

NOTICE OF MEETING

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Thursday, 11th January, 2018, 7.00 pm - Civic Centre, High Road,
Wood Green, N22 8LE**

Members: Councillors Charles Wright (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair),
Kirsten Hearn, Emine Ibrahim and Tim Gallagher

Co-optees/Non Voting Members: Yvonne Denny (Co-opted Member - Church
Representative (CofE)), Luci Davin (Parent Governor representative) and
Uzma Naseer (Parent Governor Representative)

Quorum: 3

1. **FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

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

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

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

3. **URGENT BUSINESS**

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

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

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

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

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

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

6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 8)

7. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS (PAGES 9 - 36)

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

Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel, 6th November 2017.
Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel, 10th October 2017.
Housing and Regeneration, 2nd October

8. SCRUTINY OF THE DRAFT 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY - PRIORITY X (PAGES 37 - 84)

9. UPDATE ON BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PANELS

Verbal Update

10. FIRE SAFETY IN HIGH RISE BUILDINGS

11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

12. FUTURE MEETINGS

29th January 2018
26th March 2018

Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Co-ordinator
Tel – 020 8489 2957
Fax – 020 8881 5218
Email: philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

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

Wednesday, 03 January 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 2017, 19:00

PRESENT:

Councillors: Charles Wright (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Kirsten Hearn, Emine Ibrahim and Tim Gallagher.

22. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred those present to agenda Item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at this meeting and asked that those present reviewed and noted the information contained therein.

23. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were noted from Yvonne Denny.

24. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair advised that there was a late report to be tabled at item 13, which set out a scope for a proposed review of care home commissioning by the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel.

25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

26. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

The Committee received a deputation from Rev. Paul Nicholson in relation Cabinet's decision on 14th November, to approve to Full Council the implementation of the 2018/19 council tax reduction scheme (CTRS). In particular, Rev. Nicholson raised concerns that:

- a. Under the 2018/19 council tax reduction scheme, working age claimants of council tax support continued to be capped at 80.2% of council tax liability. Rev. Nicholson set out that since April 2013, 264 of 326 local authorities in England had charged a reduced rate of council tax of between 8.5% and 30% against state benefits.
- b. The level of benefits available to working age claimants had been steadily eroded over recent years. The employment benefit payment for a single adult of £71.10 per week was insufficient and having to pay, even a reduced rate of council tax was an additional financial burden that pushed benefit claimants even further into arrears. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation, had set the minimum weekly income standard at £91.80.

- c. Concerns were raised that once residents became in arrears, the Council instigated debt proceedings and the level of debt would then be compounded by court costs. Concerns were also raised with the use of bailiffs, who sought to secure payment against social security payments.
- d. Given the 7 year difference in life expectancy between Northumberland Park and some of the most affluent wards in the borough, Rev. Nicholson emphasised that there were a number of key impacts on health related to low incomes. These included; poor diet leading to diabetes and cardio-vascular disease; cold homes leading to respiratory and cardio-vascular disease; poor nutrition leading to low birth weights; indirect health impacts such as increased levels of stress and depression.
- e. In order to support putting the health and wellbeing of all its residents first, Rev. Nicholson requested that: The additional liability over and above the statutory minimum of 8.5% should be funded from the Council's unearmarked financial reserves; the Council should stop taxing working age benefits from April 2019; withdraw the use of bailiffs; and remit the council tax of all working age claimants.

In response to the discussion of the deputation, the following points were noted:

- a. In response to a request for clarification, Rev. Nicholson requested that the Committee should call-in the Cabinet's decision. It was clarified that the original Cabinet decision was to approve the 2018/19 CTRS to Full Council for adoption and that this decision was subject to call-in, the deadline for which was 10 am on Friday 24th November. Full Council would then consider the scheme at its meeting on 4th December.
- b. In response to a question, officers advised that the cost of funding the council tax reduction scheme last year was around £19m for all categories of exemption. It was estimated that the cost of further reducing the liability for working age benefit claimants would be around £5m.
- c. The Committee considered that there were other boroughs who did not use bailiffs.
- d. The Committee invited Rev. Nicholson to give a deputation to Full Council on 4th December, as they would be taking the final decision on the CTRS.
- e. The Committee suggested that a piece of work should be undertaken in future to look at the enforcement of council tax debt and the use of bailiffs to collect arrears from benefit claimants. **(Action: Clerk).**
- f. The Committee also agreed that it would note the points raised during the deputation and use them to inform a representation to Full Council; specifically around concerns with the method of enforcement and a reminder that there were other options available in terms of the level of reduction available and how this could be funded. **(Action: OSC Members).**
- g. Rev. Nicholson advised the Committee that he thought the key emphasis should be around the impact of low income on health and wellbeing.

27. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the OSC meeting on 16th October 2017 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

28. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS

The Committee noted the minutes of the following Scrutiny Panel meetings and approved the recommendations contained therein:

- Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel, 5th October
- Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel, 12th October

29. COMPLAINTS UPDATE

Anita Hunt, Feedback and Information Governance Manager introduced a report which provided the Committee with an update on complaints performance, learning from complaints and the Local Government Ombudsman Annual Letter. Following discussion of the report, the following was noted:

- a. The Committee was advised that the process for learning from complaints had been revised, which comprised of the following key stages: FIG circulated quarterly reports which set out Stage 1 and Stage 2 complaints as well as details of upheld Ombudsman complaints; services considered those reports at internal senior management team meetings; services fed back to FIG on the actions, changes and learning that had been incorporated; SOG would then receive a quarterly report on the learning and actions.
- b. The Ombudsman expressed concern about Haringey's timelines in implementing remedies. The implementation of a regular formal report to Council on all ombudsman investigations where fault/ maladministration was found, was being put in place.
- c. The Committee sought assurances around a shortage of qualified officers and high volumes of complaints which had led to a backlog. In response, officers advised that following a recruitment drive, Revenues currently had all of its posts filled. The Benefits team currently had 8 vacancies, which was compounded by the fact that it took 9 months to train a Benefits Officer. In order to mitigate staff shortages, the service had recently taken on a 3rd party provider to provide additional staffing resources. However, the service was no longer employing temporary staff. Officers also advised that overall, there was a clear strategic impetus towards a digital channel shift.
- d. The Committee raised concerns with response times to urgent enquiries and queried whether there was anything that could be done to improve the process, particularly with the advent of a number of new Councillors in May. Officers responded that there was an urgent enquiry procedure in place and advised that Member Enquiries marked as urgent should illicit a response that day.
- e. The Committee sought assurances around the ratio of managers to staff and overall staff levels, in response officers advised that this seemed to be managed quite well.
- f. In response to a query around what could be done to improve performance around complaints further, officers advised that the key was continued performance monitoring and ensuring that individuals and services took ownership for responding to complaints and developing learning points.
- g. The Committee sought clarification on the additional staff being provided by the third party company. Officers responded that the 8 vacancies were being covered by 7 people from the external company who had been in place since

May. The backlog of complaints pre-dated the utilisation of the third party company and a significant improvement in performance was anticipated.

- h. The Committee requested that it be kept informed of complaints performance and suggested that regular reports be submitted to the Committee. The Committee also proposed that an annual report be taken to the Executive and that this should include an assessment of Ombudsman investigations where fault/maladministration was found. The Committee was advised that the most appropriate forum for this report was Corporate Committee. **(Action: Clerk/Feedback and Information Governance Manager.)**

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the information contained in the report.

30. QUARTER 2 2017/18 BUDGET MONITORING REPORT

Oladapo Shonola, Principal Accountant for Financial Planning introduced a report which set out the 2017/18 Quarter 2 financial position for the Council. It was noted that:

- a. The Council was projecting an overspend by £6.6m in 2017/18 against a £255m budget. The overspend consisted of £2.1m in Children's Services (P1), £3.4m in Adult Social Services (P2) and £0.8m in Temporary Accommodation (P5). There were also smaller overspends in P3 & P5 and a projected underspend by around £400k in Priority X.
- b. There was an improved variance in Priority 1 from the first quarter of 2017/18 by around £1.1m.
- c. There was a worsening variance in Priority 2 from the first quarter of 2017/18 by around £2.1m.
- d. There were also improved variances in Priority 3 & Priority x.
- e. The HRA showed an improvement by £0.6m giving an overall net favourable movement by 0.2m from Quarter 1 to Quarter 2.
- f. In relation to the Capital Budget there was a significant underspend forecast of £108m, which consisted of £89m on the General Fund and £19m on the HRA.
- g. The MTFs savings target for 2017/18 was £20.6m. As at Quarter 2, services were projecting that £10.17m (49%) of planned savings would be achieved compared to £13.8m (67%) at Quarter 1. The most significant adverse movement related to savings within Adult Social Services.

