VFM	Smart Working Project	Capital works to corporate buildings to support smart working programme	270			270		
VFM	Dilapidations of vacated leased in buildings	To allow disposal of leased accommodation	50			50		
VFM	Asset disposal costs - securing vacant possession	To allow vacant possession disposal of site	200	0	0	200		
VFM	R&M and H&S improvements to Council buildings	Annual programme of planned maintenance to corporate buildings	750	750	750	2,250		
	Total Other Bids		9,820	3,851	2,274	15,945		
	Total Programme		54,568	50,682	52,410	157,660		

HRA Proposed Capital Programme 2015/16 onwards				
	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	TOTAL
Programme	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Mechanical & Electrical	3,000	3,000	3,000	9,000
Asbestos Removal	160	160	160	480
Boiler Replacements	5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000
Lift Improvements	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
Structural Works	200	200	200	600
Capitalised Repairs and Minor Works	420	420	420	1,260
Extensive Void Works	300	500	500	1,300
Professional Fees	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000
Decent Homes Works	32,938	0	0	32,938
Successor Programme	0	28,000	27,000	55,000
Estate Improvements	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
Energy Conservation	100	100	100	300
Planned Preventative Maint	3,269	2,673	2,000	7,942
Supported Living	750	750	750	2,250
Extensions & conversions	600	600	600	1,800
Fire Safety	3,000	3,000	3,000	9,000
Disabled Adaptations	1,200	1,200	1,200	3,600
Stock Survey	80	0	0	80
Aids and Adaptations (decent homes)	250	250	250	750
Total Bids for Mainstream Programme	55,267	49,853	48,180	153,300
Funding for Mainstream Programme				
HRA surplus	8,941	26,534	24,861	60,336
Decent Homes Grant	11,270	0	0	11,270
MRA	19,319	19,319	19,319	57,957
Leaseholder Contributions	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000
RTB Receipts	2,439	2,000	2,000	6,439
Assumed C/fwd from PPM	1,500	0	0	1,500
Assumed C/fwd from Decent Homes	2,000	0	0	2,000
Usable Leaseholder Balances	7,798	0	0	7,798
	55,267	49,853	48,180	153,300

Project Programme				
Infill/small sites Ph 1 and Purchase Programme *	28,327	0	0	28,327
High Road West - Leaseholder Purchases	6,000	2,143	2,143	10,286
High Road West - Homeloss / Disturbance payments	2,480	0	0	2,480
ProjectsSub Total	36,807	2,143	2,143	41,093
Funding				
GLA Grant / Right to Buy Receipts	3,327	0	0	3,327
Capital Receipts	11,910	0	0	11,910
Borrowing (within Headroom)	21,570	2,143	2,143	25,856
				0
	36,807	2,143	2,143	41,093
Borrowing Headroom				
Headroom remaining	34,465	32,322	30,179	

* Expenditure on Small sites & Infill Programme is provisional at this stage.
Awaiting final cost information from Contractors'

This page is intentionally left blank

HRA Summary	2014/15		2015/16		2016/17		2017/18	
	Current Budget £000s	Increase / (Decrease) £000s	Draft Budget £000s	Increase / (Decrease) £000s	Draft Budget £000s	Increase / (Decrease) £000s	Draft Budget £000s	Increase / (Decrease) £000s
Rental Income	(83,913)	(221)	(84,134)	(1,397)	(85,531)	(1,733)	(87,264)	(1,733)
Non Dwelling Rents	(2,428)	(277)	(2,705)	(292)	(2,997)	(43)	(3,040)	(43)
Leasehold Service Charge Income	(6,976)	(165)	(7,141)	40	(7,101)	55	(7,046)	55
Tenant Service Charge Income	(9,663)	(315)	(9,978)	0	(9,978)	0	(9,978)	0
Miscellaneous Income	(6,592)	106	(6,486)	(126)	(6,612)	(129)	(6,741)	(129)
Housing Management Costs & NNDR	6,381	(121)	6,260	113	6,373	116	6,489	116
Repairs & Maintenance	4,540	0	4,540	0	4,540	0	4,540	0
Bad Debt Provision	2,260	(659)	1,601	(147)	1,454	46	1,500	46
Service Charge Costs	7,178	126	7,304	146	7,450	152	7,602	152
Total Managed Accounts	(89,213)	(1,526)	(90,739)	(1,663)	(92,402)	(1,536)	(93,938)	(1,536)
Temporary Accommodation	(1,209)	(31)	(1,240)	(28)	(1,268)	(29)	(1,297)	(29)
Community Alarm & Supported Housing	448	43	491	10	501	11	512	11
Other Property Costs	2,038	46	2,084	(26)	2,058	(436)	1,622	(436)
Regeneration Team Recharge	610	195	805	0	805	0	805	0
New Build	1,200	1,000	2,200	0	2,200	0	2,200	0
Environmental Services Recharges	1,111	0	1,111	0	1,111	0	1,111	0
Housing GF & CDC Recharge	3,019	0	3,019	21	3,040	20	3,060	20
Adults Recharges	254	0	254	0	254	0	254	0
Bad Debt Provision - Hostels	64	2	66	2	68	2	70	2
Pension Contributions Increase	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital	29,886	405	30,291	810	31,101	297	31,398	297
Management Fee	36,219	(875)	35,344	(925)	34,419	(1,000)	33,419	(1,000)
Total Retained Accounts	73,640	785	74,425	(136)	74,289	(1,135)	73,154	(1,135)
TOTAL HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT	(15,573)	(741)	(16,314)	(1,799)	(18,113)	(2,671)	(20,784)	(2,671)
Planned Opening HRA Balance	(26,575)		(24,146)		(31,519)		(23,098)	
In Year Surplus	(15,573)		(16,314)		(18,113)		(20,784)	
Capital Programme	16,702		8,941		26,534		24,861	
Funding for Staff Redundancies (if required.)	1,300		0		0		0	
Planned Closing Balance	(24,146)		(31,519)		(23,098)		(19,021)	

This page is intentionally left blank

Dedicated Schools Grant 2014-15 and Indicative 2015-16 (Excludes 2 Year Old Funding).

	2014-15	2015-16	Change
Schools Block			
Pupil Numbers	30,707	31,156	449
Unit of Funding	£5,878.44	£5,870.93	-£7.51
	£m	£m	£m
Formula allocation	180.509	182.915	2.406
Addition for Free Schools and Non Recoupment Academies	0.000	8.871	8.871
Removal of Carbon Reduction Commitments	-0.258		0.258
Addition for Newly Qualified Teachers	0.047	0.047	0.000
Schools Block DSG	180.298	191.832	11.534
Transfers to High Needs Block			
Capital Expenditure from Revenue Account	-0.489	-0.489	
Contribution to top-ups for pupils with statements	-0.289	-0.289	
In Year Fair Access		-0.338	-0.338
LAC Placements		-0.200	-0.200
Schools Forum 15 January 2015		-0.258	-0.258
Total Inter-block transfers	-0.778	-1.574	-0.796
Revised Schools Block Total	179.520	190.258	10.738
High Needs Block	£m	£m	£m
High Needs Block DSG	31.131	31.376	0.245
Removal of CRC Commitment	-0.016		0.016
Transfer from Schools Block (see Schools Block for details)	0.778	1.574	0.796
Revised High Needs Block Total	31.893	32.950	1.057
Indicative Early Years Block (to be updated by DfE with Jan data)			
Three and Four Year Old Funding			
3 and 4 Year Old Pupil Number to be updated after January Census	2,423	2,423	
Unit of Funding	£5,345.46	£5,345.46	
	£m	£m	£m
Indicative 3 and 4 year old formula allocation.	12.952	12.952	
Removal of Carbon Reduction Commitments	-0.025		0.025
Indicative Pupil Premium	0.000	0.317	0.317
Early Years Block Indicative Total	12.927	13.269	0.342
Indicative DSG (excluding 2 year old funding)	224.340	236.477	12.137

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview & Scrutiny Committee Budget Recommendations

Line reference - Detail	Scrutiny Body	Recommendation	For Cabinet response / or Information request status
1. Enable every child and young person to have the best start in life, with high quality education (proposals 1-10):			
Item 1: Early Years	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	That the Panel recommend that no final decisions be taken on this proposal until after the review of provision and full consultation has been completed.	We will be carrying out a full statutory consultation on the proposals. However we are clear that we need to make changes in this area and believe our proposals set out an enhanced design linked to a locality model and Early Help.
Item 2: Services for Young People including Young Offenders	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	(a) That the proposals be reassessed as a high risk and that a risk assessment of them be undertaken to ensure mitigation of any potential unintended impact on spend elsewhere in the system; (b) That reassurance on the balance between targeted and universal provision be reviewed; (c) That further input be obtained from young people on the proposals; (d) That the proposals in respect of services for young people be withdrawn.	We note Scrutiny's concerns; however we know that we need to deliver Services for Young People differently in future. Our Young Peoples Strategy will set out our proposals in more detail and we will involve Young People at that point. We will ensure that some provision remains at Bruce Grove and by linking the service to our Early Help model we will ensure that support is there for those who most need it.
Item 3: Public Health – 5-19	C&YP Scrutiny	That the concerns of Panel Members at the potential use of the pupil premium to address	These concerns are noted. Our Healthy Schools Co-ordinator will

	Panel	public health issues be noted.	work closely with schools to support them to identify their needs in relation to the programme and particularly how the programme improves pupil attainment and helps keep young people safe.
Item 4: Impact of Early Help on Demand	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	That concern be expressed regarding the achievability of the savings included in the proposals.	Scrutiny's concerns are noted however there we believe there is secure evidence that a genuine Early Help offer will provide savings across the system and improve outcomes for families.
Item 5: New Delivery Model for Social Care	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	That concern be expressed regarding the potential risk of the savings arising from this proposal not being achieved.	Scrutiny's concerns are noted; however we have worked closely with Service Managers and Social Work staff to come up with a robust model and are confident these savings are achievable.
Item 7: Special Educational Needs and Disabilities	C&YP Scrutiny Panel	That the proposal be noted with concern.	Scrutiny's concerns are noted. However we are clear that there is much scope to make savings while offering a modernised service that promotes independence and personal choice.

2. Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives (proposals 11-24);			
Item 11: New pathways for older people	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	The Panel recommended: (a) That a decision about the proposed closure of the Haven Day Centre be deferred until 2016/17 and that no decision be made until a review has been undertaken to ensure the Neighbourhood Connects model is appropriate for the most vulnerable day centre users. (b) That before proposals for the re-provision of the Haynes and Grange Service be considered by Cabinet, further information be sought by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing on (i) transition plans and (b) the legal covenant relating to the use of the Haynes and the social enterprise proposals. (c) That, in respect of Osborne Grove, further negotiations are undertaken with the CCG to increase NHS contributions to support the maintenance and further development of this intermediate care centre.	The Haven supports a relatively small number of people with assessed needs for social interaction, reduced isolation etc. We are seeking to make money go as far as possible in supporting older adults, therefore spending money on day centres that support only a small number of people with such needs when there is such pressure on the budget is untenable and does not deliver equity and fairness. Our aim is to ensure that as many people as possible are supported to have social opportunities, but also that we use the money we have as wisely as possible. The proposal to close the Haven will be subject to its own consultation. At present the high level plan proposes that there be an examination of the role of Neighbour connectors and their involvement in a transitional phase. This will be explored in detail during the consultation on the closure.

			With regard to the legal covenant we can confirm that the PCT had previously and now the CCG has responsibility under the covenant for making dementia support services available. There is no specification as to how they should be delivered. Adult Social Care will work closely with the CCG as more detailed plans are developed and consulted on. The Council is working closely with the CCG on the future model of services for Older People.
Item 13: New pathways for people with learning disability – Day Opportunities	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	In December the Panel expressed concern at: • How these closures will impact on the current users of these day care services; • How these closures will impact on carers, and if there are any other alternative sources of community based support?; • A loss of specialist staff and continuity of staff if the day care centres are shut; • The potential for long-term additional costs to the Council should customers be less able to access community based activities. As a result of these concerns the Panel recommended: (a) That both the Roundway Centre and Ermine Road Centre be kept open.	An alternative model of service delivery which is based on a business model will be implemented. We are keen to explore a social enterprise model where staff skills and experience and knowledge of service users are retained. All users will receive a personal budget. However it is people who live at home with parent / carers who will be used to set up and support the initial development of the business. The expectation is that providers will provide support staff to enable people who live in residential to access day opportunities in the

		(b) That the Allways Centre and Central Day Centre (Birbeck Road) remain open until further information is made available for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing in relation to voluntary sector engagement and the social investment model to ensure adequate provision of service, especially for those with high level learning disabilities.	community. At present the high level proposal is to retain the Ermine service as a resource for all client groups with learning disabilities including those on the autistic spectrum. Ermine Road is a purpose built resource with well defined physical spaces which together with a continued focus on mainstream community is envisaged will have the capacity to meet requirements. There will be a specific consultation on the proposal to close the additional three day service sites; namely the Roundway, Central and Always sites and develop a social enterprise model of service delivery. We recognise that there is significant change in adults' services, and want service users to be able to effectively engage in that change, and also as we move to more integration between health and social care to create joined up services. We are, therefore, proposing to invest £20k over 3 years in new advocacy and support to enable users to co-produce new service models.

Item 14: New pathways for people with disabilities Item 15: New pathways for people with mental health needs	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	(a) That the Panel's concerns relating to proposals 14 and 15 (listed below) be noted by Cabinet: • That concern be expressed at the achievability of savings to be generated by the development of the Shared Lives services as a social enterprise. • That concern be expressed at the potential detrimental effects on recruitment of staff to care for clients should levels of pay be offered by providers that fall below London Living Wage levels and that further information be provided regarding pay rates offered. • <i>Further clarification of how Independent Living Funds will be used once these have been received was also requested by the Panel</i> (b) The Panel recommended that all support workers / staff who care for clients be paid the London Living Wage.	The savings are not only predicated on the transfer of shared lives to a social enterprise model but also expansion of the scheme to increase the number of placements available. Shared Lives can realise value for money outcomes of more than a third when compared to traditional residential options. (a) We are working with care providers to assess, monitor and evaluate the impact of requiring the London living Wage to be paid to all staff. However our current estimates suggest that the additional cost of implementing the London Living Wage would be significant (£2m to £3m for Home Care, £8.5m for all care types) and unfortunately the Council is not in a position to fund this level of cost without additional impact on its budgets and other services. ILF funding will be used within Adult social care. All current recipients of ILF users will be subject to a reassessment of need. They will then be offered the assessed support as a direct payment in line with our direct payment processes and policy.

Item 16: New model of Social Work and Care Management	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	That concerns be expressed at the achievability of the savings proposed and that further evidence be provided that the proposed levels are realistic.	We are working closely with our Health partners and learning from good practice elsewhere. This saving is scheduled for year three and we are confident that the service integration programme will be sufficiently well developed by then for these savings to be achieved.
Item 17 Care Purchasing Residential Care	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	(a) That further feedback on the approach to Care Purchasing would be provided to a future meeting of Overview & Scrutiny; (b) That further information be submitted to the Panel to confirm that quality, effectiveness and good user experience can be maintained at reduced levels of cost for contracts; (c) That the proposals be noted with concern.	Any change to care packages will be subject to reassessment of need. Our QA division works proactively to monitor standards of care in conjunction with the CQC. We are committed to commissioning for outcomes as a vehicle to deliver quality effective care for people who use our services. Working within a consortium will not compromise this approach to commissioning. We are committed to supporting all users of adults social care in a way which maintains dignity respect and control as much as possible
Item 18: Care Purchasing Packages	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	In December concern was expressed regarding the achievability of the necessary increases in the use of the personal, community, family and voluntary sector resources required by the proposal.	People who are in receipt of adult social care, or who may need adult social care, have an assessment of need and the Council has a duty to meet assessed need. There is

		The Panel recommended the proposals in relation to Care Purchasing Packages be rejected and removed from the Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy.	nothing in the Medium Term Financial Strategy which changes that position. Everyone has the right to respect and dignity, and care packages that support this where they are eligible. The Council has said throughout the engagement process of recent weeks that re-ablement is not the answer for everyone. Where it has the potential to enable people to regain, and/or maintain, their independence, we will apply it. We believe that everyone has the right to choice and independence and it is right and proper that we support people to achieve that. We currently support younger adults with complex needs through enablement, which is a pathway which is about developing life skills so that people can engage safely in aspects of community life, and to develop goals to improve health and quality of life. However, we have listened to what people have had to say and are now recommending that, on the basis of the consultation feedback, the proposal to make savings on care packages is removed. While the

			Council will look to make changes to our reablement approach, it is recommended that we remove the savings that were originally proposed.
Item 19: Voluntary Sector Savings	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	(a) That confirmation be provided of how fairness and transparency will be addressed in the re-tendering of services. (b) The Panel recommended that there be no further cuts to the voluntary sector.	The retendering exercise will be carried out in line with Council procurement rules and the Voluntary Sector Commissioning Framework. This saving relates only to one part of the Council's funding for the voluntary sector. The Cabinet is seeking funding reductions across its commissioned and directly provided services. Not making this saving would result in the need for further cuts to other services and the proposal is not accepted for this reason.
Item 20: Healthy Life Expectancy	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	There were concerns as this proposal, as indicated outcomes would be lower uptake of preventative services (e.g. smoking) which may lead to increased risk of health problems at a later date and more costly health care interventions by health or social care services.	The panels concerns are noted. Our strategic approach to health improvement and prevention of poor health behaviours will focus on three areas for action: health in all policies (such as the recent hot food takeaway planning restriction near schools) that have considerable impact at a population level; secondly increasing our work with

			communities to increase healthier behaviours (such as the Well London project); and thirdly, are our behaviour change services provided to individuals or targeted groups – the savings relate to this third category. Increasingly, our focus will be on the first two areas of action, as this is where health impact is likely to be greater.
Item 23: Other public health services	Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel	That the Panel's concerns regarding cuts in relation to the monitoring of childhood immunisations and Tuberculosis advice be noted and assurances be made to ensure immunisation levels remained appropriate and TB rates did not rise.	The panel's concerns are noted. TB services and immunisation are the responsibility of NHS England. The saving relates to our local support to the programme. We will work with NHS England to mitigate any potential adverse impacts.
3. A clean and safe borough where people are proud to live (proposals 25-45);			
Item 39: Future of Wolves Lane Nursery Site	E&CS Scrutiny Panel	That a report back on progress with the implementation of the proposal be made to the Panel in due course and that a visit for Panel Members be arranged to the site. The Panel recommended that the cut for Year 2 is put back to Year 3 to enable investigation in to what commercial opportunities are available including opportunities for employment for young people.	Having toured Wolves Lane Nursery on the 21st Jan 2015 the Scrutiny panel was reassured that the proposed review would ensure that there was a sustainable future for the majority of the services currently offered within the year 2 timeframe. The Cabinet are not, therefore, minded to re-profile the saving.

4. Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit (proposals 46-55)			
Item 49: Economic Development	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee's comments, that services which were performing well should not be outsourced, be noted.	We are outsourcing the film service because agency provision can more effectively deliver the continuity of service and fast response times that film companies require at equivalent or lower cost to the Council than our current arrangements (one in-house film officer). At this point there is no plan to outsource any other part of this service although the final structure of the service will be designed so services are provided where they are best able to deliver the Council's priorities.
Item 50: Environmental Resources	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee's comments of the importance of maintaining efforts to achieve carbon reduction be maintained be noted.	Haringey's commitment to the 40:20 pledge – to reduce local carbon emissions by 40% by 2020 – remains. We are exploring ways to develop the green economy locally, including working with partners such as Durham University on innovative schemes that will deliver large-scale carbon reductions while supporting our commitment to economic growth.

Item 51: Reduce funding for Alexandra Palace and Park Trust	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the following concerns be noted: • Reduced funding could jeopardise the Palace Heritage Lottery Funding Project bid. • The Palace would continue to be subsidised at the expense of other priorities such as social care.	Cabinet notes the concerns raised however, the current management structure at the Palace has made good progress over the last couple of years in improving the overall operating business model. This should enable the proposed reduction to be managed without jeopardising the Heritage Lottery Funding bid. The ultimate long term aim of both the Cabinet and the Trust continues to be to move to a business model that enables the Park and Palace to be financially independent; until that time, the Council as Trustee has an obligation to ensure delivery of the original objectives set out in legislation.
Item 52: Heritage Lottery Fund bid for Bruce Castle Museum	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	Noted that any options and implications for Bruce Castle would be open to consultation and presented to Cabinet.	Cabinet confirm that full consultation will be undertaken on future options which would feed into any resultant Cabinet report before any final decisions are made.
Item 54: Cultural Strategy	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That areas in the borough which were often 'forgotten' be targeted as part of the Cultural Strategy.	The benefit that Culture can bring to all communities in Haringey is clear, and Cabinet will ensure that this is acknowledged in any further work.

Item 55: Jackson's Lane	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee's uneasiness about the proposal not to invest in Jackson's Lane beyond Year 1 be noted.	The Council's MTFP includes funding for a borough wide cultural strategy to be produced. This will provide Cabinet with a comprehensive view of the current landscape and options for the medium to long term. It is, however, confirmed that funding for Jackson's Lane will continue for the three year period of the MTFS.
5. Create homes and communities where people chose to live and are able to thrive (proposals 56-66):			
Item 56: Implement selective licensing across the borough	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	Further to the information requested: The panel agreed with this proposal, though wished to express concern that there should not be any delays to the implementation of this proposal as this may risk future income and subsequent investment in enforcement services.	Cabinet confirm that the proposal will be implemented as soon as possible and tie up with broader strategies on compliance and enforcement. Current work is under way to establish the scope of licensing, options available, legal advice and processes relating to evidence gathering and consultation.
Item 59: Early intervention / Prevention (Housing Commissioning)	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	(a) Head of Housing Commissioning Manager should investigate further the provision of rented furniture within housing support contracts and if this presented an opportunity to reduce costs; (b) Plans for the Supported Housing Review should come to Overview & Scrutiny	(a) This has been investigated and very little furniture is provided for supported housing schemes, this is generally the tenant's responsibility while for communal areas furniture is acquired via donations or using tenant association funds. The

		(Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel) the timing of which will be at a juncture where scrutiny can add most value and agreed with officers.	Council has not purchased furniture for some years and this does not therefore represent a savings opportunity. (b) Noted. The timing of this review has not yet been determined.
Item 60 and 62 Housing Unification synergies	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	(a) That a further update of the unification process is provided to the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel at its March meeting.	This is an ongoing process with regular attendance at Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel. Next due at the 2nd March meeting.
Item 63 Repairs	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	(a) That further consideration is given to prior to the disposal of council owned stock, particularly the option to demolish and rebuild where the present condition is uneconomic to repair; (b) That Homes for Haringey should reassess the age at which tenant responsibility for minor repairs is relinquished (this is currently lower than standard retirement age): (c) That there should be no reduction in the minimum lettable standard; (d) That Homes for Haringey should review the penalties and sanctions imposed on those tenants (and leaseholders) who wilfully damage their property: (e) that the proposals for Right to Buy receipts should be extended to the purchase of empty street properties.	(a) Any disposals must be appropriately authorised by the Council, and arrangements are in place to ensure that all options for the continued or alternative use of council owned stock are fully evaluated before any disposal is authorised. (b) This refers to certain 'tenants' responsibility' work being carried out for older and vulnerable people. Responsibility for minor repairs is not relinquished under the tenancy agreement but there are criteria deciding when these works will be taken on by Homes for Haringey (due to age or disability). If a tenant is physically unable to carry out the minor repair, it is expected that Homes for Haringey will continue to take on the work. The point made

			at Scrutiny was around people having certain work done (e.g. decorating) when they reached the age of 60, rather than 65. This is being reviewed as part of an exercise to establish who needs to have the wider menu of repairs carried out, whether this can be tightened, and what criteria to apply. The review will make recommendations by September 2015. (c) This refers to the planned review of the lettable standard, which decides on which works are done when a flat is empty and made ready to let. There may be some reductions in pre-letting work, with the intention to achieve better value through initiatives such as offering more decorating vouchers, or carrying out work after letting (allow quicker move-in times for new tenants). It will still be a 'lettable' standard, meaning that the properties will be ready for people to move in. This to conclude by September 2015. (d) Wilful damage leads to a recharge being made to the tenant or leaseholder. In extreme cases, further legal action will be

			considered. It is accepted that a review of the effectiveness of these sanctions would be helpful and this will be wrapped up as part of the wider set of reviews due to report in September 2015. (e) This is being actively considered
Item 64 Garage Fee Review	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	That Homes for Haringey review parking fees on its housing estates, particularly where these occur within an existing Controlled Parking Zone.	This comprehensive review of parking charges is under way and due to report in July 2015
MTFS – HRA Revenue (page 122 section 14.2)	Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel	Whilst accepting that the introduction of service charges for those in supported housing would be covered by commensurate rise in Housing benefit, further reassurance was sought on the affordability of such a charge to vulnerable people (e.g. will all those affected be fully compensated).	Additional consultation sessions will be held at each of the supported housing schemes. These sessions will deal with the individuals who may be adversely affected by the changes and will include assistance with dealing with housing benefit claims and other financial matters.
6. Enabling (proposals 67-74);			
Item 71: Muswell Hill Library Relocation & Item 72: Libraries Staff Restructure	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That (a) residents' concerns should be taken into account (in relation to relocation) and that (b) the libraries self-service system should be improved. It was noted that proper consultation would take place about the future of the library including whether to improve existing facilities onsite or move to another location.	Consultation on options and proposals for Muswell Hill library will form part of the overall project plan and residents and other stakeholders will be invited to take part in this and express their views. Work has begun on scoping and costing the investment required to improve overall technology available across all the libraries. The outcome will depend on a viable business case.

Item 73: BIP and Item 74: BIP Commercial Unit and Organisation Wide Supplier Savings	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee expressed that outsourcing did not always achieve efficiencies be noted.	Cabinet confirm that currently the BIP proposals do not assume outsourcing.
Draft Capital Programme 2015/16 and 2017/18			
Item 17: Marcus Garvey CSC Remodel of Library to accommodate customer service centre	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That the Committee did not agree with placing too many services into the library building be noted, and, that there would not be adequate parking.	Further work is being done on how to offer a range of services that make it easier for residents to interact and to do business with the Council, whilst acknowledging the value that many people place on existing library facilities and limitations in space.
Item 33: Bruce Grove Station match funding for Network Rail project to support improved commercial offer at Bruce Grove Station	Overview & Scrutiny Committee	That Network rail be encouraged to clean Bruce grove Station.	Officers are in ongoing dialogue with Network Rail about the state of the station.

This page is intentionally left blank



Haringey Council

Report for:	Cabinet 10 February 2015	Item Number:	
Title:	Planning Service review of pre-application advice services and other miscellaneous services and associated charges.		
Report Authorised by:	Lyn Garner Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development 		
Lead Officer:	Stephen Kelly – Assistant Director – Planning		
Ward(s) affected: all	Report for Key/Non Key Decisions: Key Decision		

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1. To obtain approval from Cabinet of the review of, and proposed changes to, the Council's pre-application planning advice services reported to Regulatory Committee on 15 January 2015. The review has been undertaken in the context of the priorities set out in the Corporate Plan 2015-2018 and the Development Management Improvement Plan as set out in the annexed "Supporting high quality development in Haringey – Our pre-application advice services" at Appendix 2 and new charges for Building Control Services.

2. Cabinet Member introduction

- 2.1 The Regulatory Committee considered a report on 15 January 2015 setting out details of the review of and proposed changes to the Council's pre-application planning advice services to align with priorities set out in the Corporate Plan and Development Management Improvement Plan and new proposed charges for Building Control services. The committee supported the proposed charges and changes to the service.
- 2.2 The scope, quality and value of the pre-application advice service has been reviewed in the context of Government Planning Practice Guidance 2014 and best practice. It is intended to introduce a more tailored, customer focussed service



Haringey Council

approach including the provision of advice at the feasibility stage of householder proposals and to make improvements in the information and signposting provided on the Council website. The new service offer aims to reduce the costs experienced by householders in not getting it right first time, improve the quality of planning applications coming forward and the likelihood of success for both householders and commercial businesses. Proposals have been developed for a new charging regime for the redesigned pre-application service following a benchmarking exercise with other authorities. New charges aim to recover the cost of providing the advice, with an exemption for micro businesses and a discount to small and medium businesses. Subject to Cabinet approval, the new charges would come into effect on 1 April.

- 2.3 In parallel with the new advice regime for Householders, the proposals include the reconfiguration of the current Design Review Panel to introduce a Quality Review Panel, with a new independent chair and panel of development experts offering specialist advice to applicants and the Planning Committee for more complex proposals, subject to a revised charging regime.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1. That Cabinet adopts the charges as set out in “Supporting high quality development in Haringey – Our pre-application advice services” set out at Appendix 2 for use by the Planning Service with effect from 1 April 2015
- 3.2. That Cabinet adopts the Building Control charges set out Tables 6, 7, 8 and 9 set out at Appendix 1 for use by the Building Control Service with effect from 1 April 2015; and
- 3.3. That Cabinet reviews annually the fees and charges set out therein.

4. Alternative options considered

4.1. *Do nothing*

- The Planning service could continue to provide free Duty Planning advice to householders and keep fees for commercial applicants at the current level.
- However, the Planning service is committed to making £75,000 in savings, as set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy in 2015/16. This saving cannot be accommodated within the service budget without a reduction in officer resources, which would lead to a reduction in capacity for non statutory services including planning advice. .
- While the Planning service is committed to providing the best advice to customers that it possibly can, the existing walk in service does not allow officers a chance to carry out background research on the property, or take account of other supporting materials from the client which could enhance the



Haringey Council

service customers get.

- A recent Deep Dive session with the Council's Corporate Delivery Unit has identified that the Planning service faces pressures on officer workloads as caseloads per officer have risen significantly every year. Applicants who are refused planning permission the first time around are allowed to re-submit applications for free a second time. This 'failure-demand' also increases the case loads of officers and the pressures on the service, and stress for applicants.
- To enable the planning service to meet its commitments to make £75,000 of savings, the planning service would have to reduce its budget elsewhere. This would increase the pressures on the service and put at risk the performance of the planning department, comparative to other boroughs.

4.2. Do something else

- The option outlined could be reconfigured with an alternative charging regime. The current regime has had regard to the emergent corporate plan priorities and London wide benchmarking. Whilst it would be possible to provide an alternative charging regime to secure associated cost recovery, the current regime is considered to strike an appropriate balance across the development sector.

4.3. Recommended Option

- The option recommended in this report is to approve the proposals laid out in this report.

5. Background information

5.1. The Council's Corporate Plan 2015-2018 "Building a Stronger Haringey Together" identifies 5 priorities for the Council:

- Give every child and young person the best start in life, including providing high-quality education for children and young people
- Help people live healthy, long and fulfilling lives
- Ensure Haringey is a clean, green and safe place where everyone has a good quality of life and feels proud to call it home
- Encourage growth and bring new jobs to the borough
- Create new homes and ensure our communities are places where people choose to live and can thrive

5.2. Since 2012, the Planning Service has been engaged in a programme of service improvement. In October 2013, whilst overall satisfaction levels with the planning service were high (at 82%) the pre application service was rated significantly lower than the formal application process (56% satisfied). During 2014 as part of its improvement planning process, the service has therefore undertaken a reappraisal



Haringey Council

of the scope, quality and value of its advice services. This exercise sits alongside the emerging delivery aspirations in the Corporate Plan that focus on:

- Preventing problems from occurring by providing help earlier
- Tackling inequalities and supporting people who need extra help to reach their potential
- Building community skills and capacity
- Providing value for money and ensuring that every penny spent has greater outcomes
- Placing customer care the centre of what we do
- Working in partnership with others, creating a sense of team across our community with shared objectives.

- 5.3. The review of advice services has also taken account of Government Planning Practice Guidance issued in March 2014 which sets out the value of pre-application engagement by prospective applicants as improving both the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system, improving the quality of planning applications and likelihood of success. It encourages the approach to pre-application engagement to be tailored to the nature of the proposed development and the issues to be addressed. Planning performance agreements (PPA) – which are tailored “contracts” setting out a range of charged pre application encounters/processes are also seen as a useful tool for more complicated pre-application discussions. The Government has also recently encouraged elected members to participate at the pre-application stage and reaffirmed its commitment to pre-application engagement with the community where it will add value to the process and outcome.
- 5.4. The Planning Service has already revised its “Planning Protocol” to provide for the participation of the planning committee in pre-application discussion, and to extend and clarify the process of planning decision making. As a result of the recent focus on pre-application advice, starting in April 2015, it is proposed to extend both the reach and utility of the current advice services to both homeowners and developers alongside the introduction of new and revised charges that reflect the cost to the service of providing the advice.
- 5.5. The Government’s Guidance on charging for pre-application services indicates: “Local planning authorities may charge for providing discretionary services under Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003. Where charges are made they must be on a not-for-profit basis. It is important that any charging does not discourage appropriate pre-application discussions. In this context, local planning authorities need to consider whether charging is appropriate in all cases, given the potential for pre-application engagement to save time and improve outcomes later in the process. Where possible, local planning authorities are strongly encouraged to provide at least a basic level of service without a charge. To ensure transparency, where local planning authorities opt to charge for certain pre-application services, they are strongly encouraged to provide information online about:



Haringey Council

- the scale of charges for pre-application services applicable to different types of application (e.g. minor or major and other)
- the level of service that will be provided for the charge, including:
- the scope of work and what is included (e.g. duration and number of meetings or site visits)
- the amount of officer time (recognising that some proposed development requires input from officers across the local authority or other statutory and non statutory bodies)
- the outputs (e.g. a letter or report)
- the guaranteed response times”

- 5.6. The redesign of advice services aims to approach the provision of services from the customer perspective. Accordingly, the “new” offer to homeowners and commercial businesses starts with the provision of good quality, early advice from building professionals (in the Building Control service) at the feasibility stage – through to a range of formal pre-application offers depending upon the scale of development - and providing for single or multiple office or site based meetings before an application is submitted for formal determination. For homeowners, the cost of providing the services has been discounted – reflecting the non commercial nature of the customer’s interest. For larger and more complex proposals, the charges have been set at a “full” cost recovery rate – having regard to comparative and former charging regimes. A new charge, associated with the engagement expected with the Council’s reconfigured and expanded “Quality Review Panel” is also introduced for larger and more complex schemes in line with the Councils growing commitment to delivering higher quality development across the Borough. For small businesses, having regard to the Corporate Plan cross cutting objective to support economic growth in the Borough, the charges have been waived.
- 5.7. The pre-application advice service will also be available to those seeking to regularise positions which have necessitated enforcement action. Advice that is currently given as part of the enforcement procedure will remain the same.
- 5.8. A good pre-application service reduces the costs for both the applicant (in failed application and lost time) and for the Council – avoiding the need for repeat or free go applications. The authority strongly encourages and welcomes pre-application discussions. The last significant review of the pre-application advice service was undertaken in 2008 and on 18 March 2008 the Cabinet agreed to the introduction of a more formalised service and associated charging regime for Pre-application planning advice and the introduction of the use of Planning Performance Agreements for major proposals.
- 5.9. The charges for the paid pre-application advice service have been reviewed most recently by Cabinet on 7 February 2012 which agreed updated fees and charges from 1 April 2012 including charges for the paid pre-application planning advice. The Council’s current published leaflet sets the charges and service offer to be applied from 1 January 2013.



Haringey Council

The current pre-application advice service

5.10. *Householder and Small commercial proposals*

Advice is provided in the following ways:

- Through the website where there is information on whether planning permission is required, new permitted development rights, how to make a planning application, the planning application process and the information requirements when submitting a planning application;
- A written advice service whereby customers can write/email planning customer care and receive written advice as to how to take their proposal forward
- A telephone duty officer service which operates 5 days a week on the telephone between 2-5pm (Monday- Friday)
- A face to face walk in service for householder and small proposals on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 2-4pm. Common reasons for using the walk-in Duty officer service include: advice as to whether the proposal is permitted development, advice on proposals to extend or make alterations to dwellings, advice about converting houses to flats and enforcement matters. Very few of the enquiries are from neighbours or third parties seeking advice about applications which have been submitted.

5.11. Both the face to face duty service and telephone calls are limited to 10 minutes. The advice provided is informal and unwritten because the current system means that the case officer will not have researched the planning history of the site. Advice is often given without the benefit of any plans and is therefore non- specific and is not binding. Nevertheless those obtaining advice in this way often rely on it. This can lead to difficulties as it is often given without full knowledge of the facts.

5.12. There is currently no charge made for the duty officer service. It is estimated that the face to face and telephone duty planning services account for the time of 1FTE case officer. As a result of the changes proposed, the walk in and telephone Duty Planner Service will cease. Customers with current applications will however be able to secure advice online, as well as via the Customer Contact Centre. Telephone contact with the planning case officer on planning application matters will continue.

5.13. *Non Householder/commercial proposals*

Advice is currently provided in the following ways:

- Through the website where there is information on how to make a planning application, the planning application process, permitted development rights and prior approval procedures, the role of the planning sub-committee and links to other useful sites
- A range of paid pre-application services for commercial proposals provided by appointment only A written advice note is provided. The charges for these are set out in a leaflet on the Council's website and vary according to the scale of the proposal



Haringey Council

For the major or more complex schemes a Planning Performance Agreement between the developer and the Council is suggested. A PPA is a commitment to work in partnership throughout the entire planning process including the pre-application stage and can provide a more structured way of project managing the proposal through the planning process. Such agreements are individually costed based on the needs of the project.

- 5.14. In addition to the above some of the more significant major proposals also receive advice through the following mechanisms:
- Development Management Forum: Since the introduction of the Planning Protocol in July 2014 the Council is increasingly using the established Development Management Forum to facilitate the discussion of large-scale or contentious planning proposals. The aim is to allow early discussion by Members and members of the public on planning issues related to these planning proposals.
 - Quality Review Panel (formerly the Design Review Panel): As part of the pre-application process for major and /or sensitive applications, the Council encourages applicants to present their proposals to the Haringey Quality Review Panel. The advice is used to help officers and the developer to improve upon the quality of the scheme as it evolves.
 - Developer briefings to Planning Sub Committee: The Planning Protocol adopted by Regulatory Committee in July 2014 provided for the introduction of developer's briefings for major or controversial proposals at the pre-application stage to Planning Sub-Committee and these have been taking place since September 2014.
- 5.15. Full cost recovery of taking proposals through the Development Management Forum, Quality Review Panel (formerly called the Design Panel) or developer briefings to the Planning Sub Committee is not currently being secured.

6. Proposals for the new Planning Advice Service

- 6.1. The service will introduce an enhanced paid pre application advice service for householders. This would replace the pre-application advice service for householders currently provided through our face to face or telephone duty planning service.
- 6.2. The new service will encourage prospective applicants to discuss proposals at the earliest stages and thereby achieve the potential benefits for all, the re-designed advice service seeks to approach the delivery of a development project from a customer (rather than service) perspective. This is particularly the case for householder proposals, where expertise and understanding of the development process (and risks to successful delivery of the project) represents the greatest challenge.



Haringey Council

- 6.3. In addition a building control pre-application service would also be offered – exploring the construction implications and considerations that need to be considered at the design stage, alongside advice on choosing a builder and appointing designers/architects. For complex householder projects the service has had regard to the recent best practice advice produced by the Planning Advisory Service in conjunction with the British Property Federation (July 2014) and will offer a bespoke service to reflect the needs of the project and officer time commitments.
- 6.4. The proposed new paid advice service will also be utilised for advising customers on retrospective planning applications in order to remedy a breach of planning permission.
- 6.5. These changes align with the corporate priorities of preventing problems from occurring by providing help earlier – our aim would be to enable customers to submit applications for planning permission which are right first time and incorporate the information required for a decision to be taken as quickly as possible. In introducing the service we have taken account of the need to support people who need extra help and no charge will be made for customers needed to extend their properties as a result of a disability. In line with the Scrutiny Panel's recommendations (September 2014) these measures seek to provide better feedback than is currently available in our Duty Planning Service (through written records and a 'traffic light' system), and updating the information on our website with clearer guidance about our service offer and alternative planning advice services.
- 6.6. An ongoing survey of those attending the face to face duty service (running since December 2014) shows that 57% of respondents would consider using a 'charged-for' service that met them at the house or the site in question, 29% of respondents would like a written response and background research on their property, and 29% would like the option of getting Building Control advice. 21% of respondents also wanted appointment times instead of a walk in service.
- 6.7. The charges for our new householder services can be found in Table 2 of the appendix.
- 6.8. *Basic free advice*

The service will retain the provision of basic free advice made by way of written enquiries. This would generally be by signposting customers to information, encouraging them to submit applications for a Certificate of Lawful Development, or providing retrospective advice where Planning enforcement action is being proposed. The service would continue to provide access to the relevant case officer to respond to enquiries about a current planning application. The Council's web site will provide basic general pre-application advice on the development plan policies and information requirements for the submission of a planning application together with information on constraints such as conservation areas, listed buildings and tree



Haringey Council

preservation orders. Links to offsite national planning resources will also be provided such as the interactive house on the Planning Portal.

6.9. *Updates of current charges for residential and mixed use developments*

The proposals also increase and vary the current structure of charges for the existing pre-application paid advice service for non householder/commercial proposals. The charges have been reviewed so that full cost recovery of the service is reflected in the proposed charges. It is also proposed to amend the categories to more accurately reflect the level of input required for different categories of development. Provision would be made to charge for 'add on' services such as consideration by a Development Management Forum, Quality Review Panel or a pre-application briefing to members of the Planning Sub Committee where considered appropriate. In addition the service will continue to offer Planning Performance Agreements for more complex/larger schemes to provide a tailored and bespoke service. The updated charges can be found in Table 3 of the appendix.

6.10. *Discounts for businesses*

Reflecting the Corporate Plan commitment to supporting enterprise and new employment in the Borough, it is proposed to exempt micro businesses seeking pre application advice on planning matters from charges, and to offer small to medium sized business discounts for non residential development. This will help to reduce the barriers for micro businesses (those employing less than 10 people) in seeking premises and addressing the costs of business establishment, and support the Council's objectives to support economic growth in the borough. Fees for planning applications, which are set nationally, will continue to be applied. The proposed new charges for this new service can be found in Table 4 of the appendix.

6.11. *Quality Review Panel*

As part of its commitment to improving the quality of new development delivered in the Borough, and alongside a range of new planning policy documents, the Council is proposing to refresh the existing Design Review Panel with a newly formatted and appointed Quality Review Panel. In spring 2015, the Council expects to appoint an independent chair, and a panel of development experts to form part of a fully managed Quality Review process, along the lines of the London Legacy Development Corporation and leading London Boroughs. This QRP process will provide two review options depending upon the stage at which the process has reached, and the size of development. The proposed charging schedule for the QRP (below) reflects an estimate of operating costs based upon a comparison with similar services in London, but will be subject to annual review

The charges for this new service are set out in Table 5 of the Appendix.



7. The basis of new charges

- 7.1. In accordance with best practice the proposed charges have been calculated on the basis of the cost of providing the service using the 'productive hourly rate', which accounts for the amount of hours of work the application advice will take, the hourly rate of staff and their overheads. A schedule of the "charged rates" for all officers in the service is appended to the report – in the interests of transparency and for completeness – this will support the Council in its application for costs for appeal and prosecution purposes. The charges are laid out in table 9 of the Appendix.
- 7.2. The service has also benchmarked the proposed charges with other London boroughs offering pre-application services. All London boroughs now charge for their pre-application advice services for non householder proposals, and 17 out of 33 now charge for pre-application advice/duty planning services to householders. The level of service offered by those authorities not charging for their duty planning services varies. Only 2 London Boroughs would appear to include written advice for free, with most other councils charging fees for written feedback. There is a mix of drop in and appointment only services across London, and 3 of them will not provide site specific advice. Benchmarking data shows that the average fees amongst London boroughs that charge for householder advice is around £154. The proposed paid householder service set out below has been costed to account for all officer time but has then been discounted to incentivise take up of the advice service. The final proposed charge is £152 per request. Whilst comparison between Boroughs is difficult, Table 1 in the Appendix attempts to show the charges across the London boroughs for each category compared to the current Haringey fee rate, and the proposed fee rate.
- 7.3. During 2013/2014 there were a total of 106 paid for pre-application requests with a total fee income of £80,275.