Following discussion of the report, the following points were noted:

- a. In response to a query around the use of General Fund reserves, the Committee was advised that the approved budget for 2017/18 included a planned use of £8.8m of reserves from the General Fund, which would reduce the overall level of reserves in the General Fund to £6.2m. The minimum level of General Fund reserves recommended by the S151 Officer at the time of setting the budget was £15m.
- b. The Committee sought reassurance around the General Fund reserves, given their reduction to £6.2m and a projected overspend of £6.6m at Quarter 2. The Committee questioned what was being done to manage this. In response, officers advised that budget recovery plans were being drawn up corporately to mitigate the projected overspend and that there were other activities being

considered, such as a redesignation of ear-marked reserves to the General Fund.

- c. Members enquired how confident officers were that sufficient additional revenue or other sources of funding would be found to meet the funding gap. In response, officers advised that they were reasonably confident of meeting the shortfall this year, but acknowledged that meeting the underlying gap of £15m would be dependent upon increasing revenue levels.
- d. In response to a request for clarification, officers set out that that the achievement of savings under the MTFs was included within the overspend forecast of £6.6m and that this combined with the £8.8m from General Fund reserves left a funding gap of around £15m.
- e. The Committee was advised that Finance had met with the lead officers for each Priority to discuss areas of additional savings and additional revenue streams, such increased grant income.
- f. The Committee queried about the extent to which the cost of interims and temporary staff had an impact on the budget deficit. The Committee also requested that an assessment be done around the effectiveness of outsourcing and whether there were any long term savings involved in bringing services back in-house. The Chair suggested that the Veolia contract would be an obvious candidate for reviewing the efficacy of bringing the service back in-house. The Committee agreed that it would look into the Veolia contract as part of the budget scrutiny process. **(Action: Clerk/Environment & Community Safety Panel).**
- g. The Committee raised concerns with a significant underspend in Temporary Accommodation, given the pressures on that service. In response the Principal Accountant suggested that part of the reason may have been because of difficulties in acquiring specific types of property. The Principal Account for Financial Planning agreed to provide the Committee with a response on the reasons for the underspend in temporary accommodation. **(Action: Oladapo Shonola).**
- h. The Committee noted its concern with the significant underspend in the Capital budget.

RESOLVED

That the Committee:

- I. Noted the Q2 forecast revenue outturn for the General Fund of £6.6m overspend, including corporate items;
- II. noted the net HRA forecast position of £0.2m underspend;
- III. noted the latest capital position with forecast capital expenditure of £ 101.59m in 2017/18;
- IV. noted the risks and mitigating actions identified in the report in the context of the Council's on-going budget management responsibilities/savings as set out in Appendix 3(a) and 3(g);
- V. noted the measures in place to reduce overspend in service areas; and
- VI. note budget virements set out in Section 6 and Appendix 4 of the report.

31. CORPORATE PLAN 2015-18 PRIORITY PERFORMANCE UPDATE ON BUILDING A STRONGER HARINGEY TOGETHER- JUNE 2017

Margaret Gallagher, Corporate Performance Manager introduced the report which set out performance against the outcomes and strategic priorities in the Corporate Plan 2015-18.

The Committee commented that the priority dashboard was not easy to find through the website and suggested that it should be made more accessible. The Corporate Performance Manager agreed to feed that back. **(Action: Margaret Gallagher).**

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the progress made against the delivery of the priorities and targets of the Corporate Plan, Building a stronger Haringey Together.

32. BUDGET SETTING PROCESS

Oladapo Shonola, Principal Accountant for Financial Planning gave a verbal update on the budget setting process.

- a. The Committee was advised that the national picture was a further reduction in in funding from central government. Funding from the Revenue Support Grant was down by 63% from 2010 levels.
- b. Officers commented that work was ongoing to better manage demand led pressures and that a variety of options would be considered including a transfer of some costs from the revenue to capital budget.
- c. Officers advised that that the underlying budget gap would remain from 2017/18 to 2018/19.
- d. There would be a report to Cabinet on 12th December and the budget would go through the Scrutiny Panels and back to the Committee on 29th January. Final budget proposals would be submitted to Cabinet and approved by Full Council in February 2018.
- e. In response to a request for clarification on the transfer of costs from revenue to capital, officers advised that this was a standard accountancy process and was not related to funding redundancy costs.

33. ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY SAFETY PANEL - FINAL STREET SWEEPING REPORT

Cllr Tim Gallagher, Chair of the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel introduced the Scrutiny Review on Street Sweeping to the Committee. The following was noted during the discussion of the report:

- a. In response to a question about how to manage expectations going forwards, the Committee considered that expectation levels were partially determined by existing litter and detritus levels. It was acknowledged that street sweeping should be targeted at where the problems were, not necessarily where the largest volume of complaints were received.
- b. The Chair of the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel advised that the focus of the review was frequency of sweeping and that in-house versus outsourced delivery models were not considered as part of the review.

- c. The Committee considered that there were examples of other boroughs who had an in-house street sweeping service that was separate from its waste management service. The Chair of the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel agreed to consider the relevant merits of bringing the street sweeping service in-house, and to question the Cabinet Member on this proposal at the next panel meeting. **(Action: Cllr Gallagher).**

RESOLVED

That the Committee approved the report and its recommendations and that it be submitted to Cabinet for response.

34. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Committee considered the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme update as set out.

Cllr Pippa Connor, Chair of the Adult and Health Scrutiny Panel tabled a late item to the Committee which set out the scope for a proposed review of care home commissioning by the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel.

It was noted that the overarching aim of the project was to ensure residents in Haringey received high quality care in care home settings (residential and nursing) and that contracts incentivised care homes to provide high quality care. The review would examine Haringey's current care home offer, with consideration given to both the user / carer experience and workforce support and planning.

In response to a query, the Committee was advised that the care homes were not in-house and that clients were placed into commissioned care homes, including some in neighbouring boroughs.

The Committee commented that improving personal choice in Haringey's Adult Social Care should be a key consideration in determining future service provision.

RESOLVED

- I. That the Committee noted the work programmes for the main Committee and Scrutiny Panels, as set out in appendices 1,2,3,4 & 5.
- II. That the Committee noted the verbal update, concerning the Care Home Commissioning scrutiny project, from the Chair of the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel.
- III. That the Committee agreed the scoping document for the Care Home Commissioning scrutiny project.

35. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

36. FUTURE MEETINGS

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the future meeting dates;

- 16th January 2018
- 29th January 2018
- 26th March 2018

CHAIR: Councillor Charles Wright

Signed by Chair

Date

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON MONDAY 6TH NOVEMBER 2017

PRESENT:

Councillors: Kirsten Hearn (Chair), Mark Blake, Toni Mallett and Reg Rice

Co-opted Member: Luci Davin (Parent Governor representative)

31. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

32. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Morris and Ms Denny and Ms Naseer.

33. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

35. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

36. MINUTES

In respect of the 2nd paragraph of page 3 (agenda item 23.; Review on Disproportionality within the Youth Justice System), Councillor Weston reported that the Black and Minority Ethnic Steering Group had been set up at her behest rather than by the Schools Forum. In respect the 2nd paragraph of page 6 (agenda item 24. Financial Monitoring/Budget Savings), Margaret Dennison, Interim Director of Children's Services, reported that the word "not" should be deleted.

AGREED:

That, subject to the above mentioned amendments, the minutes of the meeting of 5 October 2017 be approved.

37. HARINGEY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2016/17

Geraldine Gavin, Interim Independent Chair of the Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB), introduced the LSCB Annual Report. She had taken over from Sir Paul Ennals after he had departed in May. The report focused on what had been successful and what needed to be improved. Of greatest significance was the recent publication of the revised "Working Together to Safeguard Children" and child death review guidance and new regulations for consultation. These proposed some major changes.