8. Building Control

- 8.1 Building Control do not currently charge for pre building regulation application advice, as this is seen as an important part of the service offer to customers. The service will monitor take-up of the new offers, and the impact upon income and users applying to LABC. . The new service providing pre application advice (primarily to homeowners, but could easily be for any sector) at the property or site, is aimed at supporting Haringey residents to make informed choices about the development process, including advice on things to consider and the appointment of contractors and advisors, as well as construction and feasibility considerations. The service is intended to help those embarking on a project realise their aspirations whilst at the same time allowing customers to better understand the services provided by the Local Authority Building Control offer.



Haringey Council

8.2 In addition, the service is proposing to charge for the following services:

- Dangerous Structures – this will be a discretionary charge, based upon the time spent resolving the dangerous structure by a Building Surveyor. This charge will be based upon an hourly rate of £90 or £135 if the dangerous structure is dealt with outside normal office hours;
- Demolition Notices – it is proposed to charge a set fee of £180 for the counter issue of a demolition Notice under the Building Act 1984 Section 81;
- Safety at Sports Grounds – it is proposed to charge for work carried out in association with the issue of and the monitoring a Safety Certificate

The proposed new services and charges are laid out in table 6 of the Appendix.

8.3 Additionally, it is proposed that a number of Building Control Charges are updated. The general Building Control charges are set based upon the time taken to carry out the work along with the rates that our near neighbours charge and are set in accordance with The Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 2010. It is proposed that the charges are amended slightly to take account of recent changes in legislation and to reflect the cost of providing the services (See table 7 in the Appendix). Please note that the percentage increase on some charges are greater than others, as certain categories of work are more sensitive to competition from the private sector, while a number of services were previously undercharged. The 'works under £5,000' category has also been split into two different categories with corresponding differences in the fees, to reflect the different levels of work required for the different bands. It is also proposed to slightly increase the Building Control miscellaneous charges (See table 8 in the Appendix) to reflect the cost of provision. These have been benchmarked to ensure that they are in line with those that other LA's charge.

9 The hourly rates of officers

9.1 In line with CIPFA guidelines, planning advice service charges and building control charges must be calculated on the basis of cost recovery only (i.e. not make a profit). Charges have been based on the hourly rates of officers, which can be found in Table 9 of the Appendix.

10 Comments of the Section 151 Officer and financial implications

10.1 Local planning authorities have the power to charge for services provided in the pre-application phase of a planning application under Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003. Any charging system must be based on recovering costs and should not be profit making.



Haringey Council

11 Comments of the AD Governance and legal implications

- 11.1 The Assistant Director of Corporate Governance has been consulted on the preparation of this report, and makes the following comments.
- 11.2 The Regulatory Committee was consulted on the proposed changes to the Council's pre-application planning advice services in accordance with the terms of reference of Regulatory Committee provided for in the Constitution. Regulatory Committee resolved to recommend to Cabinet that (i) it adopts the "Supporting high quality development in Haringey – our pre-application advice services" set out at Appendix 1 for use by the Planning Service with effect from 1 April 2015; (ii) adopts the Building Control charges set out in Table 7 of the report (now Table 6 of this report) for use by the Building Control Service with effect from 1 April 2015; and (iii) it reviews annually the fees and charges set out therein.
- 11.3 S93 Local Government Act 2003 provides the broad power to charge for discretionary services namely that a relevant authority may charge a person for providing a service to him if (a) the authority is authorised, but not required, by an enactment to provide the service to him, and (b) he has agreed to its provision.
- 11.4 The power to charge does not apply if the authority (a) has power apart from this section to charge for the provision of the service, or (b) is expressly prohibited from charging for the provision of the service. The power is subject to a duty to secure that, taking one financial year with another, the income from charges under that subsection does not exceed the costs of provision the duty shall apply separately in relation to each kind of service.
- 11.5 It is open to the authority to set charges as it thinks fit and may, in particular charge only some persons for providing a service; (b) charge different persons different amounts for the provision of a service. In carrying out functions under this section, a relevant authority shall have regard to such guidance as the appropriate person may issue (emphasis added).
- 11.6 The Secretary of State has issued guidance in respect of whether the local planning authority charges for pre-application services? This provides (Paragraph:004 Reference ID: 20-004-20140306 as at 28.11.2014) as follows: "Local planning authorities may charge for providing discretionary services under section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003. Where charges are made they must be on a not-for-profit basis. It is important that any charging does not discourage appropriate pre-application discussions. In this context, local planning authorities need to consider whether charging is appropriate in all cases, given the potential for pre-application engagement to save time and improve outcomes later in the process. Where possible, local planning authorities are strongly encouraged to provide at least a basic level of service without a charge (emphasis added). To ensure transparency, where local planning authorities opt to charge for certain pre-application services, they are strongly encouraged to provide information online about:



Haringey Council

- the scale of charges for pre-application services applicable to different types of
- application (e.g. minor or major and other)
- the level of service that will be provided for the charge, including:
- the scope of work and what is included (e.g. duration and number of meetings or
- site visits)
- the amount of officer time (recognising that some proposed development requires input from officers across the local authority or other statutory and non statutory bodies)
- the outputs (e.g. a letter or report)
- the guaranteed response times”

11.7 The Council is subject to the provisions of the Equality Act 2010.

11.8 This provides that the Council must, when making decisions of a strategic nature about how to exercise its functions, have due regard to the desirability of exercising them in a way that is designed to reduce the inequalities of outcome which result from socio-economic disadvantage.

11.9 In particular it is under a Public Sector Equality Duty. A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. Services need to demonstrate that they have considered whether an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) should be carried out and undertake an EqIA if found to be necessary.

11.10 London Building Acts (Amendment) Act 1939 Section 66 provides in respect of expenses associated with dangerous structures that "All expenses incurred by the local authority in respect of any dangerous structure shall be paid by the owner of the structure but without prejudice to his right to recover the amount of the said expenses from any person liable to pay the expenses of the repair of the structure."

11.11 Building Act 1984 Section 107 in respect of expenses associated with demolition notices provides that "Where a local authority have incurred expenses for whose repayment the owner of the premises in respect of which the expenses were incurred is liable, either under this Act or by agreement with the authority, those expenses, together with interest from the date of service of a demand for the expenses, may be recovered by the authority (a) from the person who is the owner of the premises at the date on which the works are completed, or (b) if he has ceased to be the owner of the premises before the date on which a demand for the expenses is served, either from him or from the person who is the owner at the date on which the demand is served, and, as from the date of the completion of the



Haringey Council

works, the expenses and interest accrued due thereon are, until recovered, a charge on the premises and on all estates and interests in them.

- 11.12 Regulation 8 of the Safety of Sports Grounds Regulations 1987 provides the legal authority for charging in respect of Safety of Sports Grounds Act 1975 safety certificates for large sports stadia. This provides that “A local authority may determine the fee to be charged in respect of an application for the issue, amendment, replacement of a safety certificate (emphasis added) but such fee shall not exceed an amount commensurate with the work actually and reasonably done by or on behalf of the local authority in respect of the application”.

12 Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments

- 12.1 An initial draft Equalities Impact assessment was carried out by the service and published with a number of other EIAs in December 2014 as a supporting document with the Medium Term Financial Strategy in December 2014. This initial Equalities Impact Assessment identified that the proposals could disincentivise people with disabilities to apply for planning permission to adapt their homes, but found no other equalities impacts. However the planning fee regulations ‘The Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits) (England) Regulations 2012’ provide an exemption for alterations, extensions etc to a dwelling house for the benefit of a disabled person or for an application solely for the carrying out of the operations for the purpose of providing a means of access for disabled persons to or within a building to which members of the public are admitted. These exemptions would also be applied to the revised pre-application service. The Planning Service will collect equalities data during the implementation phase and beyond, and if protected groups are impacted, proposals to mitigate the effects will be introduced. This potential impact is considered to be outweighed by the benefit derived by customers from getting their applications correct the first time around, and thereby reducing the stress caused to individuals engaging in the Planning process who may otherwise have received confusing advice or have had to reapply multiple times.

13 Head of Procurement Comments

- 13.1 Not applicable

14 Policy Implication

- 14.1 Haringey’s Corporate Plan sets out the Council’s strategic direction from 2013/14 to 2014/15 with the vision of ‘One Borough, One Future’ the Corporate Plan guides the work of all Council programmes. The overarching theme is that everyone who lives in Haringey will have the opportunity to lead a successful and fulfilling life.
- 14.2 The Corporate Plan lists twelve priorities grouped into the four main outcomes which are being sought. The proposed new pre-application service



Haringey Council

addresses primarily Outcome 4: A better Council: Delivering responsive, high quality services – The new service will enable the Council to get the basics right by enabling more timely and effective advice on pre-application proposals.

14.3 Haringey has recently started consultation on a draft Corporate Plan for 2015-2018, which explains the priorities for the borough, and how the Council will achieve these priorities. The overall approach is to encourage investment in the borough to create more opportunities. While this is not yet adopted policy the proposed service sits alongside the emerging delivery aspirations that focus on:

- Preventing problems from occurring by providing help earlier
- Tackling inequalities and supporting people who need extra help to reach their potential
- Building community skills and capacity
- Providing value for money and ensuring that every penny spent has greater outcomes
- Placing customer care the centre of what we do
- Working in partnership with others, creating a sense of team across our community with shared objectives.

15 Reasons for Decision

15.1 The Corporate Plan promotes a confident, new vision for Haringey including a more collaborative and constructive relationship with our service users and residents. The changes to the Planning Advice Service have been prompted by a fundamental reappraisal of our users needs, coupled with a reappraisal of the costs in delivering the planning service (and the avoidable elements of costs that will help improve value for money). The proposals reflect our commitment to supporting pre-application discussions. The last significant review of the pre-application advice service was undertaken in 2008 and on 18 March 2008 the Cabinet agreed to the introduction of a more formalised service and associated charging regime for Pre-application planning advice and the introduction of the use of Planning Performance Agreements for major proposals. These proposals will bring the charges and the service offer “up to date” and help realise the shared objective within the corporate plan to support high quality housing and growth across the Borough.

16 Use of Appendices

Appendix 1- tables of charges

Appendix 2- PAPA leaflet

17 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985



Haringey Council

The background papers are set out below:

- Corporate Plan 2015-2018
- Corporate Delivery Unit Deep Dive, October 2014
- Local Government Act 2003
- Equality Act 2010
- Planning Practice Guidance 2014
- Planning Advisory Service Pre Application Suite published in June 2014
- Planning Service telephone customer satisfaction survey October 2013
- Planning service customer survey December 2014
- Planning Protocol adopted by Regulatory Committee on 12 June 2014(Regulatory Committee)
- Community Engagement in the Planning Service – Report to Cabinet on 16 September 2014
- Planning- Increased Income 2- Equalities Impact Assessment published on December 2014.



Haringey Council

Appendix One

17.1 Table 1 - Benchmarking pre-application advice charges across London

Category	London Average	Haringey current	Proposed new rate
Minors 1-5	£591.10	£600	£670
Minors 6-9	£963.31	£600	£770
Majors 10-24	£1,813.60	£1,300	£2,370
Majors 25-50	£2,371.31	£2,100	£2,850
Majors 51-100	£2,724.53	£2,100	£2,850 first meeting then suggestion for PPA
Majors 100+	£3,351.80	£4,150	As above
PPA	Bespoke	Bespoke	Bespoke

17.2 Table 2- Proposed new charges for the Householder Pre-application advice service

Service	Explanation of the service	Cost
Building Control pre-app meetings on site	Building Control does not currently charge for pre application meetings as this is seen as a key marketing tool (charges could lead to losing market share), However it is proposed to offer a pre application meeting at the property or on the site of the proposed works at a charge. This service would support people who might want advice about how to ensure their building works are carried out to a high standard and could include detailed site specific details, as well as advice on type of professional advisors that they need to appoint – all before they go too far in appointing advisors and then finding that for some reason they cannot do what they want to do.	Flat rate of £90 (If the customer then uses our Building Control Service, £45 (50% of the fee) would be discounted from the relevant Building Control fee for their first meeting.
Householder advice	This service will provide an enhanced planning advice service about the proposed development. Householders will be able to book an appointment and will be asked to provide basic information about their project before the meeting. This would allow our planning officers to do prior research on the site, providing bespoke advice about the property. The	£152



Haringey Council

	meeting would last half an hour, after which written advice will be provided within 10 working days, including the information requirements when submitting a planning application, so both the officer and customer have a record of the advice provided.	
Bespoke Householder advice	Householders with complex projects, for example large basement excavations, loft conversions, listed buildings or proposals raising conservation issues will be offered an enhanced service based on the hourly rates of the staff needed to provide comprehensive advice. Customers will be offered advice about the support they will need before they commit to buying this service.	Bespoke price on request The hourly rates to be used for staff are: - £60/hr for a planning officer - £60/hr for a design officer - £80/hr for team leader sign off - £90/hr for a building control officer
Out of office visits	If customers wish to get advice on site, for example at the site of the proposed development, they will be charged an additional cost for a half hour meeting and travelling time. If the customers wants Building Control advice at this site meeting, then a Surveyor will attend and the charge will be as described earlier (£90 with 50% refunded when the formal application is submitted to Haringey Building Control)	£90

17.3 Table 3- Non householder/residential developments pre-application advice services

Service	Explanation of service	Old Charge	New Charge
Minors - (Category 5) 1-5 residential units	Previously we had one category for developments of between 1-10 units. However, we have split the previous category because developments with 1-5 houses do not require input from a viability consultant for affordable housing. The increase in the fee proposed is due to the need to provide advice on the	£600 (inc. VAT) £300 each additional meeting (inc. VAT)	£670 + VAT



Haringey Council

	Community Infrastructure Levy (hereafter called CIL), and inflation.		
Minors (Category 4) 6-9 residential units	Developments of over 6 residential units require input from a viability consultant for affordable housing. The increase is explained by the new advice on CIL, and affordable housing.	£600 (inc.VAT) £300 each additional meeting (inc. VAT)	£770+ VAT
Majors (Category 3) 10-24 residential units	This category is the same as the previous category we had for majors of between 10-24 units. However, the cost of providing this service has been increased to reflect the need for input from Transportation planning officers, design officers, advice on CIL, and the viability of affordable housing	£1,300 (inc.VAT) £650 each additional meeting (inc. VAT)	£2,370 +VAT
Majors (Category 2) 25-50 residential units Mixed used developments	This service was previously provided under category 1 services for '25-100' units. However, this has been split to recognise that there is big differences in the amount of work planning officers have to carry out between developments of 25 units, and development of more than 51 units. As above, the costs of Transportation planning, Highways input, input from design officers, advice on CIL and advice around the viability of affordable housing have been included in this cost.	£2,100 (inc.VAT) £1,050 each additional meeting (inc. VAT)	£2,850 + VAT
Majors (Category 1) 50 or more residential units Mixed use developments	For developments of this size we would propose that the customer has one outline meeting at this flat rate, after which they will be asked to sign a PPA. This is because developments of this size are complex, require a wide range of expert advice, and often require bespoke and varying amounts of advice.	£4,150 (inc. VAT) £2,100 each additional meeting (inc. VAT)	£2,850 + VAT
Senior management time	This service will be provided subject to availability. This service is for customers who want to supplement the advice with the input from senior managers/Head of Service	N/A service did not exist	£100 per hour + VAT


Haringey Council

Director's time	This service will be provided subject to availability. This service is for customers who want to supplement the advice with input from the Assistant Director - Planning.	N/A service did not exist	£120 per hour +VAT
PPA (Planning Performance Agreements)	A bespoke service that calculates the amount of work and expertise a proposal will take and offers a bespoke price. Different developments will require different kinds of expertise, and different levels of that expertise, and the bespoke price reflects this. The hourly rates/costs will be used as the basis for calculating the cost of a PPA. This may include taking a proposal to a Quality Review Panel, Development Management Forum or to a Pre-application committee briefing. Charges will be on the basis of full cost recovery. A standard initial meeting charge of £2850 would be applied and the meeting would scope out the terms of the Planning Performance Agreement.	Bespoke	Bespoke
Transportation assessments	For complex projects which require additional transport scoping assessments as part of a technical working group/ pre application advisory role, or post permission implementation support, additional charges will apply based on the Transport officer hourly rate (see table – for individual officer hourly rates)	N/A this was not previously accounted for separately	£60 per hour of work +VAT

17.4 Table 4- charges for non-residential commercial developments

Service	Explanation of service	Cost
Advice for micro businesses (10 employees or less for change of use of 100m ² 499m ²)	Similar level of service to that offered in the Householder pre-application advice service.	Free
Minors proposals (Category 4) 499m ² -999m ² floorspace	This would be charged at half the residential/mixed use development rate to reflect the discount for small/medium sized business.	£385 + VAT for first meeting



Haringey Council

Major proposals Category 3 non residential development 1000- 1999m ²	. These would be charged at half the cost of the corresponding fee scale charged for residential developments	£1,185 + VAT for first meeting
Majors (Category 2) 2000m ² -9999m ² commercial space	These would be charged at half the cost of the corresponding fee scale charged for residential developments	£1,425 + VAT for first meeting
Majors (Category 1) 10,000m ² or more commercial floor space	For developments of this size we would propose that the customer has one outline meeting at this flat rate, after which they will be asked to sign a PPA. This is because developments of this size are complex, require a wide range of expert advice, and often require bespoke and varying amounts of advice.	£2,850 + VAT for first meeting
PPA (Planning Performance Agreements)	A bespoke service that calculates the amount of work and expertise a proposal will take and offers a bespoke price. Different developments will require different kinds of expertise, and different levels of that expertise, and the bespoke price reflects this. The hourly rates/costs will be used as the basis for calculating the cost of a PPA. This may include taking a proposal to a Quality Review Panel, Development Management Forum or to a Pre- application committee briefing. Charges will be on the basis of full cost recovery. A standard initial meeting charge of £2850 would be applied and the meeting would scope out the terms of the Planning Performance Agreement.	£2,850 initial meeting Bespoke price after first meeting

17.5 **Table 5- Charges for the Quality Review Panel**

Service	Charge
Formal review- Quality Review Panel with full presentation and feedback from panel of experts	£3,500 + VAT + room hire charge for the venue
Chair's review- Quality Panel review with feedback from the Chair only - usually for smaller or less complex schemes.	£1,350 + VAT + room hire charge for the venue



Haringey Council

17.6 **Table 6- Charges for proposed new Building Control services**

Service	Explanation of the service	Cost
Building Control pre-app meetings on site	Building Control does not currently charge for pre application meetings as this is seen as a key marketing tool (charges could lead to losing market share). However it is proposed to offer a pre application meeting at the property or on the site of the proposed works at a charge. This service would support people who might want advice about how to ensure their building works are carried out to a high standard and could include detailed site specific details, as well as advice on type of professional advisors that they need to appoint – all before they go too far in appointing advisors and then finding that for some reason they cannot do what they want to do.	Flat rate of £90 (If the customer then uses our Building Control Service, £45 (50% of the fee) would be discounted from the relevant Building Control fee.
Dangerous Structures	A discretionary charge, based upon the time spent resolving the dangerous structure by a Building Surveyor.	This charge will be based upon an hourly rate of £90 or £135 if the dangerous structure is dealt with outside normal office hour
Demolition Notices	For the counter issue of a Demolition notice under the Building Act 1984 Section 81	Set fee of £180
Safety at Sports Grounds	Proposed to charge for work carried out in association with the issue of and the monitoring of a Safety Certificate	To be charged at full cost recovery



Haringey Council

17.7 Table 7- updated charges for Building Control services

SCHEDULE A			
	Building Control Charge 2014	Proposed Building Control Charge 2015	% increase
Extension <10m²	£428.00	£440.00	3%
Extension 10m² - 40m²	£515.00	£525.00	2%
Extension 40m² - 60m²	£598.00	£600.00	0%
Over 60m²	Building Control Charge based on estimated cost of work		
Loft Conversion without dormer(s)	£428.00	£440.00	3%
Loft Conversion with dormer(s)	£598.00	£600.00	0%
Detached garage 30m² - 60m²	£428.00	£440.00	3%
Recovering roof (per dwelling)	£257.50	£265.00	3%
Replacement of windows/doors for every five windows or part thereof	£180.00	£200.00	11%
Electrical works (non competent person)	£257.50	£265.00	3%
Green Deal works	£166.67	£180.00	8%
Shop Fitout each 100m² or part there of	£248.00	£255.00	3%
New Shop front (up to 10m)	£210.00	£220.00	5%
NEW BUILD DWELLINGS (houses and flats, three stories without basements)			
1 new dwelling	£598.00	£700.00	17%
2 - 5 dwellings (per additional dwelling - in addition to the charge for one dwelling)	£218.00	£220.00	1%
6 - 20 new dwellings (per additional dwelling over 5 - in addition to the charge for five dwellings (plan charge - £514.50+VAT and inspection charge	£181.00	£183.00	1%



Haringey Council

£1,470+VAT))			
Over 20 dwellings	Estimate required, individually assessed charges to be determined - please contact Building Control (0208 489 5504) for quote		
ALL OTHER WORKS Estimated cost of works	Building Control Charge	Proposed Building Control Charge	
up to £2000	£217.00	£200.00	-9%
up to £5000 (£2,001 - £5,000)	£217.00	£225.00	4%
£5001 - £10,000	£268.00	£280.00	4%
£10,001 - £20,000	£371.00	£390.00	5%
£20,001 - £30,000	£474.00	£500.00	5%
£30,001 - £40,000	£577.00	£600.00	4%
£40,001 - £50,000	£680.00	£710.00	4%
£50,001 - £60,000	£783.00	£820.00	5%
£60,001 - £70,000	£886.00	£930.00	5%
£70,001 - £80,000	£989.00	£1,010.00	2%
£80,001 - £90,000	£1,092.00	£1,110.00	2%
£90,001 - £100,000	£1,195.00	£1,210.00	1%
£100,001 - £120,000	£1,298.00	£1,315.00	1%
£120,001 - £140,000	£1,401.00	For estimated cost over £120k individually assessed charges to be determined - please contact Building Control (0208 489 5504) for quote	

17.8 Table 8 - Additional charges

Additional Building Control Charges			
	2014	2015	% increase
Completion Certificates	£41.00	£45.00	10%
Copy Documents	£15.50	£20.00	29%
Copy Plans A3 (where permissible) - first page	£10.00	Individually determined	
Subsequent page(s)	£5.00		
Research fee	£32.00	£35.00	9%


Haringey Council

Surveyor hourly charge (08:00 - 18:00)	£83.00	£90.00	8%
Surveyor hourly charge (18:00 - 08:00)	£124.50	£135.00	8%
Technical Support charge	£41.50	£45.00	8%

17.9 **Table 9- The Hourly rates of Officers**

Title/Role	£ Rate per hour
Assistant Director	£120
Head of Service	£100
Planning Service Team Leader	£80
Building Control Officer	£90
Planning Officer	£60
Subject specialist (e.g. transport, conservation officer, trees, ecology, urban design)	£60
Support service costs	£40

18 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

The background papers are set out below:

- Corporate Plan 2015-2018
- Corporate Delivery Unit Deep Dive, October 2014
- Local Government Act 2003
- Equality Act 2010
- Planning Practice Guidance 2014
- Planning Advisory Service Pre Application Suite published in June 2014
- Planning Service telephone customer satisfaction survey October 2013
- Planning service customer survey December 2014
- Planning Protocol adopted by Regulatory Committee on 12 June 2014(Regulatory Committee)
- Community Engagement in the Planning Service – Report to Cabinet on 16 September 2014
- Planning- Increased Income 2- Equalities Impact Assessment published on December 2014.



Appendix 2



Supporting high quality development in Haringey- Our pre application advice services



Charges from 1 April 2015

Thank you for taking the time to consider the pre application advice services offered by Haringey Council. The Council's Corporate Plan makes clear Councilors commitment to ensuring that new development in the borough is of the highest quality and is supported by an efficient, user focused planning and building control service. The Planning and Building Control team have therefore come together to provide a range of new services designed to help you to realise your aspirations from your project, whilst meeting all of the up to date planning and building regulation requirements of the Council.

This leaflet sets out the range of advice services that the Council offers – be it a householder development or a major regeneration proposal. The document also explains how you can access these advice services and the associated charges that apply. The charges have been set in line with S93 of the Local Government Act 2010 on a “not for profit” basis – and cover no more than the cost of providing the service to you. In some cases (such as for householders and small businesses) these charges are subsidised by the service to ensure that everyone can access good, early advice to help make their project a success. A range of “enhancements” to the advice services are also available - reflecting feedback from previous users. In all cases, our objective is to help you to realise your aspirations in a way that fits with the Council objectives and policies as quickly, and efficiently as possible.

In addition to the paid for advice services detailed in this leaflet, the Council provides information on its web pages in relation to planning and building control related issues. This includes details of conservation areas, and advice for those who own or live in a listed building along with hints and tips to all potential applicants to help your project to be a success. The web site also provides links to other advice available online from government and related institutions. To access this information please go to www.haringey.gov.uk/planning

Our advice services

Whatever your project, the Council provides a range of tailored services that aim to ensure you get the right level of advice for the scale and impact of your project. Save for the most straightforward of projects, the Council encourages pre-application advice as a means by which you can discuss and shape your project so that, by the time the planning application is submitted, you can have a clear understanding of the likelihood that your scheme will be found to meet the Councils' planning or building regulation requirements. The schedule below lists a range of services for different size and types of development which we believe may benefit from our services. For more information, please speak to our customer contact centre or, for more complex proposals, our planning and building control officers who will be able to advise you on a suitable advice service to meet your needs.

Description	Main Charge(s)	Extra Charges
Building Control pre-app meeting This service would support people who might want a service to advise them about how to approach a proposal and the practicalities of constructing/carrying out their project before they think about appointing builders etc. They could be used as an early advice service before detailed planning application drawings are prepared or as advice for householders who want to ensure their permitted development is built correctly.	£90+ VAT	£90 for any subsequent meetings + VAT Customers who use our Building Control Services following the approval of their planning application would be eligible for a 50% discount for their first meeting
Householder advice service Booked appointments only. The service includes background research on the site in question and a written advice note within 10 working days	£152+ VAT	Meeting on site as opposed to at River Park House, Wood Green. (see below)
Bespoke householder advice for complex projects Available for complex projects, such as large basement excavations or loft conversions Bespoke service. Price is calculated according to the hourly rates of the staff needed to provide the service. Agreed timeline for project Hourly rates to be used for staff are: - £60/hr for a planning officer - £60/hr for a design officer - £60/hr for a Transport planning officer - £80/hr for team leader sign off - £90/hr for building control officer	Bespoke price	N/A
Optional additional Out of office visits Available in addition to any of the services above. Officers will visit the applicant in their home/offices within Haringey/ or at the site in question Booked appointments only	£90 +VAT for travel time (in addition to meeting cost)	N/A

Non- Householder/commercial advice services (excluding residential developments)

Description	Main Charge(s)
Minors and small businesses (10 employees or less) - (Category 5) Change of use 100m ² -499m ²	Free
Minors (Category 4) 500m ² -1999m ² commercial units	£385 + VAT
Majors (Category 3) 1000-1999 m ² commercial units	£1,185 +VAT
Majors (Category 2) 2000m ² -9999m ² commercial space	£1,425+ VAT
Majors (Category 1) 10,000m ² or more commercial floor space and	£2,850+ VAT
PPA (Planning Performance Agreements) Bespoke service that calculated the amount of work and expertise a proposal will take and offers a bespoke price, based on the hourly rates of required officers. Customers should attend an initial scoping meeting to agree the terms of the PPA.	£2,850 initial meeting +VAT Bespoke price after first meeting

Non- Householder Residential developments

Description	Main Charge(s)
Minors (Category 5 proposals) Creation of 1-5 residential units	£670 + VAT
Larger Minors (Category 4 proposals) Creation of 6-9 residential units Affordable Housing Liability	£770 + VAT
Majors (Category 3 proposals) Provision of 10-24 dwelling units Development of a site of 0.5ha and over Mixed use developments	£2,370 +VAT
Majors (Category 2 proposals) Provision of 25-50 dwelling units Mixed use developments	£2,850+ VAT
Majors (Category 1 proposals) • 50 or more residential units • Mixed use developments	£2,850+ VAT

Planning Performance Agreement • To include Development Management Forum and pre-application Committee briefing as agreed. An extra charge (below) is due for access to the Quality Review Panel – used for large or complex developments.	First meeting to scope out the PPA service - £2,850 + VAT Subsequent meetings calculated at bespoke price based on full cost recovery of providing services identified as necessary at the scoping meeting - £60/hr for a planning officer - £60/hr for a design officer - £80/hr for team leader - £90/hr for building control officer + VAT
Senior Management or Director's Time Subject to availability This service is for customers who want to seek the advice of the Assistant Director on their projects	Senior Manager £100 per hour + VAT Director £120+ VAT per hour
Transportation scoping assessments • For projects which require additional transport involvement such as for scoping/assessment work as a part of an applicants technical advice group.	£60 per hour of work +VAT
Quality Review Panel To offer customers advice on major and/or sensitive applications, allowing developers to gain advice and feedback from the Council's advisory panel on quality development as schemes evolve before a formal application is submitted..	Full formal review £3,500 + VAT + room hire charge Chair's review £1,350 + VAT + room hire

Notice on the fee payable for the service

It must be noted that the fee you pay for PAPA service is solely for the provision of pre-application advice. If after this advice you decide to submit a planning application, the pre-application charge will not be deducted from any fee for the application itself.

The PAPA fee is non-refundable unless the meeting is cancelled by the London Borough of Haringey.

What will you get from the service?

We will:

- Contact you within 2 working days of receiving your request and fee for PAPA and give you details of any further information you may need to supply before the meeting takes place.

- Arrange a meeting date with you and all the necessary officers required to advise you on your case, including (where applicable) any site visits needed. We will endeavour to hold the meeting within two weeks of receiving the request.
- Provide detailed written confirmation within 10 working days of the meeting of the advice and views given by us. This will include what information/documentation you will need to supply in order to submit a valid application.

Please note that for large scale proposals with highly complex issues, there may need to be a series of meetings before a formal application is submitted. If this is the case then you may benefit from a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA); please see our website for more information.

Please note that for some of the services (esp. householder and small business pre-application advice) unless otherwise stated, the service offered does not include our officers either undertaking a site visit or attending a site meeting with you. In these cases, you may choose to have a meeting at the site (or other location) for an additional charge

How to request a Pre-Application Planning Advice meeting

Householder proposals

To request a Pre-Application Planning Advice meeting, please visit our website at http://www.haringey.gov.uk/index/housing_and_planning/planning-mainpage/applications.htm to complete the form, submit your fee and book a pre-application meeting.

Please provide us with as much of the following information as you can when you submit your request, or at least 5 working days before your appointment:

- 1:1250 site location plan
- Photographs of the site and surroundings
- Drawings of your proposal
- Any other relevant information that you want the Council to consider in support of your proposal

This information should be sent to planningcustomer@haringey.gov.uk along with a meeting reference number that was given to your when you booked your appointment. Appointments can also be booked through our customer services phone line on 0208 489 1000. Please note if the information is not received in time, you will not receive full feedback at the meeting.

If you have received an Enforcement Notice on work carried out on your property, you can also use our Pre-Application advice service to receive advice on a retrospective planning application, or on carrying out remedial works.

Non- Householder/ Commercial proposals and residential developments

To request a Pre-Application Planning Advice meeting, please download the request form from our website [link], fill it out and send it to us via post or email. You should include the following information through our online webform:

- 1:1250 site location plan
- Photographs of the site and surroundings
- Drawings of your proposal
- Any other relevant information that you want the Council to consider in support of your proposal

Email: planningcustomercare@haringey.gov.uk alongside a meeting reference number which was given to you.

Disclaimer

Please be aware that although Pre-Application Planning Advice that has been given to an applicant will be taken into account if a subsequent planning application is made, any advice given is not legally binding upon the Local Planning Authority and does not constitute a formal decision.

What we need to see/know before the meeting for non householder/commercial schemes

This is not an exhaustive list but should be a good basis of what information we will need to see to help us provide you with the best advice. We will aim to inform you if we require anything else more specific. The more information you can provide us with the more comprehensive our advice will be. If the documents below are relevant to your application you must ensure that we receive them 5 working days before the pre-application meeting to give officers enough time to have a thorough look through.

Ownership

- We need clarification of the applicant's status regarding the ownership of the land within the site covered by the application.

The existing site or building

- A plan showing the existing site area, existing buildings and other features, for example the location of trees.
- Details you may have of the existing floor space broken down by how it is used at the moment.
- Visual materials that will help us understand the existing site or photographs, models etc.

Your proposal

- A full description of your proposal, including where this has been designed, details of the floor space broken down to show how it will be used. For larger residential developments this should include the breakdown of affordable and private housing proposed, if any.
- Drawings, sketches, photographs or models of the proposal. These need to include floor plans, elevations, adjacent buildings, access, servicing, parking arrangements, means of escape and the initial architectural approach and materials to be used.

Planning Obligations/CIL

- Larger planning applications often need to be accompanied by a legal agreement that restricts or regulates the development or use of land (known as a Section 106 agreement). We look to agree the draft legal agreement in advance of the Planning Sub Committee meeting in order to avoid delay in issuing of the planning permission. Any

costs associated with the S106 agreement will be charged to the applicant.

- The Council has produced a Supplementary Planning Obligations SPD adopted on 14 October 2014. You are advised to read this to see the range of issues which are likely to prompt the need for such a document before you prepare your proposal. We will, as part of the pre-application service, give more detailed guidance as to the effect of these on your particular proposal.
- CIL- Both Haringey CIL and Mayoral CIL are payable on development which creates new additional floor space of more than 100 sq metres. To determine whether an application is CIL Liable, please fill in the CIL Liable Form. More information is available on the website and advice will be provided at the meeting.

Fee

You will need to pay for the meeting before attending your appointment. Payments can be made through our website via debit or credit card.

Please note that we do not provide automatic refunds if you cancel your meeting. If a meeting is cancelled by Haringey staff, we will try to reschedule the meeting as soon possible, or offer a refund.

At the meeting - what will be discussed?

Planning officers in Haringey have unique knowledge of how local and national planning policies could have an impact on your development. Matters that may be discussed at the PAPA could include:

1. Principle of development - Land Use

- If the site is covered by specific policies in the Haringey Local Plan or other designations or safeguards to determine if the proposals correspond with the "site allocation or any site specific or area designations in our Local Plan? If so, is there a reason why these should not be followed or set aside?
- If the Council's plans or policies require specific elements or matters to be considered for the type of development proposed – and how your proposals have engaged with these requirements.

2. Does the proposal lead to any significant and overwhelming impacts that render the principle of development unacceptable. Consultation

- The extent to which your proposals have been informed by any community consultation (See the Council's statement of Community Involvement)
- Any feedback secured to date from any Stakeholders and Statutory Consultees
- Formal channels for scheme review such as the Quality review Panel, Area Forums and member Pre-application engagement.

3. Design

We will consider the extent to which the development addresses the requirements of the Council's development Quality Charter. In addition to the Quality Charter, this will include specific considerations around:

• Built form	• Architecture
• Scale	• Materials
• Historic development	• Environmental Impact
• Archaeology	• Impact on strategic views
• Street patterns	
• Massing	

4. Housing Policies

If the proposal triggers a requirement for affordable housing, we can advise as to the level and tenure required.

5. Amenity

The likely impact on nearby residents such as loss of daylight, privacy or noise disturbance and the need for any specific studies to accompany your application.

6. Heritage

- The impact your proposal may have on any listed building or, if within a conservation area, whether the development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of that conservation area
- The impacts on other heritage assets such as historic Parks or Gardens
- Whether there are any archaeological implications in your proposal

7. Natural environment

How your proposal will affect the ecology or biodiversity in the area or the otherwise harm the beneficial use of open space.

8. Transportation

The transport impacts of the development (if any) and proposals for mitigation and management of travel demand.

9. Planning Obligations/CIL liability

Issues which are likely to be subject to a Section 106 legal agreement and the timescale for providing the agreement for signing. Applicants will be asked to provide information on the proposed heads of terms, details of the owner's title to the land/any third party interest in the land.

10. Process

Next steps for the application, need for further pre-application meetings or planning submission process including details of any specific studies or plans that may be required to support your proposal.

After the Meeting


Following the meeting we will write to you within 10 working days, with a summary of the Council's conclusions in respect of the merits of the scheme (using a traffic light system) and advice or recommendations in respect of your proposal that you may need to address prior to submission. If during or following the meeting, new information or issues arise an extended timescale may be agreed.

Further Information


For more information on the Council pre-application services, please see our website or contact our customer services team on 0208 489 1000.

Complaints

The Planning and Building Control Service is constantly striving to improve the quality of the services that we provide. Should you be unhappy with the service that you have received or wish to raise any other issues in respect of the Council pre-application advice service please write to Emma Williamson, at emma.williamson@haringey.gov.uk

**Flow Diagram of the PAPA process
HOUSEHOLDERS**

**Flow Diagram of the PAPA process
NON HOUSEHOLDERS (Commercial or
residential developments)**





Haringey Council

Report for:	Cabinet	Item Number:	
Title:	Review of Fees and Charges 2015-16		
Report Authorised by:	Kevin Bartle – Assistant Director of Finance (CFO)		
Lead Officer:	Neville Murton (020 8489 3176) <u>neville.murton@haringey.gov.uk</u>		
Ward(s) affected: ALL	Report for Key/Non Key Decisions: KEY		

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1. The Council's income policy requires an annual review of the level of the Fees and Charges levied upon service users with a view to ensuring that income is maximised commensurate with the full recovery of costs.
- 1.2. This report considers the relevant factors affecting the review of fees and charges, identifies those services where an increase is being proposed and seeks:
 - Approval to increase the fee or charge rate to those services where an increase is proposed, subject to Equalities Impact Assessments being undertaken, as set out in paragraph 10; and,
 - Agreement to where an alternative approach is being proposed.

2. Cabinet Member introduction from Councillor Jason Arthur, Cabinet Member for Resources and Culture

- 2.1. It is important that, as part of our on-going financial planning, we comply with the Council's policy to annually review our fees and charges taking account of issues such as the general economic climate and the Council's overall financial position.



- 2.2. Taking all relevant factors into account I believe that a general increase in fees and charges of 2.3% as proposed in this report is appropriate and that, for those services where an alternative approach has been proposed, these are also reasonable. I therefore commend this report to the Cabinet.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1. The Cabinet is asked to approve:
- (i) a general increase of 2.3% be applied to Fees and Charges levied by the Council with effect from 1 April 2015;
 - (ii) the approach for those services set out in this report where a different rate other than the general increase is proposed;
 - (iii) that final decisions on (i) and (ii) above are delegated to the respective Assistant Directors in respect of their services following completion and consideration of equality impact assessments where this is appropriate; and,
 - (iv) that the estimated additional income arising from the increases in Fees and Charges as set out in this report amounting to c£240k be reflected within the Council's 2015-16 budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy documents.

4. Alternative options considered

- 4.1. This report proposes a range of alternative approaches dependent on particular services and relevant factors. As such a range of alternative options ranging from no increase to differentiated rates of inflationary increases have been considered and reflected in this report.

5. Background information

- 5.1. At its meeting of 21 December 2010 the Cabinet resolved, amongst other things, to adopt an updated policy in relation to external income. This confirmed a number of relevant issues including that:
- Service managers should review the level of fees and charges annually as part of the financial and business planning process;
 - Charges should generally increase by RPI as a minimum and also seek to maximise allowable income;
 - A full list of proposed charges should be presented to Cabinet by the end of March each year.
- 5.2. This report meets the requirements of the Council's external income policy for the 2015-16 financial year and as such contains details of the current and proposed levels of fees and charges to take effect as set out during that year.



Haringey Council

- 5.3. The government's inflationary target remains at 2%. Annual average inflation during 2012 and 2013 was 3.22% and 3.05% respectively. During 2014 annual inflation (i.e. the 12 month rolling level of inflation) has generally fallen still further as indicated in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Annual RPI Inflation Jan. to Dec. 2014

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2.8%	2.7%	2.5%	2.5%	2.4%	2.6%	2.5%	2.4%	2.3%	2.3%	2.0%	1.6%

Average Jan to Dec 2014 = 2.38%

- 5.4. A comparison of independent (i.e. non-governmental) forecast of inflation in August 2014 suggested average inflation of 2.6% in 2014 and 3.3% in 2015 suggesting a return to higher average inflation over the course of 2015. The current impact of suppressed oil prices is a significant component in determining short term inflationary movement.
- 5.5. Given the inflationary risks that still remain, it is proposed to apply a general level of increase in Fees and Charges of 2.3% which is consistent with the average annual position, and reflects the current downward trend in RPI post the August analysis but also tends to disregard the recent impact of oil price falls (which have fallen steeply since June 2014) on the indices post October 2014.

6. Service Specific information

- 6.1. The Appendices 1 – 12 detail all of the fees and charges proposed for increase; showing the 2014-15 rate, the proposed 2015-16 rate and the inflationary uplift applied.
- 6.2. These have been prepared on the basis of a 2.3% increase, either by individual charge or as an average across the service as a whole. The next section 'Comments of the Chief Financial (Section 151) Officer and Financial Implications' sets out those areas where exceptions to the general increase have been considered, or to reflect a previously agreed approach, or are subject to statutory provisions.

7. Exceptions

- 7.1. Within certain services there are a small number of fees and charges where any increase is determined by the Government and cannot be changed by law e.g. the cost of marriage and civil partnership ceremonies. These have been annotated within the relevant appendices.
- 7.2. A number of fees and charges cannot be set by the Cabinet. Regulation 2(6) of the Local Authorities (Functions and responsibilities)(England) Regulations 2000 provides that charges for certain approvals, consents, permits and licenses (e.g. licensing/planning/consent under the highways Act 1980) may not be made by the



Haringey Council

Executive (Cabinet). These fees are set by the Council's Regulatory Committee and a separate report will be prepared for that committee before the start of the financial year.

7.3 Libraries & Culture

- 7.3.1 The service are proposing an overall average increase of 4.9%. The proposed changes reflect the service's intent to revise reservations service charges in response to customer feedback, particularly for items already in stock; to limit 5p increases for reasons of cash handling and that charges were last revised in 2012.

7.4 Waste

- 7.4.1 The service are proposing an average 4% increase across all services due to escalating disposal charges and to break-even on the provision of commercial services. A few charges have been limited to contractual RPIX inflation increase only to encourage recycling over refuse.

7.5 Parks Events

- 7.5.1 No increase is proposed for Parks Events as a major redesign of fees and charges came into effect in January 2014. These were a significant uplift in many cases for commercial rates and a reduction for community events. Therefore the proposal for 2015 is to hold the current fees.

7.6 Adult Learning

- 7.6.1 All Adult Skills Budget (ASB) courses are free to the unemployed however, non-eligible learners are only funded at 50% with the funders assumption is that the remaining 50% is collected as fees by the provider. Whilst the exact fee will vary according to the accreditation approved by the funder the proposals is to charge the 50%. The proposal around ESOL courses is to increase the charge from £1 to £2 per hour with some £1 concessions. This is dramatically lower than all local providers. Literacy and Maths courses remain free to everyone.

7.7 Traffic Management

- 7.7.1 Overall charges are increasing by an average of 5% with the majority of the fee changes directly associated with savings proposals presented to Members in December and which form part of the overall medium term financial plan.

7.8 Registrars



Haringey Council

- 7.8.1 The Registrars service is proposing to make a number of changes to their charges either to align to those set statutorily or to better fit with the overall market as they are in competition with other boroughs / providers. This will see some prices increased above inflation, some not amended and some reduced with an average 3.9% being proposed. No overall increase to the budgeted income is proposed as the service are currently struggling to achieve existing targets. The proposals attached aim, as a minimum, to enable current income to be achieved whilst providing a comprehensive service.

7.9 Planning & Building Control

- 7.9.1 The Planning directorate is updating a number of fees and charges across the Pre-application planning advice service and Building Control services, to more effectively recover the costs of running the service. Some new services have been proposed, principally a paid householder pre-application service and a Quality Review Panel. The service will retain the provision of basic free advice made by way of written enquiries. This would generally be by signposting them to information, encouraging them to submit applications for a Certificate of Lawful Development or providing retrospective advice where planning enforcement action is proposed. The Customer Service Centre will provide a telephone service for general enquiries and the Council's website will provide basic general pre-application advice with links to off site national planning resources such as the interactive house on the Planning Portal. The proposed changes were agreed by Regulatory Committee on 15 January 2015, and further details of the broader policy change are to be included in a separate report to March meeting of this Committee.