From April 2019, LSCBs would cease to exist. Safeguarding would become the responsibility of three statutory partners; the local authority, CCG and Police. In respect of the proposals relating to serious case reviews, it was proposed that they would continue to be undertaken locally except where there were issues that might be of national interest, which would be dealt with by a national panel. New arrangements to review child deaths would need to be agreed locally. The proposed changes and transitional process carried some risks in their implementation and there was important work to do over the next 18 months to make sure the risks were well managed.

Since coming to Haringey, she had found an active partnership and good dialogue. She felt that the LSCB was keen and alert to bringing in changes where necessary. There had been an increasing amount of pressure to access services. There were currently too many cases being referred inwards and not enough early intervention. She highlighted a number of issues;

- The LSCB was giving particular attention to neglect;
- Gangs and serious youth violence were big issues. She noted that the borough's Youth Parliament had identified gangs and crime, mental health and having things to do as their top three priorities;
- In respect of mental health, a concordat had been signed to prevent young people in crisis being held temporarily in Police stations. Consideration was being given by the government to passing responsibility for this issue to local authorities; and
- The London Safeguarding Board continued to play a significant role. Issues of child sexual exploitation, female genital mutilation and the Prevent programme were three London wide priorities that all local LSCBs also needed to make progress on.

In answer to a question, she stated that funding for the LSCB was its biggest challenge. Partners made contributions to the LSCB but the bulk of the funding came from the local authority. Under the new arrangements, the costs were intended to be shared between the three statutory partners. Under the current system, the amount contributed by CCGs varied between areas and some other areas received more from their CCG than Haringey. She commented that the new arrangements would include provision for independent scrutiny, although how this was done would be a matter for local determination.

Ms Gavin commented that she had access to a spreadsheet on LSCB funding across London. Some boroughs received virtually nothing from external sources to fund their LSCB but payment in kind was sometimes offered instead. The new guidance stated

that all three statutory partners should jointly fund the LSCB. Serious case reviews could have significant financial implications, with each costing between £5-10,000, and there could be several of these each year. She felt that, at the very least, there needed to be some consistency between boroughs who were part of the Sustainability and Transformation Plan for north central London. There was a requirement for independent external scrutiny within the guidance but how this was achieved was not specified.

She stated that the purpose of the LSCB was to facilitate partnership and dialogue and hold partners to account for their contribution to keeping children and young people safe. There was a small business unit to support this in Haringey. New support arrangements would need to be determined as part of the local transitional arrangements. Although the aim of the new arrangements was to remove unnecessary bureaucracy, there was a need for a minimum level of administrative support.

The timing and frequency of board meetings was a matter for it to decide and it currently met on a three monthly basis. Reducing the number of meetings and restricting attendance to just those who were essential helped make arrangements more cost effective. However, there was a risk though that the voluntary sector and schools would not be as well engaged with the LSCB as a result of this. Active lay members could add value to the work of the LSCB.

In answer to a question, Ms. Gavin stated that the LSCB got no money from central government. It was entirely funded by safeguarding partners. She reported that the first draft of the updated Working Together had contained no reference to schools. Of particular relevance was the fact they were not regarded as a statutory partner. Most LSCBs currently contained Headteacher representatives but some academies were less co-operative. Most Headteachers were nevertheless keen to assist. She stated that there were specific concerns in respect of home educated children that needed to be considered.

In response to a question, Ms. Gavin reported that there were good links with Adult Safeguarding but there was nevertheless a need for services to be joined up better. Whilst improvements had been made, more progress needed to be made.

In answer to a question regarding lay and community involvement, she reported that a newsletter had been produced for community and voluntary sector colleagues in order to generate awareness and interest. However, there were some difficulties due to lack of funding. She felt that practice could be better informed by engagement with the community. The Youth Council could provide a source of feedback but thought needed to be given on how best to engage with them.

She reported that there were around 100 serious case reviews that took place nationally in a year and they were all now required to be published. In practice, most LSCBs published executive summaries on their websites. There was one currently in progress in Haringey and there were currently around 1-2 per year. Cities such as Birmingham could have up to 8 at any one time.

They Panel thanked Ms. Gavin for her kind assistance.

38. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS; CHILDREN AND FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES

Councillor Eugene Ayisi, the Cabinet Member for Communities, reported on current issues within his portfolio. In terms of youth services that were provided by the Council, he reported that current provision covered only a small number of young people within the borough. Schools and other organisations provided a certain amount in addition to this. A working group had been set up to consider youth provision, including a partnership with Onside to develop a Youth Zone for Haringey.

The ambition was to cater for 1500 young people and provide opportunities for 7 days per week.

In answer to a question regarding the voice of the child, he stated that it was often too late by the time engagement took place with those who came into contact with the Youth Justice Service. Interventions needed to take place at an earlier stage, before young people got into trouble. Risk factors could include young people becoming disillusioned with school and exposure to domestic violence. Although youth services could assist, they were not a silver bullet.

Gill Gibson, Assistant Director for Early Help and Prevention, reported that there were plans to deliver a 'Hackathon' participation event on addressing obesity and it was intended to follow this with a further participation event on the theme of knife crime. The Youth Council, who had strong links with schools and community groups, were on the steering group arranging these and so would be involved.

In answer to a question, the Cabinet Member stated that there was an awareness of what provision for young people existed across the borough that was provided by the community and voluntary sector. The Bridge Renewal Trust had assisted with this process. Onside would be utilised to help develop additional capacity. He would be happy to share details of current provision.

In answer to a question regarding Black History Month, he stated that a Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) staff network had been developed. He felt that staff were an excellent resource whose contribution could sometimes be overlooked. However, he felt that it was important that senior management within the Council were reflective of the borough's diversity.

In response to a question regarding knife crime, he stated that it was important that young people had confidence in the Police to protect them. However, confidence in the Police in Haringey was low and had been low historically. Police were now being assigned to primary schools so that relationships could be built up with children from an earlier age. He felt that there needed to be a dual approach, with enforcement for those who committed offences and support for those who needed it. Whilst it was necessary sometimes to have a robust approach to enforcement, he felt that there needed to be balance.

Councillor Weston, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, responded to questions from the Panel. In respect of the Harris Academy, she stated that it was difficult to know what was behind their very good OFSTED inspection results. Nationally, 57% of their academies were classified as outstanding. Of the three Harris

Academies in Haringey, two were rated as outstanding and one rated as good. However, 99% of all schools in Haringey were rated as either good or outstanding.

There was no evidence of looked after children having difficulty in gaining admission to schools within the borough, including academies. Broadly speaking, there were no differences in the way that academies dealt with admissions. Looked after children were offered places within the time limit in virtually all cases. Looked after children also had access to the borough's Virtual School, which was very highly rated. She agreed to find out how many looked after children attended academies within the borough and report back.

In respect of Education, Health and Social Care assessments, these were still comparatively new. There was a 20-week completion target, which was challenging. Haringey had used trained staff to coordinate plans and were seeking to commission additional days. There were currently vacant posts within the service but she was confident that that all of the assessments would be dealt with within the 20-week time limit once these were filled. 30% were currently completed within the time limit.

She was aware that changes to the SEN transport had caused difficulties for some families as there was no longer a door-to-door service. Some families had contacted her with concerns regarding this and work had taken place to find a solution. She was happy to consider the arrangements for other families if they contacted her. Gill Gibson, Assistant Director for Early Help and Prevention, reported that changes had been made to accommodate particular children if necessary. As agreed at the last Panel meeting, she would circulate a briefing on the changes shortly. The number of routes had been reduced from 151 to 108 in order to make savings. The service was nevertheless mindful of the needs of children.

The Chair reported that Panel Members had submitted a number of questions to the Cabinet Member regarding concerns that had been raised in respect of support offered to families with no recourse to public funds (NRPF) and it had been agreed that a fuller response would be made to these in due course.

Panel Members expressed concern at the evidence that they had received from community and voluntary sector organisations regarding the service provided by the no recourse to public funds (NRPF) team. The Cabinet Member stated that the concerns raised had been on board. Ms Alexander reported that some of the concerns had been shared by management and two audits had been commissioned in response to them in order to obtain a clearer picture of practice. The most recent one had shown practice to be compliant but had also made some recommendations for improvement.

The Cabinet Member reported that families who were NRPF came under a number of different categories. Such assistance that could be required focussed on the needs of children. Training was provided for relevant staff on a regular basis and this included specific sessions on issues such as human rights.