8. Comments of the Chief Finance Officer and financial implications

- 8.1. The estimated financial effect arising from the implementation of the 2015-16 Fees and Charges rates, as set out in this report is an increase in income budgets amounting to £243k.
- 8.2. There are a number of areas where the service is advising that it has been unable to meet its current budgeted income level. For these areas there are two options available; either:
- Fee levels could be increased without a commensurate increase in the level of the income budget; this would seem to be justified if the effect on **demand** from a fee increase is considered to be unaffected. In this case a fee increase could be applied which might have the effect of making the current budget level more achievable; or
 - If the level of fees is discouraging demand then an increase in fees would tend to worsen the achievement of income. In this case an increase in fees would appear to be counterproductive.
- In either case a decision to not increase the service's income target would be neutral on the overall budget position.



Haringey Council

9. Comments of the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance and legal implications

- 9.1. Certain fees for services provided by local authorities are set out in the parent legislation or in regulations made under the parent legislation. In such instances the Council has no discretion as to the level of the charge.
- 9.2. In addition, section 93 Local Government Act 2003 permits local authorities to charge for discretionary services, provided that there is no alternative power allowing the local authority to charge and provided that there is nothing in the parent legislation preventing the local authority from charging for these discretionary services. Where the Council charges for such discretionary services, it has a duty to secure that, taking one financial year with another, the income from charges does not exceed the costs of provision. Section 93 permits the Council to charge only some persons for providing the discretionary service and also permits the Council to charge different persons different amounts for providing a service.
- 9.3. In reviewing fees and charges, services need to demonstrate that they have had due regard to the overarching Public Sector Equality Duty as set out in the Equality Act 2010. Services need to demonstrate that they have considered whether an equalities impact assessment should be carried out and undertake such an assessment if found to be necessary.
- 9.4. Certain fees may not be set by the Cabinet. Regulation 2 (6) of the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 provides that decisions on certain approvals, consents permits and licenses (for example premises licences; licenses for street trading) cannot be made by the Executive (Cabinet). Likewise, charges for such approvals, consents permits and licenses may not be made by the Cabinet. These fees will be set by the Regulatory Committee.

10. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments

- 10.1. It has been agreed that Managers will do an initial assessment of the charges within their services to determine if they have a high, medium or low equalities impact.
- 10.2. All of the fees and charges that have been identified as low impact will require screening. Where a fee or charge has been increased as a result of a statutory requirement, we have decided not to do a full equality impact assessment, as the authority has no control over the increase. The charges and fees identified as medium will be subject to either a screening or full equality impact assessment, dependant upon whether the impact is disproportionate on service users or on any one of the protected groups. All fees and charges that have been assessed as having a high impact will be subject to a full equality impact assessment.

11. Head of Procurement Comments



Haringey Council

Not applicable

12. Policy Implication

- 12.1. The Council's income policy requires that an annual review takes place and this report together and, where relevant, The Regulatory Committee report, meets that policy obligation.

13. Reasons for Decision

- 13.1. It is a requirement to review Fees and Charges annually. The financial position that the Council finds itself in supports the view that levels of fees and charges should be maximised taking into account all relevant factors including the effect on service users and any consequent demand for services.

14. Use of Appendices

Appendix 1	Children's Centres
Appendix 2	Libraries & Culture
Appendix 3	Neighbourhood Action – Waste Collection
Appendix 4	Parks
Appendix 5	Parks Events
Appendix 6	Adult Learning (HALs)
Appendix 7	Asset Management
Appendix 8	Regulatory Services (excl. Licenses etc. set by Reg. Committee)
Appendix 9	Traffic Management
Appendix 10	Adult Services
Appendix 11	Registrars
Appendix 12	Building Control & Planning

15. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX 1

Childcare fees for Childrens Centres
run by the Council

Description Charge	Current Charge (£)	Proposed Charge (£)	% Change
Haringey Residents			
Age range			
Under 2s	£ 225.00	£ 230.18	2.3%
2-3 year olds	£ 200.00	£ 204.60	2.3%
3+ year olds	£ 175.00	£ 179.03	2.3%
Out of Borough Residents			
Age range			
Under 2s	£ 300.00	£ 306.90	2.3%
2-3 year olds	£ 223.00	£ 228.13	2.3%
3+ year olds	£ 175.00	£ 179.03	2.3%
* All charges shown are weekly (vat not chargeable)			
Average			2.3%

LIBRARY SERVICES	Current charge	Proposed charge	Increase
Reservations (items already in stock)	£1.10	£0.70	-36.4%
Reservations (items not in stock)	£1.10	£1.50	36.4%
Reservations (over 60s)	£0.55		
Overdue books – per item per day (except DVDs).	£0.20	£0.22	10.0%
Overdue books – per item per day (except DVDs). Over 60s.	£0.10	£0.11	10.0%
Maximum overdue charge per item (except DVDs) – standard charge	£6.00	£6.60	10.0%
Maximum overdue charge per item (except DVDs) – Over 60s charge	£3.00	£3.30	10.0%
Lost ticket replacement	£2.00	£2.20	10.0%
Lost ticket replacement for over 60s and under 16s	£1.00	£1.10	10.0%
DVD/Blu-ray: Blockbuster per loan for two days	£3.00	£2.00	-33.3%
DVD/Blu-ray hire: films per loan for one week	£1.10	£1.20	9.1%
Multi DVDs (sets of 4 or more) per loan for one week	£3.30	£2.00	-39.4%
Music CD hire per loan for one week.	£0.55	£0.50	-9.1%
Music CD hire per loan for one week. Over 60s.	£0.25	£0.25	0.0%
Spoken Word (Talking Books) per loan for 3 weeks	£1.00	£1.00	0.0%
Small Ads per 3 weeks	£2.50	£3.00	20.0%
Lost or damaged items: Out of print books	£18.00 non-fiction	£18.50	2.8%
	£12.00 fiction	£12.40	3.3%
	£6.00 children's	£6.40	6.7%
Lost or damaged items: Out of production DVD/Blu-ray	£12.00	£12.40	3.3%
Photocopying charges	B&W A4 10p per sheet Colour A4 50p per sheet	B&W A4 10p per sheet Colour A4 50p per sheet	0.0%
Printing charges (from public network)	B&W A4 10p per sheet	B&W A4 15p per sheet	33.3%
	Colour A4 50p per sheet	Colour A4 50p per sheet	0.0%
FAX (per sheet)	Outgoing (UK) £1.00	£1.10	10.0%
	International £1.50	£1.60	6.7%
	Incoming £1.00	£1.10	10.0%

The proposed increases/decreases reflect the service's intent to revise reservations service charges in response to customer feedback, particularly for items already in stock; to limit 5p increases for reasons of cash handling and that charges were last revised in 2012

BRUCE CASTLE MUSEUM & ARCHIVES SERVICES	Current Charge	Proposed Charge	Increase
Room Hire			
1. Community rate	£140	£145	3.6%
2. Corporate rate	£280	£280	0.0%
3. Overtime	£60	£60	0.0%
Photocopying by Archive staff A4 B&W per page	£0.40	£0.40	0.0%
Photocopying by Archive staff A4 Colour per page	£1.50	£1.50	0.0%
Photocopying by Archive staff A3 B&W per page	£1.00	£1.00	0.0%
Photocopying by Archive staff A3 Colour per page	£3.00	£3.00	0.0%
Digital scan by Archive staff	£2.00	£2.50	20.0%
Provision of information on CD by Archive staff	£3.00	£3.50	16.7%
Minimum charge for remote orders and paying by cheque	£5.00	£6.00	20.0%
A4 microfilm printout from External Bureau	£0.45	£0.50	11.1%
A3 microfilm printout from External Bureau	£0.90	£1.00	11.1%
Camera licence fee (per day) - for personal phones/cameras used to take photos of documents	£5.00	£5.00	0.0%

AVERAGE INCREASE ACROSS CULTURE & LIBRARIES

Average

4.4%

NA Team - charges for commercial waste collection and bin hire

Refuse

Charge Description	Current charge	Proposed Charge	% Increase
Sack – refuse	£1.09	£1.35	24%
Heavy duty sack – refuse*	-	£1.60	0%
1100 litre bin – refuse	£15.40	£16.95	10%
660 litre bin – refuse	£9.24	£10.15	10%
360 litre bin – refuse	£5.28	£5.80	10%

Recycling

Charge Description	Current charge	Proposed Charge	% Increase
Sack – recycling	£0.83	£0.85	2.4%
Cardboard bundle tape	£0.83	£0.85	2.4%
1100 litre bin – recycling	£8.25	£8.45	2.4%
660 litre bin – recycling	£4.95	£5.05	2.0%
360 litre bin – recycling	£2.75	£2.80	1.8%

Charge Description	Current charge (WEEKLY)	Proposed Charge (WEEKLY)	% Increase
Bulk refuse bin hire	£2.68	£2.75	2.6%
Bulk recycling bin hire	£0.00	£0.00	0.00%

Fixed Penalty Notices

FPN Type	Current fine level in Haringey	Allowed Range	Discount for early payment	% Increase
Highways Act, 1980, various offences for example unauthorised marking of the highway, obstruction, skip offences	£100	Fixed - Government	£50	0.0%
EPA Section 87 littering	£75	£50-£80	£50 (not used)	6.7%
EPA Section 47 Receptacles for Commercial	£100	£75-£110	£60 (not used)	10.0%
CoPA Section 5 - Waste Carrier	£300	Fixed - Government	£180 (not used)	0.0%
EPA Section 34 - Fail Waste Transfer Note S34	£300	Fixed - Government	£180 (not used)	0.0%
Health Act Section 7 Smokefree Individual	£50	Fixed - Government	£30	0.0%
Health Act Section 6 Smokefree Signage	£200	Fixed - Government	£150	0.0%
LLA Section 34 Breach of St Trad. Licence	£100	Fixed - Government	£60	0.0%
LLA Section 38 Unlicensed Street Trading	£150	Fixed - Government	£90	0.0%

4.0%

ACTIVITY										Percentage Increase			
Parks Service Continued										Appendix 4 (b)			
Park Based Organised Exercise / personal training - 11-20 clients 2+ x sessions per week annual fee										15/16 Act 3			
Park Based Organised Exercise / personal training - 21-30 client 1 x session per week annual fee										14/15			
Park Based Organised Exercise / personal training - 21-30 client 2+ x sessions per week annual fee										15/16 Act 2			
Park Based Organised Exercise / personal training - 21-30 client 2+ x sessions per week annual fee										14/15			
Wolves Lane Nursery Cafe Area/Meeting Room per hour										15/16 Act 1			
Wolves Lane Classroom per hour										Proposed			
Parks Car Parking										Active 2			
Commercial Event Car Parking										Proposed			
Coach Parking										Active 3			
Car Parking as per Finsbury Park Signage										14/15			
In Borough Schools/Education Use										15/16 Act 2			
Tennis Courts - Schools per hr per ct										14/15			
Football										15/16 Act 1			
Activities not requiring a mark out										Proposed			
Rounders pitch initial markout										Active 1			
Rounders remark										14/15			
Rounders hire										15/16 Act 2			
Running Track Hire (100 m 6 lane)										14/15			
100m Track Remark										15/16 Act 1			
Running Track Hire (50m 6 lane)										Proposed			
50m Track Remark										Active 2			
Running Track Hire (200m 6 lane)										14/15			
200m Remark										15/16 Act 2			
Running Track Hire (400m 8 lane 100 m straight)										14/15			
400 m remark										15/16 Act 1			
Environmental activities/Forest School										Proposed			
Vat Inclusive Standard plus 2.3%										Active 1			
14/15 15/16 15/16 std										14/15 15/16 Act 2 14/15 15/16 Act 3			
Percentage Increase by Status Category										Std Act1 Act2 Act3			
Overall Percentage Increase										2.3% excluding new charges			

Sales of plants and other Nursery items to be increased to reflect Council inflationary increase of 2.3%

Active Club 1 – Is available to all clubs, church groups or community groups for all one off hires which are not commercial in nature.

Active Club 2 – Properly constituted Haringey sports clubs that book for more than 10 sessions in one go.

Active Club 3 – Externally accredited "Charter Standard" Haringey sports clubs that book for more than 10 sessions in one go.

Wolves Lane Nursery

Parks Events Current Charges

APPENDIX 5

ACTIVITY	No of attendees	Vat inclusive	Application fee	Booking fee	Operational day fee/basic hire fee	Extra event days	Grounds deposit	Environment impact fee	Percentage increase	Comments
Community & Charity										
Very Small	Up to 100		£25	£25	£25	£0	£0	£0	0.0%	
Small	Up to 500		£25	£25	£50	£0	£100	£0	0.0%	
Medium	Up to 2000		£50	£50	£100	£0	£300	£100	0.0%	
Finsbury Park - Medium	Up to 2000		£50	£50	£145	£0	£300	£100	0.0%	
Large	Up to 10000		£50	£50	£500	£0	£600	£300	0.0%	
Finsbury Park - Large	Up to 10000		£100	£500	£2,500	£0	£600	£1,000	0.0%	
Funfair and Circus										
Small	Up to 500		£120	£125	£400	£0	£1,000	£200	0.0%	
Medium	Up to 2000		£120	£500	£500	£0	£2,000	£500	0.0%	
Large	Over 2000		£120	£500	£700	£0	£3,000	£600	0.0%	
Finsbury Park - Large	Over 2000		£120	£500	£800	£0	£3,000	£750	0.0%	
Corporate Promotions / Roadshows / Media Events										
Small	Up to 1000		£120	£500	£1,250	£0	£500	£500	0.0%	
Medium	Up to 5000		£120	£1,250	£4,000	£0	£2,000	£1,000	0.0%	
Large	Up to 10000		£120	£2,500	£8,000	£0	£4,000	£2,000	0.0%	
Commercial Charity Fundraising (Rates apply where an entry fee is payable)										
Small	Up to 500		£120	£50	£125	£40	£100	£0	0.0%	
Medium	Up to 2000		£120	£100	£500	£150	£300	£500	0.0%	
Large	Up to 10000		£120	£500	£3,500	£1,050	£600	£1,000	0.0%	
Commercial Events										
Small	Up to 500		£120	£125	£1,250	£375	£250	£100	0.0%	
Medium	Up to 2000		£120	£1,250	£5,000	£1,500	£1,000	£400	0.0%	
Large	Up to 10000		£120	£2,500	£25,000	£7,500	£5,000	£2,000	0.0%	
Major	Up to 50000		£120	£6,000	£240,000	£72,000	£10,000	£10,000	0.0%	
Other costs				Core Cost	Setup / set down	Booking Fee	Ground Deposit			
Finsbury Park - Road closure per half day				£270					0.0%	
Event Signage per location per week				£25.00					0.0%	
Event / Promotional Banners per location per week				£50.00					0.0%	
Private Event - not open to the public - Non licensed				£75/sqm	50% per day	£ 120	£ 500		0.0%	
Private Event - not open to the public - Licensed				£150/sqm	50% per day	£ 240	£ 3,000		0.0%	
Markets - Maximum Stall Holder fee £120 / day				35% / stall rate	20% of event rate	£ 300	£ 2,000		0.0%	
Utilities Charged as per usage plus 10% management fee				Actual plus 10%					0.0%	
Disruption Charge as per reasonable costs for each event				By negotiation					0.0%	

Notes to charges

Application fee - This is an administered fee to process the application form. Non refundable.

Booking fee - This is the charge paid by the applicant once the event is approved in order to secure the date and venue.

Operational Day Fee - This fee is charged to hire the park or open space.

Basic site hire - This fee applies to commercial & commercial fundraising events to hire the park or open space.

NB Commercial events are charged from £2.50 – £4.80 per head, and corporate events are charged from £2.50 – £4.40 per head

Extra event days - This fee applies to commercial, commercial fundraising and corporate events

Charged at 30 per cent of the basic site hire fee and levied per day.

Setup /Setdown days - Charged at percentage of the basic site hire fee and levied per day.

50% for Community & charity, 10% for commercial charity, 2.5% for commercial & corporate events, 20% for funfairs

Grounds damage deposit - (refundable) Charged at Fixed Fee or basic fee (Corporate events charged at either 20% of total hire fee which is greater)

Environment impact fee - Charged at a basic fee - Non Refundable.

Description Charge		Old Charges (£)	New Charges (£)	% Change	Comments
Community Learning (ASL)					
CL: Arts		4.00	5.00	25.0%	Hourly Charge: Note courses also accrue materials costs: this will vary according to the course.
CL: Languages short course		4.00	5.00	25.0%	Hourly charge
CL: Languages long course		4.00	5.00	25.0%	Hourly charge
CL: Wellbeing		4.00	5.00	25.0%	Hourly Charge:
CL: Creative media and digital tech		4.00	5.00	25.0%	Hourly Charge:
CL: Microsoft Applications for Beginners		4.00	5.00	25.0%	Hourly Charge:
Adult Skills Budget (ASB)					All ASB courses are free to the unemployed. Non-eligible learners are only funded at 50% by the SFA. The funders assumption is that the remaining 50% is collected as fees by the provider. The exact fee will vary according to the accreditation approved by the funder. HALS is therefore seeking permission to charge the 50% of the generated funds as the funder expects. Some courses will see a very small change, others now have significantly higher guided learning hours attached and fees will be far higher. The courses shown are as examples only, the exact curriculum and approved accreditation can be subject to funding change, for instance some provision offered in the past is no longer funded.
ASB: Counselling - Short		164.00	170.00	3.7%	
ASB: Counselling Long		497.00	515.00	3.6%	
ASB: Business Skills (SAGE/Bookkeeping)		150.00	230.00	53.3%	
ASB: ESOL		2.00	4.00	100.0%	
Average Uplift				31.1%	ESOL courses have been charged @ £2 per hour with some £1 concessions. This is dramatically lower than all local providers and the service has used fees to subsidise however the 50% must apply Literacy and Maths courses remain free to everyone.

APPENDIX 7

Asset Management	Current Charge	Proposed Charge	Comments
Ad Hoc Fees for professional Valuation Services	£48 (per hour)	£49.10	2.3% inflation added and rounded on all charges.
Staff Car Parking	£309	£316.20	
Facilities Management (FM) Services to external tenants (Business charges)			
Room Hire – Civic Centre / River Park House	£22 - £80 per hour dependent upon requirements.	£22.50 - £81.80 per hour dependent upon requirements.	NB The £7 base charge was not increased last year
Hall Hire – Woodside House:	£47 - £70 per hour	£48.10 - £71.60 per hour	
Hornsey Town Hall Rooms			
- Day Rate (Commercial)	£600.00	£613.80	
- Day Rate (Community)	£300.00	£306.90	
- Day Rate (Town Hall Square)	£100.00	£102.30	
Neighbourhood Resource Centre	£7-£29 per hour	£7.20-£30.70 per hour	

Regulatory Services	Current Charge	Proposed Charge	% Increase
	£	£	
Pest Control			
Domestic Treatment for Rats	116.00	118.70	2.3%
Commercial Per treatment for rats	174.00	178.00	2.3%
Concession Per treatment for rats	32.00	32.75	2.4%
Domestic Per treatment for mice	116.00	118.70	2.3%
Commercial Per treatment for mice	172.00	176.00	2.3%
Concession Per treatment for mice	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Wasps - Domestic one nest	93.00	95.15	2.3%
Wasps - Domestic per additional nest	39.00	39.90	2.3%
Wasps - Commercial Ladders not required One nest	199.00	203.60	2.3%
Wasps - Commercial Ladders required One nest			
Wasps - Commercial per additional nest	39.00	39.90	2.3%
Wasps - Concession	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Cockroaches - Domestic (Course of 3 Treatments)	174.00	178.00	2.3%
Cockroaches - Commercial	247.00	252.70	2.3%
Cockroaches - Concession	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Fleas - Domestic	116.00	118.70	2.3%
Fleas - Commercial	252.00	257.80	2.3%
Fleas - Concession	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Pharaoh's Ants - Domestic (single dwelling)	126.00	128.90	2.3%
Pharaoh's Ants - Commercial	126.00	128.90	2.3%
Pharaoh's Ants - Concession	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Bed bugs - Domestic	228.00	233.25	2.3%
Bed bugs - Commercial	249.00	254.75	2.3%
Bed bugs - concession	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Stored Product Pests - Domestic	126.00	128.90	2.3%
Stored Product Pests - Commercial	P.O.A	P.O.A	
Stored Product Pests - Concessions	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Pigeons - All clients Treatment and/or proofing	n/a	n/a	
Squirrels - Domestic	126.00	128.90	2.3%
Squirrels - Commercial	126.00	128.90	2.3%
Squirrels - Concessions	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Other Pests - Domestic	126.00	128.90	2.3%
Other Pests - Commercial	P.O.A		
Other Pests Concession	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Missed visit and additional visit charge			
Domestic	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Commercial	32.00	32.75	2.3%
Concession	19.00	19.45	2.4%
Drain Examinations Per examination (unless cases of formal action or involving rodent infestation) excluding use of closed circuit TV inspection.	158.00	161.65	2.3%
Domestic	252.00	257.80	2.3%
Commercial	229.00	234.30	2.3%

Regulatory Services	Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	% Increase
Regulatory Services . . Continued			APPENDIX 8 (b)
Not for profit charges			
Rodent control. Per treatment for rats and mice	118.00	123.90	5.0%
Wasps One nest	133.00	139.65	5.0%
Per additional nest	36.00	37.80	5.0%
Cockroaches (Quotes Available)	170.00	178.50	5.0%
Fleas (Quotes Available)	144.00	151.20	5.0%
Pharaoh's Ants	133.00	139.65	5.0%
Bed Bugs (Quotes Available)	191.00	200.55	5.0%
Stored Product Pests	P.O.A	P.O.A	
Pigeons	P.O.A	P.O.A	
Not for Profit Squirrels	118.00	123.90	5.0%
Not for Profit Other Pests	P.O.A	P.O.A	
Missed visit and additional visit charge	29.00	30.45	5.0%
Drain Examinations Per examination (unless cases of formal action or involving rodent infestation) excluding use of closed circuit TV inspection	171.00	179.55	5.0%
Mortuary			
Reception of Bodies from Other Authorities			
(A) For Post Mortem Examination (PME) assistance and retention (a) Reception between 08:00 and 16:00 Mon to Fri	252.00	257.80	2.3%
(b) Reception outside times in (a) above	349.00	357.00	2.3%
(c) Additional charge to (a) or (b) Special Post Mortem Examination	579.00	592.35	2.3%
(d) Additional Charges for 2nd or subsequent Post Mortem	471.00	481.85	2.3%
(B) For retention of bodies with no PME assistance (a) Reception between 08:00 and 16:00 Mon to Fri	79.00	80.85	2.3%
(b) Reception outside times in (a) above	117.00	119.70	2.3%
For retention of bodies for National Assistance Burials beyond date of referral to Authority concerned. (Per week or part thereof)	91.00	93.10	2.3%
Charge for visit of Police Officers for Street Duty Awareness Training (including necessary protective clothing)	18.00	18.45	2.5%
ESTABLISHMENT CHARGE (Percentage of cost of works unless other stated)			
1.For works in default of owner following failure to comply with legislative requirements	30% + VAT	30% + VAT	0.0%
2. For works by agreement	20% + VAT	20% + VAT	0.0%
3. For arrangement of Burials or Cremations	30% + VAT	30% + VAT	0.0%
4. Supervision of works only	30% of cost of work	30% of cost of work	0.0%
5. Application for consent to the operation of a loudspeaker in contravention of Section 62 (1) of the Control of Pollution Act 1974	183.00	187.25	2.3%
OFFICER TIME – reports, consultations and investigations			
Minimum charge for up to 2 hours	138.00	141.20	2.3%
Charge per hour after first 2 hours	69.00	70.60	2.3%
Health Education Training			
Level 2 Award in Food Safety in Catering (per person per course)	61.00	62.40	2.3%
Health Certificates (no vat applicable)			
Food - one Copy	124.00	126.85	2.3%
Sampling requiring analysis	No Change		

Regulatory Services	Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	% Increase
Regulatory Services . . Continued			APPENDIX 8 (c)
Movements of bodies			
Certification for sealing of coffins for dispatch overseas - first two hours	134.00	137.10	2.3%
Plus per hours thereafter Freedom from Infection Certificate for movement of bodies outside UK	81.00	82.86	2.3%
Private Water Supplies			
Risk assessment minimum charge for up to 2 hours	134.00	137.10	2.3%
Risk Assessment each additional hour	68.00	69.60	2.4%
Authorisation	100.00	100.00	0.0%
Investigation -	100.00	100.00	0.0%
Sampling Visits:			
Sample taken under S.10 routine compliance	25.00	25.00	0.0%
Sample Analysis - check Monitoring	100.00	100.00	0.0%
Sample Analysis -Audit monitoring	500.00	500.00	0.0%
Contaminated land			
Application for information in respect of potentially contaminated sites.	65.00	66.50	2.3%
Copy of documents and files.	Price on application	Price on application	
(*) ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITTING (all fees are statutory and are due to be increased in April)			
Application Fees			
Standard process	1579	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Additional fee for operating without a permit	1137	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
reduced fee activity (except VRs)	148	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
PVR1&11 combined	246	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
vehicle refinishers (VRs)	346	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
reduced fee activity: Additional fee for operating without a permit	68	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
mobile screening and crushing plant	1579	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
for the 3rd to 7th applications	943	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
for the 8th and subsequent apps	477	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Where an application for any of the above is for a combined Part B and waste application, add an extra £297 to the above amounts		Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Annual Subsistence charge	739 (+99)*	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Standard process low	1111(+149)*	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
standard process medium	1672(+198)*	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Standard process high	76/151/227	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
reduced fee activities L/M/H	108/216/326	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
PVR1&11 combined Med component	218/349/524	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
vehicle refinishers L/M/H	618/989/1484	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Mobile screening and crushing plant for 1st and 2nd permits L/M/H	368/590/884	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
for the 3rd-7th permit L/m/H	189/302/453	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
8th-subsequent permits L/M/H	189/302/453	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Late payment fee (NEW)	£50	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
* the additional amounts in brackets must be charged where a permit is for a combined Part B and waste installation			
Where a Part B installation is subject to reporting under the E-PRTR Regulation, add an extra £99 to the above amounts			

Regulatory Services	Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	% Increase
Regulatory Services . . Continued			APPENDIX 8 (d)
Transfer and Surrender			
Standard process transfer	162	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Standard process partial transfer	476	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
New operator at low risk reduced fee activity	75	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Surrender: all Part B activities	0	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Reduced fee activities: transfer	0	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Reduced Fee Activities: partial transfer	0		
Temporary transfer for mobiles	45	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
first transfer			
repeat transfer	51	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
repeat following enforcement or warning	10	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Substantial Change	51	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Standard process	1005	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Standard process where the substantial change results in a new PPC activity	1579	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
Reduced fee activities	98	Not Set by Defra yet	Fees to be known by April 2015
LAPPC Mobile Plant charges (NEW)			
Number of permits	Application Fee 2015-16	Subsistence Fee 2015/16	
		Low	Medium
1	1579	618	989
2	1579	618	989
3	943	368	590
4	943	368	590
5	943	368	590
6	943	368	590
7	943	368	590
8 and over	477	189	302

High

1484

1484

884

884

884

884

884

453

Sustainable Transport

<i>Description Charge</i>		<i>Current charges 14-15</i>	<i>Proposed charges (15-16)</i>	<i>% Change</i>
Resident Visitor Permits				
1 Hour residents standard		0.30	0.30	0.0%
2 Hour residents standard		0.60	0.65	8.3% *
Daily resident standard		3.20	3.40	6.3%
Weekend permit standard		7.90	8.30	5.1%
2 Week permit standard		12.80	13.40	4.7%
1 Hour residents concessionary		0.20	0.20	0.0%
2 Hour residents concessionary		0.30	0.30	0.0%
Daily resident concessionary		1.50	1.60	6.7% *
Weekend permit concessionary		3.40	3.60	5.9%
2 Week permit concessionary		6.40	6.70	4.7%
Traders Permits per day charge		7.40	7.80	5.4%
Traders Permits monthly		132.70	139.30	5.0%
Business Permit		254.60	267.30	5.0%
Car Club Permit		127.30	133.70	5.0%
Doctors Permit		254.60	267.30	5.0%
Resident Permits				
CO2 based				
1st resident permits				
Up to 100 CO2 g/km - including electric vehicles)		21.20	22.30	5.2%
101-150 CO2 g/km		53.00	55.70	5.1%
151-185 CO2 g/km		106.10	111.40	5.0%
186 CO2 g/km and over		159.10	167.10	5.0%
2nd and further vehicles				
Up to 100 CO2 g/km - including electric vehicles)		21.20	22.30	5.2%
101-150 CO2 g/km		84.90	89.10	4.9%
151-185 CO2 g/km		137.90	144.80	5.0%
186 CO2 g/km and over		212.20	222.80	5.0%
Engine Size based pre 23rd March 2001				
1549cc or less		53.00	55.70	5.1%
1550cc to 3000cc		106.10	111.40	5.0%
3001cc and above		159.10	167.10	5.0%
2nd and further vehicles				
1549cc or less		84.90	89.10	4.9%
1550cc to 3000cc		137.90	144.80	5.0%
3001cc and above		212.20	222.80	5.0%
Spurs Day Resident Permit		Free	20.00	New
Spurs event day visitor permit		2.00	2.10	5.0%

Description Charge		Current charges 14-15	Proposed charges (15-16)	% Change
Administration Fee for changes/reissue		10.60	11.10	APPENDIX 9 (b) 4.7%
Monthly residents		21.20	22.30	5.2%
Courtesy car residents		21.20	22.30	5.2%
Companion Badge		21.20	22.30	5.2%
Car Park Season Ticket 4 sites		226.00	237.30	5.0%
Car Park Season Ticket 4 sites		135.80	142.60	5.0%
Highway Licences				
Scaffolding (Includes Site Inspection Fee)		344.80	362.00	5.0%
Revisit Fee - per visit		31.80	33.40	5.0%
Emergency Inspection		74.30	78.00	5.0%
Hoarding (Includes Site Inspection Fee)		344.80	362.00	5.0%
Revisit Fee - per visit		31.80	33.40	5.0%
Emergency Inspection		74.30	78.00	5.0%
Container (£80.00 per week for storage on carriageway)		159.10	167.10	5.0%
Revisit Fee - per visit		31.80	33.40	5.0%
Mobile Crane (includes £60.00 Inspection fee)		381.90	401.00	5.0%
Revisit Fee - per visit		31.80	33.40	5.0%
Oversail Crane		583.50	612.70	5.0%
Revisit Fee - per visit		31.80	33.40	5.0%
Access Bar markings (white lines)		180.40	189.40	5.0%
Crossovers - Inspection/Estimate Fee		265.20	278.50	5.0%
T/TMO's		3182.70	3341.80	5.0%
Emergency TMO		257.50	257.50	0.0%
Suspensions - Admin charge		74.30	78.00	5.0%
per bay per day charge		16.00	16.80	5.0%
per				
Skip Licence		74.30	78.00	5.0%
Materials Licence		74.30	78.00	5.0%
Combined Skip/Materials Licence		84.90	89.10	4.9%

Description Charge		Current charges 14-15	Proposed charges (15-16)	% Change
Pay & Display CPZ/ Stop & Shop	Low	1.20	1.30	8.3%
	Medium	1.90	2.10	10.5%
	High	3.00	3.30	10.0%
Car Parks	Up to 1hr	1.10	1.20	9.1%
	1 - 3hrs	2.10	2.30	9.5%
	3 - 4hrs	6.40	7.00	9.4%
Garman Rd	Up to 1hr	0.80	0.90	12.5%
	1 - 3hrs	2.00	2.20	10.0%
	3 - 4hrs	3.00	3.30	10.0%
Bury Road Car Park	All day	2.00	2.20	10.0%
	Sunday	1.00	1.10	10.0%
	Quarterly	60.00	66.00	10.0%
	Yearly	238.00	261.80	10.0%
Spurs Event Day Tarriff		10.00	10.50	5.0%

The following charges apply to this service, but are set by other statutory bodies.

Street Works charges (all regulated charges set by legislation)		Current charges 14-15	Proposed charges (15-16)	% Change
Immediate works permit (non traffic sensitive streets)		40.00	40.00	0.00
Immediate works permit (traffic sensitive streets)		60.00	60.00	0.00
Minor works permit (non traffic sensitive streets)		45.00	45.00	0.00
Minor works permit (traffic sensitive streets)		60.00	60.00	0.00
Standard works permit (non traffic sensitive streets)		75.00	75.00	0.00
Standard works permit (traffic sensitive streets)		130.00	130.00	0.00
Major Works permit (non traffic sensitive streets)		225.00	225.00	0.00
Major Works permit (traffic sensitive streets)		345.00	345.00	0.00
Permit variation (non traffic sensitive streets)		35.00	35.00	0.00
Permit variation (traffic sensitive streets)		45.00	45.00	0.00
Sample inspections		50.00	50.00	0.00
Defect inspections		47.50	47.50	0.00
Fixed penalty notices (regulation 20, and section 74, 70)		80/120	80/120	
Fixed penalty notices (regulation 19)		300/500	300/500	
Penalty Charge Notices				
Serious contraventions				
PCN		130.00	130.00	0.00
if paid within 14 days		65.00	65.00	0.00
Less serious contraventions				
PCN		80.00	80.00	0.00
if paid within 14 days		40.00	40.00	0.00
Contravention Bus Lane & Moving traffic		130.00	130.00	0.00
if paid within 14 days		65.00	65.00	0.00
vehicle release (following removal)		200.00	200.00	0.00
storage		40	40	0
Blue Badge				
Administration Charge		10.00	10.00	0

Cost Centre	Service	Service type	Charge period	14/15 charge	Up-lift	Proposed 15/16 Charge
S11106	Emergency Response	Monitoring Only	Per Week	£3.61	2.30%	£3.69
S11106	Emergency Response	Monitoring & Visiting	Per week	£6.14	2.30%	£6.28
S14210	Osborne Grove Nursing Home	Nursing Care	Per week	£1,084.00	2.30%	£1,108.93
S52401	Linden Residential Home	Residential Care	Per week	990.4	2.30%	£1,013.18
S51200	Winkfield Resource Centre	Drop-in	Per Session	£50.00	2.30%	£51.15
S51200	Winkfield Resource Centre	Day Care	Per Session	£40.00	2.30%	£40.92
S53200	Clarendon Day Centre	Day Care	Per Session	£40.00	2.30%	£40.92
S14106	Haynes Day Centre	Day Care	Per Session	£40.00	2.30%	£40.92
S14102	Grange Day Centre	Day Care	Per Session	£40.00	2.30%	£40.92
S14101	Haven Day Centre	Day Care	Per Session	£40.00	2.30%	£40.92
S12500	Meals on Wheels	Cost per 2 course hot meal /day £	Per Meal	£3.30	2.30%	£3.38

Average Uplift

2.30%

Charge Description	Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	% Increase	VAT Y/N
Births, Marriages & Deaths - Statutory fees cannot be changed				
Statutory marriage & civil partnership services held in the register office	50.00	50.00	0%	NO
Designation of a private premises as an approved premise. Council and council linked premises charged advertising cost only (currently £0)	200.00	200.00	0%	NO
Civil Partnership Conversion appointment	N/A	45.00	0%	NO
Civil Partnership Conversion initial appointment - if having a ceremony	N/A	27.00	0%	NO
Notices for marriage & civil partnership	35.00	35.00	0%	NO
Birth, death, marriage & civil partnership certificates	4.00 at time of Registration, 7.00 in a current Register or 10 in a full register	4.00 at time of Registration, 7.00 in a current Register or 10 in a full register	0%	NO
Attending religious buildings for marriage and civil partnership ceremonies (CHURCH)	90.00	90.00	0%	NO
Religious building certification inc religious venues for civil partnerships	28 (worship) 120 (marriage)	28 (worship) 120 (marriage)	0%	NO
Public search of records	18.00	18.00	0%	NO
Marriage, civil partnership or civil partnership to marriage conversion ceremonies held in the Civic Suite:				
Ceremony Room:				
Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday	100.00	110.00	10%	NO
Friday	140.00	150.00	7%	NO
Monday to Friday from 6pm to 8pm	140.00	230.00	64%	NO
Monday to Friday from 8pm to 11pm	140.00	400.00	186%	NO
Saturday AM	200.00	230.00	15%	NO
Saturday PM from 1pm to 6pm	285.00	280.00	-2%	NO
Sunday up until 6pm	N/A	320.00	0%	NO
Saturday and Sunday from 6pm to 11pm	285.00	500.00	75%	NO
Bank Holidays	N/A	350.00	0%	NO
Weddings between 11pm and 8am - Any day at the Civic Centre - Any room	N/A	1000.00	0%	NO
Valentines Day Monday to Friday	140.00	150.00	7%	NO
Valentines Day Saturday	N/A	230.00	0%	NO
Council Chamber				
Council Chamber Monday to Friday up until 6pm	N/A	230.00	0%	NO
Council Chamber Monday to Friday from 6pm to 11pm	N/A	460.00	0%	NO
Council Chamber (Saturdays) AM	350.00	350.00	0%	NO
Council Chamber (Saturdays) PM 1pm to 6pm	450.00	460.00	2%	NO
Council Chamber (Saturdays 6pm to 11pm)	N/A	650.00	0%	NO
Council Chamber (Sundays up until 6pm)	N/A	525.00	0%	NO
Council Chamber (Sundays and Bank Holidays from 6pm to 11pm)	N/A	700.00	0%	NO
Bank Holidays (up until 6pm)	N/A	525.00	0%	NO
Marriage, civil partnership or civil partnership to marriage conversion ceremonies held in Committee Rooms				
Committee Rooms Monday to Friday	100.00	110.00	10%	NO
Committee Rooms Saturday	200.00	150.00	-25%	NO
Committee Rooms 1+2 combined and Canteen (Monday to Friday)	200.00	200.00	0%	NO

Charge Description	Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	% Increase	VAT Y/N
Registrars . . Continued				
APPENDIX 11 (b)				
Marriage, civil partnership or civil partnership to marriage conversion ceremonies held at approved premises, for example Alexandra Palace,				
Week day - before 6pm	400	440	10%	NO
Saturday - before 6pm	450	460	2%	NO
Sunday - before 6pm	525	525	0%	NO
Bank Holidays - before 6pm - Bank Holidays	1000	900	-10%	NO
Sunday before Bank Holidays - completed before 6pm	1000	525	-48%	NO
Easter Sunday and Monday, Christmas Day, Boxing Day, New Years Day and national events causing a bank holiday to be called before 6pm	1500	900	-40%	NO
Weekday - 6pm to 11pm	600	650	8%	NO
Saturday - 6pm to 11pm	675	650	-4%	NO
Sunday - 6pm to 11pm	788	700	-11%	NO
Bank Holidays - 6pm to 11pm	1500	1500	0%	NO
Any day - 11pm to 8am any day	N/A	2000	0%	NO
Easter Sunday and Monday, Christmas Day, Boxing Day, New Years Day and national events causing a bank holiday to be called - between 6pm and 11pm	2250	1500	-33%	NO
Additional Fees - non Statutory				
Notices give outside Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm	15.00	15.00	0%	NO
Issue of Birth, Marriage or Death certificate on day of request (admin fee)	11.00	12.00	9%	NO
One hour service handwritten certificate (admin fee)	21.00	25.00	19%	NO
One hour service printed certificate	21.00	12.00	-42%	NO
Ceremonies late attendance fee - if more than 20 minutes late from agreed arrival time	N/A	50.00	0%	NO
Silver Ceremony Enhancement for Civic Suite weddings	N/A	10	0%	NO
Gold Ceremony Enhancement for Civic Suite weddings	N/A	30	0%	NO
Ceremony planning fee away from the Civic Centre (per hour)	200	205	3%	NO
Booking fee	N/A	50.00	0%	NO
Postage fee	1.00	1.00	0%	NO
Postage fee recorded or overseas	5.00	5.00	0%	NO
Issuing of a letter on request	10.00	15.00	50%	NO
Renewal of marriage vows / naming / commitment ceremonies in Civic Suite				
Ceremony Room:				
Monday to Friday (inclusive of VAT)	300.00	230.00	-23%	YES
Saturdays (inclusive of VAT)	300.00	300.00	0%	YES
Sundays (inclusive of VAT)	N/A	350.00	0%	YES
Monday to Friday from 6pm to 11pm	300.00	350.00	17%	YES
Bank Holidays and between 6pm and 11pm at weekends	N/A	600.00	0%	YES

Charge Description	Current Charge £	Proposed Charge £	% Increase	VAT Y/N
Registrars . . Continued				
APPENDIX 11 (c)				
Renewal of marriage vows / naming / commitment ceremonies away from the Civic Centre				
Monday to Friday (inclusive of VAT)	540	540	0%	YES
Saturdays (inclusive of VAT)	600	600	0%	YES
Sundays (inclusive of VAT)	690	690	0%	YES
Bank Holidays (inclusive of VAT)	1260	1000	-21%	YES
Sunday before Bank Holidays (inclusive of VAT)	1260	1000	-21%	YES
Easter Sunday and Monday, Christmas Day, Boxing Day, New Years Day and national events causing a bank holiday to be called	1860	1000	-46%	YES
Nationality checking service				
Single Applicant	50.00	55.00	10%	YES
Child	25.00	30.00	20%	YES
Follow up visit	20.00	25.00	25%	YES
Citizenship Ceremonies				
Private Citizenship Ceremony Monday to Thursday. Ceremonies at approved premises charged at wedding fees plus VAT	120.00	130.00	8%	YES
Private Citizenship Ceremony Friday	170.00	180.00	6%	YES
Private Citizenship Ceremony Saturday	230.00	275.00	20%	YES
Statutory fee per Citizenship Ceremony attendee	80	80	0%	NO

Average Uplift

3.49%

Table 1 - Householder pre-application advice services:

Service	Explanation of the service	Haringey Current	Proposed new charges	% increase
Building Control pre-app meetings on site	This service would support people who might want a service to advise them about how to approach a proposal and the practicalities of constructing/carrying out their project before they think about appointing builders etc, or as an early advice service for householders who	N/A- This service does not currently exist	Flat rate of £90 +VAT (If the customer then uses our Building Control Service, £45 (50% of the fee) would be discounted from the relevant Building Control fee.	N/A this service does not currently exist so is not comparable
Householder advice	Half hour meeting which will provide background research for the proposal, planning advice, and a written response to proposals for planning permission.	Free	£152+ VAT	
Householder delivery contract	As above, but for Householders with complex projects, for example large basement excavations, loft conversions, listed buildings or proposals raising conservation issues.	N/A – this service does not currently exist	Bespoke price on request The hourly rates to be used for staff (see below)	
Optional additional charge for Site Visit/Out	Available in addition to any of the services above. Officers will visit the applicant in their	N/A- this service does not	£90 +VAT	

Table 2 - Proposed Revised Fees for existing pre-application advice services for residential developments:

Category	London Average	Haringey current	Proposed new rate	Percentage increase
Minors 1-5 residential units	£591.10	£600 + VAT	£670+VAT	12%
Minors 6-9 residential units	£963.31	(Currently there is only category of minors for 1-9 units)	£770+VAT	28%
Majors 10-24 residential units	£1,813.60	£1,300 +VAT	£2,370+ VAT	83%
Majors 25-50 residential units	£2,371.31	£2,100+VAT	£2,850+ VAT	36%
Majors 51-100 residential units	£2,724.53	£2,100+VAT	£2,850 first meeting + VAT	36%
Majors 100+ dwellings	£3,351.80	£4,150+VAT	Then suggestion for PPA	-32%
PPA	Bespoke	Bespoke	Bespoke	

Table 3- Proposed new service offer and charges for micro businesses (for non residential development).