In respect of the amount of subsistence that was provided, Sarah Alexander, Assistant Director for Safeguarding and Social Care, reported that the amount payable was £65.75 per family but this did not include housing. There was no set amount and what

was currently paid was lower than the £73.90 that advice suggested was appropriate. She was not aware as to why this level had been set. Whilst it would be possible to review the amount payable, any increase would have a significant impact on the budget and there was no provision for this.

The Cabinet Member reported that a member of staff had been commissioned from the Home Office to undertake immigration tests, support social work staff and analyse data. Consideration was currently being given to whether this support should be re-commissioned. In terms of safeguarding, Ms Alexander reported that victims from NRPF families received the same service as any other child.

In answer to a question regarding whether austerity had led to more children being taken into care, the Cabinet Member reported that it was not possible to be certain whether this was the case in Haringey. The number of looked after children had fallen since its peak but there had been an increase recently. It was possible that this was due to there being more unaccompanied asylum seekers.

In respect of the free childcare offer for 3 and 4 year olds, she reported that it had been estimated that there were 1710 children in Haringey that were entitled to the offer. The projected number of places was 1419 and considered sufficient to meet demand. However, there had been problems with the HMRC system that was intended to support provision. Webpages to promote take up had been updated and parent champions were being recruited to encourage take up. There had been a negative impact on some childcare settings and a review of progress was planned. The borough was funded according to the level of take up.

The Panel thanked the Cabinet Members for their kind assistance.

AGREED:

That the Cabinet Member for Children and Families be requested to circulate details to the Panel on the number of looked after children attending academies in the borough.

39. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

AGREED:

That the work plan be approved.

CHAIR: Councillor Kirsten Hearn

Signed by Chair

Date

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ADULTS & HEALTH
SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY, 10TH OCTOBER, 2017,
6.30 - 9.35 pm**

PRESENT:

Councillors: Pippa Connor (Chair), Gina Adamou, David Beacham,
Patrick Berryman, Eddie Griffith and Peter Mitchell

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillors: Jason Arthur, Zena Brabazon, Gideon Bull and Bernice Vanier

15. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was noted apologies for absence had been received from Helena Kania (Non-Voting Co Optee).

17. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Gina Adamou declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 by virtue of one of her daughters working in Haringey as a social worker.

Cllr Gina Adamou declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 by virtue of one of her daughters being a teacher.

Cllr Gina Adamou declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 by virtue of her son working in the teaching and education sector.

Cllr Pippa Connor declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 by virtue of her sister working as a GP in Tottenham.

Cllr Pippa Connor declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 by virtue of being a member of the Royal College of Nursing.

Cllr Gideon Bull declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 by virtue of being an employee for NHS Improvement.

There were no disclosable pecuniary interests or prejudicial interests declared by members.

19. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/ PRESENTATIONS/ QUESTIONS

None.

20. MINUTES - 6 MARCH 2017

AGREED: That the minutes of the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 6 March 2017 be approved as a correct record.

21. MINUTES - 29 JUNE 2017

AGREED: That the minutes of the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 29 June 2017 be approved as a correct record.

22. NORTH CENTRAL LONDON JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE UPDATE

Cllr Connor, in her capacity as Vice Chair of the North Central London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (NCL JHOSC), provided a verbal update on recent meetings.

The Panel was informed the NCL JHOSC had met twice during September. Cllr Connor explained that on 19 September the Committee had received presentations from:

- Andrew Wright, Director of Strategic Development, Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust, on the St Ann's Hospital Site Redevelopment. Cllr Connor advised that the full business case would be considered by the NCL JHOSC as soon as it was available.
- Representatives from the Camden and Islington Foundation Trust, concerning the St Pancras Site Redevelopment. Cllr Connor advised that the final business case would be considered by the NCL JHOSC at a future meeting.

During the discussion, the Panel suggested it would be useful for Haringey's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) to receive an update on the St Ann's Hospital Site Redevelopment. Cllr Connor agreed to discuss this suggestion further with the Chair of OSC, including the option of holding a briefing for all Members.

In response to questions about the NCL JHOSC meeting, held on 22 September, Cllr Connor provided updates on the following:

- The financial position of the Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust.
- The fact that a site visit would be arranged for the Committee to visit the Chase Farm site.