Service	Current cost	Proposed new cost	% increase
Advice for micro businesses (10 employees or less)- (Category 5) for change of use 100m2-499m2	Free	Free	N/A
Minors (Category 4) 500m2-999m2 commercial floor space	£600 +VAT (Currently there is only category of minors for 1-9 units)	£385 +VAT	-36%
Majors (Category 3) 1000m2-1999m2 commercial floorspace	£1,300 + VAT	£1,185 +VAT	-9%
Majors (Category 2) 2000m2-9999m2 commercial floorspace	£2,100+ VAT	£1,425+ VAT	-32%
Majors (Category 1) 10,000m2 or more commercial floor space	£4,150+ VAT	£2,850 +VAT for first meeting.	-31%
PPA (Planning Performance Agreements)	Bespoke	£2,850 initial meeting + VAT Bespoke price after first meeting	N/A

Table 4 - New services for major residential or mixed use developments:

Service	Explanation of service	New Charge	% increase from previous charge
Quality Review Panel - Formal Review	This service will replace the current Design Review Panel service	£3,500+ VAT + room hire charge	N/A this service did not exist before in this form and was part of some PPAs
Quality review panel- Chair's review	Replacement for Design Review Panel- Feedback from the Chair only- usually for smaller or less complex schemes.	£1,350 + VAT + room hire charge	
Senior management time	This service will be provided subject to availability. This service is for customers who want the senior manager (Head of Development Management, Head of Planning Policy and Transport or Head of Housing Investment & sites) to attend a meeting	£100 per hour + VAT	
Director's time	This service will be provided subject to availability. This service is for customers who require the attendance of the Assistant Director of Planning at their meeting and is an additional charge in the case of Major residential developments of 10-50 units, or Category 2 or 3 commercial developments	£120 per hour + VAT	
PPA (Planning Performance Agreements)	A bespoke service that calculates the amount of work and expertise a proposal will take and offers a bespoke price.	Bespoke price	N/A not comparable
Transportation assessments	For complex projects which require additional transport scoping assessments as part of a technical working group/ pre application advisory role, or post permission implementation support, additional charges will apply based on the Transport officer hourly rate	Bespoke	N/A this service did not exist before in this form and was part of some PPAs

Building Control & Planning

APPENDIX 12 (d)

Table 8 - updated charges for Building Control services

SCHEDULE A			
	Building Control Charge 2014	Proposed Building Control Charge 2015	% increase
Extension <10m ²	£428.00	£440.00	3%
Extension 10m ² - 40m ²	£515.00	£525.00	2%
Extension 40m ² - 60m ²	£598.00	£600.00	0%
Over 60m ²	Building Control Charge based on estimated cost of work		
Loft Conversion without dormer(s)	£428.00	£440.00	3%
Loft Conversion with dormer(s)	£598.00	£600.00	0%
Detached garage 30m ² - 60m ²	£428.00	£440.00	3%
Recovering roof (per dwelling)	£257.50	£265.00	3%
Replacement of windows/doors for every five windows or part thereof	£180.00	£200.00	11%
Electrical works (non competent person)	£257.50	£265.00	3%
Green Deal works	£166.67	£180.00	8%
Shop Fitout each 100m ² or part there of	£248.00	£255.00	3%
New Shop front (up to 10m)	£210.00	£220.00	5%

NEW BUILD DWELLINGS (houses and flats, three stories without basements)				
1 new dwelling		£598.00	£700.00	17%
2 - 5 dwellings (per additional dwelling - in addition to the charge for one dwelling)		£218.00	£220.00	1%
6 - 20 new dwellings (per additional dwelling over 5 - in addition to the charge for five dwellings (plan charge - £514.50+VAT and inspection charge £1,470+VAT))		£181.00	£183.00	1%
Over 20 dwellings		contact Building Control (0208 489 5504) for quote		
ALL OTHER WORKS		Building Control Charge	Proposed Building Control Charge	
cost of works				
up to £2000		£217.00	£200.00	-9%
up to £5000 (£2,001 - £5,000)		£217.00	£225.00	4%
£5001 - £10,000		£268.00	£280.00	4%
£10,001 - £20,000		£371.00	£390.00	5%
£20,001 - £30,000		£474.00	£500.00	5%
£30,001 - £40,000		£577.00	£600.00	4%
£40,001 - £50,000		£680.00	£710.00	4%
£50,001 - £60,000		£783.00	£820.00	5%
£60,001 - £70,000		£886.00	£930.00	5%
£70,001 - £80,000		£989.00	£1,010.00	2%
£80,001 - £90,000		£1,092.00	£1,110.00	2%
£90,001 - £100,000		£1,195.00	£1,210.00	1%
£100,001 - £120,000		£1,298.00	£1,315.00	1%
£120,001 - £140,000		£1,401.00	For estimated cost over £120k individually assessed charges to be determined - please contact Building Control (0208 489 5504) for quote	

Table 9 - Additional charges

Additional Building Control Charges			
	2014	2015	% increase
Completion Certificates	£41.00	£45.00	10%
Copy Documents	£15.50	£20.00	29%
Copy Plans A3 (where permissible) - first page	£10.00	Individually determined	
Subsequent page(s)	£5.00		
Research fee	£32.00	£35.00	9%
Surveyor hourly charge (08:00 - 18:00)	£83.00	£90.00	8%
Surveyor hourly charge (18:00 - 08:00)	£124.50	£135.00	8%
Technical Support charge	£41.50	£45.00	8%

Table 9- Proposed new Building Control services.

Service	Explanation of the service	Current cost	Cost	Percentage change
Dangerous Structures	A discretionary charge, based upon the time spent resolving the dangerous structure by a Building Surveyor.	There is a charge if we carry out works to remove the danger, based on the hourly rate of £90/hr. Call outs without works carried out, or where a structure is not dangerous are provided for free.	This charge will be based upon an hourly rate of £90 or £135 if the dangerous structure is dealt with outside normal office hours	N/A this service does not currently exist and is not comparable
Demolition Notices	For the counter issue of a Demolition Notice under the	Free	Set fee of £180	N/A this service does not currently
Safety at Sports Grounds	Proposed to investigate charging for work carried out in association with the issue of and the monitoring of a Safety Certificate	Free	To be charged at full cost recovery based on the hourly rate of staff	N/A this service does not currently exist and is not comparable.

This page is intentionally left blank



Haringey Council

Report for:	Cabinet, 10 February 2015	Item Number:	
Title:	Development vehicle feasibility study and business case		
Report Authorised by:	Lyn Garner, Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development		
Lead Officer:	Dan Hawthorn, Assistant Director for Regeneration		
Ward(s) affected: All		Report for Key/Non Key Decisions: Key	

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 This report seeks Cabinet approval for the proposal to tender for a feasibility study and business case including engagement with Members, staff and stakeholders for a Haringey development vehicle, and – if such an approach is recommended – support for the procurement of partners for that vehicle.
- 1.2 Subject to the more detailed work proposed here, it is considered that a development vehicle, established as a joint venture between the council and one or more private sector partners, is a leading option for removing what would be otherwise insuperable barriers to realising the council's ambitions for building new homes and securing its wider regeneration objectives, including in relation to the Tottenham regeneration programme; the emerging Wood Green Investment Framework; housing estate renewal and the council's own commercial portfolio. This is principally because, while the council has access to the land required, it cannot access sufficient capital funding and does not on its own have the commercial and development expertise required to achieve the best possible outcomes. The creation of a vehicle would marry the council's land assets with investment and expertise from one or more private partners while retaining a stake and a degree of influence over the pace and nature of development that would not be possible with more traditional land deals or development agreements. This proposal builds upon the initial scoping work already done for the council by Turnberry Real Estate, which is summarised later in this report.



Haringey Council

- 1.3 This report therefore seeks Cabinet approval to carry out the next stage of work as a result of the recommendations made by officers which have been based on the conclusions of the Turnberry study. Our intention is to commission an external consultant to (a) refine the feasibility work commenced by Turnberry and develop a business case for the preferred option; and (b) support the council through the procurement of one or more joint venture partners. This would comprise both commercial and financial advice, to ensure the appropriate level of probity for a potential decision of this nature, and would be complemented by legal advice on the same matter which has already been procured. Stage (b) would only be pursued if stage (a) resulted in a recommendation to procure one or more partners for a vehicle, and if Cabinet subsequently agreed to accept that recommendation and commence procurement. That decision – to proceed to stage (b) – would likely come to Cabinet in approximately summer 2015.

2. Cabinet Member introduction

- 2.1 Haringey's ambitions for regeneration, new homes and mixed communities are at the heart of our new Corporate Plan. It's clear that the council's own land has an exciting and important role to play in realising those ambitions, through a combination of housing estate renewal, releasing surplus land and improving the use of our commercial portfolio. But it's equally clear that the potential in that land cannot be unlocked without both major investment, which the council cannot generate on its own, and development expertise which no public sector body any longer has in house.
- 2.2 A council with Haringey's ambitions must therefore find the right partners to achieve the necessary transformation at the necessary pace. At the same time, the council must stay in control of the nature and timing of development, and – in these times of increased financial self-reliance – maintain its long-term stake in the value of its assets. That's why we are investigating the options for a strategic, long-term partnership which will enable us to plan and deliver high-quality regeneration that really meets the needs of Haringey's residents and businesses, now and in the future.
- 2.3 This decision simply takes us to the next stage in that investigation. It is my intention to engage significantly with Members, staff and stakeholders to ensure that the recommendations I make in the summer are supported with sound information and evidence to success. In a few months time, I will come back to cabinet colleagues with the outcome of this work and – depending on that outcome – possibly with a much bigger decision on whether and how to start the formal process for forging this partnership.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That Cabinet approves the proposal to tender for an external consultant to (a) refine the feasibility work commenced by Turnberry and develop a business case for the preferred option; and (b) support the council through the procurement of one or more



Haringey Council

joint venture partners, if that approach is recommended and subsequently approved by Cabinet.

- 3.2 That Cabinet approves additional budget provision of £400,000 from the earmarked Urban Renewal Reserve to fund the project.

4. Alternative options considered

- 4.1 The work proposed here – to develop a business case for the establishment of a development vehicle – is intended precisely to weigh up the case for establishing a single vehicle against the alternative options, including alternative joint venture approaches and more traditional approaches, as well as assessing the various options for pursuing a single vehicle-based approach. The alternatives to the work proposed here would be either to terminate the council's work on assessing those options, or to adopt and pursue one of them without further analysis and proceed direct to procurement of the vehicle itself, with risks both to optimising the delivery of our objectives and value for money.
- 4.2 As set out in paragraph 1.2, termination of council's work to assess options for a development vehicle would significantly hamper delivery of its ambitions (as set out in the draft corporate plan for 2015-18) for building new homes and securing its wider regeneration objectives, including in relation to the Tottenham regeneration programme; the emerging Wood Green Investment Framework; housing estate renewal and the council's own commercial portfolio. While the council has access to the land required to achieve its desired outcomes, it can neither access sufficient capital funding through its general fund or housing revenue account (partly because of constraints imposed on borrowing), nor draw on sufficient in-house commercial and development expertise. Only through a partnership arrangement such as the proposed vehicle could the council marry its land assets with the necessary investment and expertise, while retaining a stake and a degree of influence over the pace and nature of development that would not be possible with more traditional land deals or development agreements.

5. Background information

Strategic context

- 5.1 Haringey council's draft corporate plan for 2015/18 includes:

- As priority 4, a commitment to *Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit*. Included in this priority is a specific objective which says that 'We will focus growth by prioritising new homes and jobs in Wood Green and particularly in Tottenham, where need and opportunity are greatest, and by bringing some of the borough's key community assets into more active use'.
- As priority 5, a commitment to *Create homes and communities where people choose to live and are able to thrive*. Included in this priority is a specific objective



Haringey Council

which says that '*We will provide access to good quality and affordable housing, increasing the supply of new homes*'.

These proposed priorities for 2015/18 build upon the priorities in the existing 2013/15 corporate plan to *Deliver regeneration at priority locations across the Borough* (priority 8) and *Ensure that everyone has a decent place to live* (priority 9).

5.2 In support of these objectives, Haringey council has also:

- Consulted (in late 2014) on the priorities and principles proposed as the basis of its new Housing Strategy, including a proposed priority to 'build more homes across the borough'. It is expected that the new Housing Strategy will be adopted by Cabinet in March 2015.
- Adopted the ambitious housing delivery targets in the London Plan for its suite of new Local Plan documents, subject to consultation from February 2015, which identify development opportunities and sites for some 17,000 additional homes (across the borough, not just on council land) to 2026.
- Adopted (in March 2014) its Strategic Regeneration Framework for Tottenham, which commits, among other things, to '*an ambitious programme of estate renewal where necessary*' and to '*secure investors to provide a whole range of housing at a range of prices and tenures to ensure more people get access to the quality homes they need*'.
- Commenced a review of its own commercial property portfolio, due to conclude later in 2015.

The work done so far and next steps

5.3 In December 2014, Turnberry Real Estate submitted to the council its scoping report for a development vehicle, based on a commission from the council. The report described, assessed and compared the range of options for securing the investment and expertise necessary to secure regeneration across its portfolio of sites.

5.4 The basic principles underpinning any vehicle proposition would be that:

- The council would hold a 50% stake in the vehicle, with the remaining 50% stake held by its strategic investment partner or partners.
- The vehicle would be established for the long term, most likely for a period of up to 20 years with an option to further extend.
- The council's contribution – and equity stake – would comprise some or all of its investment portfolio and development sites. The strategic investment partner(s) would provide funding, as well as services including (but not limited to) asset management, development management and fund management.
- Receipts would be distributed pro rata between the councils and partner(s) based on their stake, or recycled to support the delivery of further projects.

5.5 Based on Turnberry's assessment (of the national and local housing and property market, the council's portfolio of land and investment property, the additional funding



Haringey Council

sources available to support regeneration, and the feedback from its soft market testing exercise), its report concludes:

- a) That, in its land assets, and given current market conditions, Haringey council has significant potential to achieve major housing growth and wider regeneration on its own land in support of the aims set out in the draft corporate plan;
- b) That the council cannot deliver these outcomes on its own, given the constraints of funding and expertise, and a joint venture vehicle of some kind would offer a good opportunity for the council to ease those constraints while maintaining value for money and control over the scale, pace and quality of development.
- c) That, on balance, the benefits for the council of a joint venture approach to development – in terms of unlocking development, potential return for the council, and influence over the nature and pace of development – would outweigh the challenges associated with a share of development risk and the resource associated with establishing and managing the vehicle;
- d) That the council has the fundamental option to either seek a number of specific joint ventures on a site-by-site basis, or to seek a single overarching joint venture to take forward all sites;
- e) That the council, if it decided to seek a single vehicle, could do so either by securing a development partner (seeking development finance from third parties on a site-by-site basis), an investment partner (seeking development management services from third parties on a site-by-site basis) or an overarching strategic partnership that brought in both investment finance and development management capacity across the whole programme;
- f) That, of all these vehicle options, the last – for an overarching strategic partnership that brought in both investment finance and development management capacity across the whole programme – appears on the basis of the limited analysis conducted so far to offer the strongest balance of risks and opportunities to the council;
- g) That there is considerable market interest among potential partners in the vehicle, based on the strength of Haringey's land assets, the current state of the London housing market and the reputation of Haringey's political and officer leadership;
- h) That, before engaging formally with the market to procure one or more partners for a vehicle, further work was needed to compare these options both to each other, and to more traditional options for bringing forward development on council land including land sales and development agreements, including by assessing each option's financial and risk implications, based on a detailed analysis of the council's assets and their development potential. This further work would also present an opportunity to clarify the council's objectives; develop a detailed business case for the preferred option, to support what would be a significant long-term decision to commit the council's assets to such an approach; and (if a vehicle is recommended) define in detail a procurement strategy.

The proposed tender



Haringey Council

- 5.6 Officers recommend that the council move the project to the next stage by procuring more detailed advice in the form of a feasibility study and business case for a preferred development vehicle option..
- 5.7 Bidders will be invited to submit tenders setting out how they will support the council in delivering the next stage of this work, as set out in paragraph 5.5(h) of this report, including by supporting the council in refining its precise objectives. The successful bidder will also be expected to ensure its analysis and recommendations are aligned with the council's emerging Capital Asset Strategy.
- 5.8 While some local authority joint venture development vehicles have started to emerge in recent years, they are still a relatively new phenomenon and the consultancy market for advice in this area is still not fully mature. Therefore, while bids for this work will be sought from firms with direct experience of advising on delivery structures and structuring joint ventures between public and private sector bodies and procuring development/investment partners alongside public sector organisations, any consultant bidding for this work is expected to be widely experienced in working with and attracting major investors, including pension funds; experienced in the property development market, development finance, financial modelling and land assembly; and experience in advising on commercial terms on property.
- 5.9 If this work results in a recommendation to proceed with a vehicle, a separate procurement exercise – involving a full OJEU process – will be required for the procurement of partners in that vehicle. This report seeks approval to include in the contract for business case support an option for extension to cover procurement support, to facilitate the quick commencement of the OJEU process without having to re-procure support services. However, a decision to accept the business case and proceed with procurement will subject to a separate report and decision by Cabinet, as set out in paragraph 5.11
- 5.10 The commission will be separated into distinct phases, separating the business case element from the procurement support element, with approval from Cabinet required before proceeding to (and incurring expenditure against) that second phase. Provided the recommendations of the business case are accepted by Cabinet, it is intended that the second phase can then proceed. The commission will be based on a fixed fee for each separate element of the work.
- 5.11 If the business case results in a recommendation to proceed with a full procurement exercise, it is anticipated that two further Cabinet decisions will be required:
- a decision to accept the recommendation to proceed, and the specific recommendations about the preferred model and procurement approach, before an OJEU process commences (expected in approximately summer 2015); and
 - a final contract decision resulting from that OJEU process (expected in approximately summer 2016).



Haringey Council

5.12 The estimated total cost to support this work is £500,000, comprising £100,000 for legal advice (which has already been separately procured) and £400,000 for the commercial and financial advice that is the subject of this report. Of this total, the £100,000 for legal costs has already been allocated from the Tottenham programme budget and £400k should be allocated from the reserve earmarked for this type of project; the Urban Renewal Reserve.

6. Comments of the Chief Finance Officer and financial implications

6.1 Due to changes in Local Government funding arrangements, the Council is becoming increasingly dependent on Council Tax income and Business Rates income to fund its activities and this is reflected in the priorities that underpin the new Corporate Plan, especially Priorities 4 and 5, as referenced in Paragraph 5.1 of this report. The proposal in this report seeks to facilitate the delivery of those priorities and in doing so should help to improve the Council's wider financial position.

6.2 The costs of the Turnberry's work mentioned in this report have been met from existing revenue budgets in 2014-15.

6.3 As outlined in 5.12 the estimated total cost of the next three stages of this project is £500,000. Existing budget provision of £100,000 within the Tottenham Regeneration Team should be used to part fund this project, with the balance of £400,000 being drawn down from the Urban Renewal Reserve, which is an earmarked reserve appropriate for this purpose.

6.4 If at any point the costs of progressing to the next stage exceed the available budget, then further Cabinet approval will be required before the projects progresses to the next stage.

7. Assistant Director of Corporate Governance Comments and legal implications

7.1 The Assistant Director of Corporate Governance has been consulted on the contents of this report and comments as follows.

7.2 The recommendation at paragraph 3.1 is to approve procurement of a consultant. Any procurement exercise would need to ensure compliance with the Council's Contract Standing Orders and, as appropriate, EU Competition requirements on procurement.

7.3 The overall project is a key decision and the Directorate has confirmed that this has been included in the Forward Plan.

7.4 The Assistant Director of Corporate Governance confirms that there are no legal reasons preventing Cabinet from approving the recommendations in this report.

8. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments



Haringey Council

- 8.1 While there are no direct equalities or community cohesion implications of procuring the feasibility, business case and procurement support services as proposed in this report, these services are in support of wider objectives which are aimed at improving the supply of housing – and particularly affordable housing – with the aim of improving access to all sorts of housing for everyone, and in particular vulnerable and protected groups.

9. Head of Procurement Comments

- 9.1 The extracts from the Turnberry Real Estate of December 2014 set out a range of options and recommendations. These need to be assessed, all with a view to reach a recommendation on how the Council should proceed. This assessment work will require the appointment of an organisation or organisations knowledgeable and respected in the market.
- 9.2 The Procurement Service will provide support so that a tender for a feasibility study and business case for a Haringey development vehicle is made in compliance with the Council's Standing Orders and the Public Contracts Regulations.

10. Policy Implication

- 10.1 While this proposal is intended to support delivery of already-adopted policies and priorities set out in the council's draft corporate plan and elsewhere, there are no direct additional policy implications of approving the proposal set out here.

11. Reasons for Decision

- 11.1 The option of establishing a joint venture development vehicle as a way of pursuing housing development and regeneration on the council's land has potentially significant implications in governance and financial terms for the council itself, and could have a major material impact on places and people across a number of wards, hence this is considered a key decision for approval by Cabinet.

12. Use of Appendices

- 12.1 N/A

13. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985



Haringey Council

Report for:	Cabinet 10 February 2015	Item Number:	To be added by the Leader's Office
Title:	The Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15		
Report Authorised by:	Lyn Garner - Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development		
Lead Officer:	Jon McGrath – Assistant Director Property & Capital Projects Tel: 020 8489 2198 e-mail: jon.mcgrath@haringey.gov.uk		
Ward(s) affected: St Anns	Report for Key Decision:		

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 This report recommends disposal of a property that is not suitable for long-term retention following changes in service delivery. It is further recommended that a disposal should proceed directly given the need to achieve capital receipts to sustain the capital programme, whilst also reducing property running costs.


2. Cabinet Member introduction

- 2.1 The Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 remains surplus to Council requirements. The disposal is therefore in accordance with the Council's Corporate Asset Policy and will also release latent value and generate capital receipts to support the capital programme and wider Council priorities.

3. Recommendations

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- 3.1 Re-confirms the original decision by Cabinet on 12 February 2013 that the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 is surplus to requirements.
- 3.2 Authorise the Assistant Director of Property & Capital Projects to dispose of the Council's freehold interest in the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 for best consideration reasonably obtainable to Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability.



Haringey Council

3.3 In the event that Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability are unable to proceed with the acquisition, that officers engage with Derby Hall Christian Assembly/Aitch in an attempt to agree a holistic policy compliant scheme.

3.4 In the event that Derby Hall Christian Assembly/Aitch are unable to present a holistic policy compliant scheme and proceed to an acquisition, that the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 is offered for sale on the open market for best consideration reasonably obtainable.

4 Other options considered

4.1 Retention of the property as is:-

A Property Review previously deemed, following cross service consultation, that no future Council operational or strategic requirements have been identified for the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15.

4.2 Retention for wider area regeneration:-

The Red House is not in a designated regeneration area and a disposal that brings forward a new mixed use development scheme will help improve the local area.

5 Background information

5.1 The Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 was operated by the Council as a Residential Care Home for older people. The 34 bed 2 storey care home provided services for the physically frail and older people with dementia until its recent closure in 2013.

Please see attached Ordnance Survey extract plan no. BVES A4 0358e for identification purposes. The subject asset is located within the borough's St Anns Ward.

5.2 The closure followed a Cabinet resolution on the 19 July 2011 to shut the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 along with other Council owned older people's residential care homes.

5.3 EXEMPT

5.4 EXEMPT

5.5 EXEMPT

5.6 The title check also revealed that rights of way exist over the car-park to the rear of the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 in favour of the Derby Hall Christian Assembly (DHCA), 425-431 West Green Rd, N15. DHCA is a small multi-national



Haringey Council

church which holds services in English. They also let a small space within their grounds to the Rainbow Nursery (rated as "good" by the last Ofsted inspection).

- 5.7 The DHCA is situated adjacent to the Red House (please see attached Ordnance survey extract plan no. BVES A4 0358e) and were relocated to their present site as part of a land swap following the West Green Rd/Stanley Rd/Culross Rd (Clearance Area) CPO 1967, which eventually made way for, amongst others, the Council's Culross and Albany Housing estates.

Historically, Derby Hall was located circa 250m to the rear of the existing Red House on the now extinct Derby Rd, N15, where a place of worship dated back to the turn of the last century.

- 5.8 The DHCA were approached to gauge their appetite for relinquishing their rights over the car-park (so as to improve the development potential for the Red House). However, they declined this and expressed an interest in acquiring the Red House.
- 5.9 As the DHCA were considered a special purchaser (by virtue of being an adjacent landowner), they were given the opportunity to put forward a proposal; a special purchaser is usually prepared to pay a sum in excess of the market value that other hypothetical purchasers in the market would be prepared to pay.
- 5.10 The DHCA sought to engage on a joint venture initially with the developer Magic Homes as they acknowledged they would be unable to bring forward a development proposal on their own without a development partner.
- 5.11 However, the DHCA were unable to agree terms with Magic Homes and after engaging with a number of professional suitors/advisors, subsequently entered into a joint venture agreement with the Aitch Group.
- 5.12 During the interim, Magic Homes had undertaken considerable preliminary work, including the acquisition of an interest in the adjacent pub (which renders them with special purchaser status) to further widen the development envelope and entered into a joint venture agreement with the charity Leonard Cheshire Disability, who provide independent living units for the disabled and are seeking to launch their first London project on the Red House site.
- 5.13 Consequently, a decision was made together with the Council's retained agent to invite both parties, as special purchasers, to submit their proposals, but within an agreed set of development planning parameters (on receipt of informal advice) which would help the Council and their retained agent to compare like for like and assist in arriving at a meaningful decision. This could result in accepting one, or rejecting both.
- 5.14 Both parties have submitted the following proposals, a synopsis of which has been set out below:-



Haringey Council

DHCA & Aitch

- 2 blocks comprising a 3/4 storey block consisting of a new 5000ft² church & nursery, 4000ft² A1 retail and residential units and
- A separate 3 storey rising to 6 storey residential block. 85 residential units in total across both blocks.
- A new road dissecting the 2 blocks linking West Green Rd and Stanley Rd.
- EXEMPT

Magic Homes & Leonard Cheshire Disability

Option A

- A predominantly 3 storey block (rising to 5 storeys at the north east corner) consisting of a new 4,800ft² church (for DHCA), 41 residential units and 11 independent living units for the physically disabled.
- A new community facility of 1120ft²
- EXEMPT

Option B (DHCA retain their existing premises with this option)

- A predominantly 3 storey block (rising to 5 storeys at the north east corner) consisting of 41 residential units and 11 independent living units for the physically disabled.
- A new community facility of 829ft²
- EXEMPT

5.15 Both the proposals put forward by DHCA/Aitch and Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability are broadly in line with development planning policy. However, advice provided by Transportation Planners has assisted with evaluating both party's submissions and arrive at a recommendation.

5.16 Having given consideration to both parties submissions, Transportation Planners are principally concerned with the DHCA/Aitch's proposal to increase the size of the church. Although informal development advice suggested a new church of up to 5,000 ft² could be supported within a new development, Transportation Planners are concerned that the area's CPZ is unable to offer a sufficient level of


Haringey Council

parking control to mitigate the increase in parking/traffic generated by a proposed expansion of the church.

- 5.17 Furthermore, Transport Planners have additional concerns with DHCA/Aitch's proposed new private road, which would run through the site from West Green Rd to Stanley Rd. The new private road would include provision of loading bays for deliveries by articulated vehicles within a Home Zone and would further result in additional traffic onto Stanley Road (a no-through road).
- 5.18 For the reasons cited in 5.16 & 5.17 above, Transportation Planners are unable to support DHCA/Aitch's submission. Transportation Planners are only able to support Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability's Option B proposal.
- 5.19 Although DHCA/Aitch submitted the highest offer, this is predicated on what is now deemed an un-viable development scheme. Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability's offer is thus acceptable, with scope for improvement as their bid assumes a modest density (given the site's high PTAL rating of 6).
- 5.20 This report consequently seeks authority for the Assistant Director of Property & Capital Projects to negotiate a sale, subject to planning, of the Council's freehold interest in the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 for best consideration reasonably obtainable to Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability.
- 5.21 In the event that Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability are unable to proceed, that officers engage with Derby HCA/Aitch in an attempt to agree a holistic policy compliant scheme, failing which the asset is offered for sale on the open market.
- 6 Comments of the Head of Planning Policy & Transport Planning
 - 6.1 The Head of Planning Policy & Transport Planning has considered both proposals.
 - 6.2 Due to concerns including a proposed increase to the size of the church, which would result in an increase in both trip generation and parking, along with the creation of a new private road with loading areas within a predominantly Home Zone, Transport Planning cannot support the DHCA/Aitch proposal.
 - 6.3 Due to concerns including a proposed increase to the size of the church, which would result in an increase in both trip generation and parking, Transport Planning cannot support Magic Group/Leonard Cheshire Disability's Option A.
 - 6.4 With the existing church remaining un-changed and the proposed community use small enough not to cause an adverse impact, Transport Planning can support Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability's Option B.



7 Comments of the Chief Finance Officer and financial implications

7.1 The proceeds of this disposal are required to support the Council's capital programme and the forecast capital receipt has been factored into the Medium Term Financial Plan.

7.2 EXEMPT

7.3 However, at this point there is a substantial risk that the available capital receipt will be significantly reduced by monies that may need to be paid to the NHS as outlined in Paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 of this report.

7.4 Although the bid from Magic Homes / Leonard Cheshire Disability is less than the bid from DHCA & Aitch, it is the recommended bid as the Magic Homes scheme is more likely to be planning policy compliant and the DHCA & Aitch bid is dependent on the planning application being approved and thus the amount offered in this case is seen as unlikely to be received.

8 Comments of the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance and legal implications

8.1 Under Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council has the power to dispose of its freehold interest in the Red House to Magic Homes/Leonard Cheshire Disability for the best consideration reasonably obtainable.

8.2 The Report in paragraph 5.4 correctly states that a caution is registered against the title which requires the Council to repay the grant of £1.74m on a disposal. It should also be noted that at present no agreement has been reached with the NHS regarding repayment of a proportionate part of the grant.

8.3 Any future development of the Red House may require the consent of the Derby Hall Christian Assembly Trustees to vary their parking and access rights over the Red House.

8.4 Consideration should be given to include in the sale agreement overage provisions designed to trigger further payment in the event of increased density of the sale site at a later date.

9 Comments of Deputy Director for Community Housing

The Deputy Director for Community Housing has been consulted in the preparation of this report.

10 Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments

10.1 The capital receipts generated from the disposals will support Council objectives benefiting the wider community



Haringey Council

11 Policy Implications

- 11.1 The proposals are consistent with the Council's Corporate Asset policy as set out in the Asset Management Plan.

12 Reasons for Decision

- 12.1 This report recommends that Members re-confirm the original decision by Cabinet on 12 February 2013 that the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15 is surplus to requirements.
- 12.2 Members are asked to note that a caution exists on the Red House which will result in redemption sum being paid in the region of £600,000 from the eventual capital receipt.
- 12.3 As the Red House is not suitable for long-term retention following changes in service delivery, this report consequently recommends a disposal to the special purchasers Magic Homes & Leonard Cheshire Disability as their proposed scheme is policy compliant, which will assist in generating a capital receipt to sustain the capital programme.

13 Use of Appendices


- 13.1 Appendix 1– Ordinance Survey Plan of the Red House, 423 West Green Rd, N15.

14 Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

14.1 Background Documents

- 14.2 The report contains exempt information. Exempt information is contained in Part B and is not for publication. The exempt information is under the following category (identified in amended schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972):-

S(3) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person including the authority holding the information.



The Red House
423 West Green Road
Tottenham
LONDON
N15 3PJ

CPM No. 0816

Overlay : H & SS - Community Bldgs

Plan produced by Janice Dabinett on 07/11/2012

Deed packet : Multiple

LR title no. : Multiple

Site Area (hectares) : 0.3015 ha

Scale 1:1250

Drawing No. BVES A4 0358e



Haringey Council

Report for:	Cabinet 10 February 2015	Item Number:	To be added by the Leader's Office
Title:	Land rear of 1-11 The Drive, N11		
Report Authorised by:	Lyn Garner - Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development		
Lead Officer:	Jon McGrath – Assistant Director Property & Capital Projects		
Ward(s) affected:	Bounds Green	Report for Key Decision:	

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1. This report provides background information on a Council site formerly leased (now expired) as garden land to the residents of no.s 1-11 The Drive N11, which is recommended for disposal following a review of the Council's land holding policy across the borough for the highest value that can be obtained. Following consideration as part of the Property Review including consultation with Services, no future Council operational or strategic requirements have been identified for the site. It is therefore recommended that the disposals should proceed directly given the need to achieve capital receipts in the current year to sustain the capital programme whilst reducing property-running costs.

2. Cabinet Member introduction

- 2.1. The land to the rear of 1-11 The Drive, N11 is a site that has long been used by the residents as extensions to their gardens. The site has been declared surplus to requirements and available for disposal. A sale to the residents will generate a capital receipt which will be used to support the Council's capital programme whilst also allowing residents the continued use of the land.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1. Authorise the Assistant Director of Property & Capital Projects to dispose of the Council's freehold interest in the land rear of 1-11 The Drive for best consideration reasonably obtainable.



Haringey Council

- 3.2. To give the owners of No.'s 1-11 The Drive first refusal to collectively acquire the site as one lot (rather than as individual plots).
- 3.3. In the event the residents are unable to proceed with a collective acquisition, the site to be offered for sale on the open market for best consideration reasonably obtainable.
- 3.4. However, should the site not receive a satisfactory offer when offered for sale on the open market, that the subject land is retained for the Council's New Build Programme.

4. Other options considered

- 4.1. **Continue to lease individual plots on a non secure basis to the adjoining properties** – EXEMPT (This is information is contained within Part B of the report).
- 4.2. **Dispose of individual plots to the adjoining properties for the market value** – the sale of individual plots is not supported as some residents may opt not to buy with the Council left with inaccessible small parcels of land.
- 4.3. **Dispose of the land as one lot (rather than in single plots) to the adjoining properties collectively restricting its the use to garden land** – such a restriction would artificially suppress the value of the land thereby failing to demonstrate best consideration for the Council. This option is therefore not supported.

5. Background information

- 5.1. The land to the rear of Nos 1-11 The Drive, N11 is a Council owned site which forms part of the Housing Revenue Account (acquired using Housing powers and held for housing purposes).
- 5.2. The subject land is situated to the rear of 1-11 The Drive, N11, which in turn is a parallel slip road on the southern side of Bounds Green Rd and is located almost equidistant between Bounds Green tube station to the east and the junction with the North Circular Road to the west: please see attached Ordnance Survey extract plan no. BVES A4 2563 for identification purposes.

The subject land is located within the borough's Bounds Green Ward.

- 5.3. EXEMPT (This is information is contained within Part B of the report).
- 5.4. Prior to the expiry of the leases, the residents of No.s 1-11 The Drive requested that either new leases were granted or they were given the option of acquiring the Council's freehold interest of their respective parcels of land directly to the rear of their properties.



- 5.5. The Council has recently undertaken a review of its landholding policy across the borough which is *“to hold land for immediate and future service delivery to meet Council priorities, contribute to social and economic regeneration or to meet the Council’s financial strategy (income and capital value)”* and has concluded that there is no strategic or operational reason to retain the subject land as it is not generating any meaningful rental income and the rent collection and estate management costs far exceed the current rent or the assessed market rent for the site.
- 5.6. Following consideration as part of the Property Review including consultation with other Services, no future Council operational or strategic requirements have been identified for the land rear of 1-11 The Drive, N11. Consequently, in line with the Council’s Asset Management Plan, which is *“to only hold assets that are required for immediate service delivery or contribute to the achievement of corporate objectives and priorities in the longer term,”* the site has been declared surplus to Council requirements and suitable for disposal.
- 5.7. It is therefore recommended that a disposal of the subject land to the residents should proceed directly given the need to achieve capital receipts in the current year to sustain the capital programme.
- 5.8. Accordingly, the residents of 1-11 The Drive, N11 have been given the opportunity to acquire the subject land (as opposed to a renewal of the leases which would only generate a modest revenue stream).
- 5.9. As the subject land has development potential and in order to maximise the capital receipt, consultants were instructed to carry out a planning feasibility study to determine the optimum development scheme. Establishing the planning status of the subject land provides greater certainty with development potential, eliminates risks and uncertainty, whilst optimising the potential capital receipt.
- The feasibility study concluded that a small terrace of 3 no. 4 bed houses (fronting Blake Rd, N11) as the optimum scheme for the subject land. Following client consultation, the consultants were instructed to submit a planning application for 3 no. 4 bed houses which, subsequently received planning approval (HGY/2013/2396).
- 5.10. EXEMPT (This is information is contained within Part B of the report).
- 5.11. EXEMPT (This is information is contained within Part B of the report).
- 5.12. This report consequently seeks authority to proceed sequentially with:-
- a disposal of the subject land to the residents of 1-11 The Drive, N11 collectively,
 - should the sale to the residents fail to complete, that the subject land is offered for sale on the open market for best consideration and



- c. should this prove un-successful, retain for the Council's New Build Programme.

6. Comments of the Section 151 Officer and financial implications

- 6.1. The proceeds of this disposal are required to support the Council's capital programme and the forecast capital receipt has been factored into the Medium Term Financial Plan.
- 6.2. The sale of the site will generate a capital receipt of £700,000 based on the development density achieved via the planning consent which should be achievable in the next financial year (15/16). Subject to funding regulations, the receipt will be 100% useable in line with the Council's Capital Strategy.
- 6.3. Securing the planning status of the site in advance of selling the site has de-risked the site making it more attractive to potential buyers.

7. Comments of the Assistant Director of Corporate Governance and legal implications

- 7.1 The Report provides that this land is held as housing land and forms part of the Housing Revenue account. As such the Council's disposal powers are contained under the Housing Act 1985.
- 7.2 Subject to investigation of title, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in exercise of powers under section 32 of the Housing Act 1985 and of all other powers enabling him in that behalf gives to all local authorities under General Consent 2013 A.3.2 the power to dispose of vacant land at any price determined by the local authority
- 7.3 It is envisaged that the land will be sold as one plot either collectively to the adjoining properties at 1-11 The Drive who will be given first refusal or on the open market.
- 7.4 The sale agreement should provide for overage provisions as mentioned in paragraph 5.11 of the Report in the event of further development outside of the planning permission.

8. Comments of Deputy Director for Community Housing

- 8.1 The Deputy Director for Community Housing concurs with the recommendations contained in this report.



Haringey Council

9. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments

- 9.1. The capital receipts generated from the disposals will support Council objectives benefiting the wider community

10. Policy Implications

- 10.1. The proposals are consistent with the Councils' Corporate Asset policy as set out in the Asset Management Plan.

11. Use of Appendices

- 11.1. Appendix 1 – Ordinance Survey Plan of Land r/o 1-11 The Drive N11.

12. Reasons for Decision

- 12.1. This report confirms that following cross service consultation, the subject land is surplus to requirements and on the Council's disposal's list. The report consequently recommends that the residents of 1-11 The Drive, N11 are given first option to acquire the subject land for best consideration.

13. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

13.1 Background Documents

- 13.2 The report contains exempt information. Exempt information is contained in Part B and is **not for publication**. The exempt information is under the following category (identified in amended schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972):-S(3) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person including the authority holding the information.



Haringey Council



**Land rear of 1-11 The Drive
Bounds Green
LONDON
N11**

FREEHOLD DISPOSAL

CPM no.

Overlay : H & SS - misc.

Plan produced by Janice Dabinett on 14/07/2011

Deed Doc. No. WGUDC 173

LR title no. : AGL201407

Site Area (in hectares) : 0.1774 ha

Scale 1:1250

Drawing No. BVES A4 2563



Haringey Council

Report for:	Cabinet 10 th February 2015	Item number	

Title:	Delegated Decisions and Significant Actions

Report authorised by :	Nick Walkley, Chief Executive

Lead Officer:	Ayshe Simsek(Tel. 020 8489 2929)

Ward(s) affected: Not applicable	Report for Key/Non Key Decision: For information

1. Describe the issue under consideration

To inform the Cabinet of delegated decisions and significant actions taken by Directors.

The report details by number and type decisions taken by Directors under delegated powers. Significant actions (decisions involving expenditure of more than £100,000) taken during the same period are also detailed.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

Not applicable

3. Recommendations

That the report be noted.

4. Other options considered

Not applicable

5. Background information



Haringey Council

To inform the Cabinet of delegated decisions and significant actions taken by Directors.

The report details by number and type decisions taken by Directors under delegated powers. Significant actions) decisions involving expenditure of more than £100,000) taken during the same period are also detailed.

Officer Delegated decisions are published on the following web page http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/mgDelegatedDecisions.aspx?bc_r=1

6. Comments of the Chief Financial Officer and financial Implications

Where appropriate these are contained in the individual delegations.

7. Head of Legal Services and Legal Implications

Where appropriate these are contained in the individual delegations.

8. Equalities and Community Cohesion Comments

Where appropriate these are contained in the individual delegations.

9. Head of Procurement Comments

Where appropriate these are contained in the individual delegations.

10. Policy Implications

Where appropriate these are contained in the individual delegations.

11. Use of Appendices

The appendices to the report set out by number and type decisions taken by Directors under delegated powers. Significant actions (decisions involving expenditure of more than £100,000) taken during the same period are also detailed.

12. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Background Papers

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report;

Delegated Decisions and Significant Action Forms



Haringey Council

Those marked with ♦ contain exempt information and are not available for public inspection.

The background papers are located at River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, London N22 8HQ.

To inspect them or to discuss this report further, please contact Ayshe Simsek on 020 8489 2929.

This page is intentionally left blank

DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES

Significant decisions - Delegated Action – January 2015

♦ denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
1.		NIL	
2.			
3.			
4.			

Delegated Action

Number
150112 Request for Waiver of CSO - Care Act Programme - IQ Public Sector
150120 CSO 10.02.1(d) Variation of Contract - Haricare FSD
150109 Request for Waiver CSO 8.02 - Advocacy Services

Submission authorised by:  _____
 Beverley Tarka – Interim Director of Adult Social Services

Date: __ 30th January 2015 _____

This page is intentionally left blank

DIRECTORATE OF REGENERATION, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Significant decisions - Delegated Action 2014/2015 – January 2015

◆ denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
1.			

Delegated Action			
Type	Project	Value	Number
Request for waiver of CSO 8.02 under CSO 10.01	Wood Green Town Centre Local Consultation Lyn Garner	£6,951	
Request to approve 1) award of contract under CSO 9.06.1c and 2) to award a letter of intent under CSO 9.07.3	Extension & Conversion Programme – 88 Stonebridge Road N15 Lyn Garner 16.01.15	£80,852	
Request to approve 1) award of contract under CSO 9.06.1c and 2) to award a letter of intent under CSO 9.07.3	Extension & Conversion Programme – 162 Park View Road N17 Lyn Garner 16.01.15	£41,035	
Exception to Procurement: Appointment of Create London to carry out a feasibility study	Tottenham Regeneration Programme – Tottenham Green Fire Station Lyn Garner 26.01.15	£7,000	

Submission authorised by:



Lyn Garner
Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development

Date: 30 January 2015

This page is intentionally left blank

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

Significant decisions - Delegated Action - For Reporting to Cabinet on

♦ Denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
1.	12.01.15	Gas Maintenance services contract	Approve the Memorandum of Agreement – Between LBH and Purdy's for the supply of gas services in Temporary Accommodation contract value £220k for 1 year.
2.	23.01.15	Award of contract for RPH Cafe/Coffee shop	For the Chief Operating Officer to award the contract for a cafe/coffee shop at River Park House to the Canteen Cafe for a period of 5 years, with an option to extend for further periods of up to 2 years. The Cafe is a concessionary contract, as such there is no cost to the Council, bar the initial outlay for the coffee counter; the financial risk for this venture lays with the cafe provider.
3.	23.01.15	M & E stand Alone works HO 01 capital works programme 2014 15	To seek approval of the AMP for Mechanical & Electrical (M&E) Works for of £681,215.83 Hornsey HO 01. This project forms part of the Year 7 Capital Works programme for 2014/15.
4.	28.01.15	Extend Housing Related Support Contract	Habinteg Housing Association is a provider in the Housing Related Support Physical Disabilities Sector. The service provides support to 23 service users in an accommodation based setting, some with severe physical disabilities requiring high support needs. The contract has been extended by one year at a cost of £15,458.27.

CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER

Significant decisions - Delegated Action - For Reporting to Cabinet on

♦ Denotes background papers are Exempt.

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision
5.	28.01.15	Contract variation to the Cycle Training Contract to vary the contract.	In 2013/14 the Council allocated £80,000 for school cycle training, £10,000 for one to one cycle training to carry out on and off-road cycle training for children and adults, and £10,000 for Dr Bike maintenance sessions. A similar budget was allocated for 2014 to 15 and 2015 to 16. During 2013 to 2015 the Smarter Travel team were allocated approximately £90,000 extra funding from TfL to fund Haringey cycling softer measures. Due to the success of all of the Council's Cycling Services and the increase in funding from TfL for these measures, we will exceed the threshold of the contract limit which is £217,324.50. We project that the amount that will be spent to the end of the contract (up to 31st August 2016) will be approximately £450,000. This is taking into the consideration the possible allocation of further funds from TfL for cycling measures. Recommendations Contract variation under 10.02.1 (b) to the Cycle Training Contract to vary the contract by a further £232.676.

Delegated Action

Type	Number

Director/Assistant Director Signature



Date 30.01.15

This page is intentionally left blank

Significant decisions – January 2015

No	Date approved by Director	Title	Decision

Page 517

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is exempt

This page is intentionally left blank