- The staffing workstream for the Sustainability and Transformation Partnership for North Central London.
- Issues in relation to public engagement concerning the Sustainability and Transformation Partnership for North Central London.

It was noted that consideration had also been given to issues concerning the Dementia Pathway and the approach that was being taken, across North Central London, to commissioning procedures of limited clinical effectiveness.

AGREED: That the update on recent NCL JHOSC meetings be noted.

Clerk's note - the minutes from the NCL JHOSC meetings held on 19 September and 22 September 2017 can be viewed online via <http://democracy.camden.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=268&Year=0>

23. FUTURE MODEL OF HEALTH AND CARE IN HARINGEY - DISCHARGE PATHWAYS AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT

John Everson, Assistant Director of Adult Social Services, provided an update on Haringey's Design Framework for Integrating Health and Social Care. Mr Everson commented that his report provided a particular focus on the work that had taken place across health and social care to improve discharge from hospital pathways and market developments to support this.

The Panel was informed that the Haringey Design Framework provided a clear, shared and strategic view across health and care partners, to ensure the independence of all residents. The Panel was asked to note that the Design Framework was underpinned by a number of important principles, including:

- Preventing avoidable health conditions
- Connecting people to their communities
- Maximising independence and wellbeing
- Integrating and joining up health and care to deliver seamless services
- Delivering fair and equal care across the borough
- Co-designing support with citizens to promote choice and control

The Panel was informed there were four patient pathways and that these were based upon the level of support required on leaving hospital. The following points were noted:

Pathway 0	The patient no longer has any additional needs.
Pathway 1	The patient has some additional needs that can be safely met at home – they can be left alone between care visits.
Pathway 2	The patient is unable to return home immediately and cannot be left alone between visits. The discharge may need more planning owing to complexity in the situation or the patient may need an intermediate care bed.
Pathway 3	The patient is unable to return home. They have need of residential or nursing home care and/or may be Continuing Healthcare eligible.

The Panel was informed that discharge to access was a change to NHS and Social Care procedures, moving all non-essential processes, including assessments of long term care needs, out of the acute setting. Mr Everson went on to provide clarity on the discharge to access statement of principles:

- **Home First:** The Panel was informed every effort would be made to enable people to go home and that creative solutions would be used to keep the person at home following discharge. It was noted that readmission would be the last resort.
- **Simplification:** The Panel was advised of the importance of providing one number for wards to ring (Single Point of Access) and for not insisting on lengthy or duplicating assessments before a patient left hospital. The importance of making discharge pathways as simple as possible and taking as many discharge-related tasks out of the hands of ward staff was also noted.
- **Responsiveness:** The Panel was informed care needs would be assessed in a residents home within two hours of discharge. It was noted any necessary equipment would be provided on the same day or the day following assessment. The importance of providing necessary care packages and putting in place wrap-around support to keep the patient at home longer, reducing reliance on long term care services in the future, was also highlighted.

In response to questions, Mr Everson explained there were benefits to patients (reduced risk of deconditioning and hospital-acquired infection), staff (more time to focus on patient care) and hospital and social care (more bed capacity and reduction in longer term social care packages).

Mr Everson concluded his presentation by outlining a number of case studies which highlighted improved outcomes across each of the pathways.

In terms of market development, Charlotte Pomery, Assistant Director for Commissioning, answered a number of questions in relation to section 3.5 of the report.

The Panel was informed Haringey's reablement service was a key component of the Design Framework. This ensured people were supported home in a timely manner and received the care they needed to recover their independence. However, it was noted that additional capacity and market development was also required in order to manage new ways of working. In response to questions, Ms Pomery explained that by changing the commissioning approach for home care – now supplied through a Dynamic Purchasing System – the Council had ensured sufficient local capacity to meet need, had stabilised the home care market across the borough, had decreased local provider reliance on zero hour contacts and were now in a position to redesign the model of home support more fundamentally.

Ms Pomery advised that work was ongoing with partner authorities across North Central London in order to safeguard capacity for the local health and care economy, particularly in respect of nursing care. Due to the considerable demand for this type of provision, and with limited supply, the Panel was informed the Council was working on ways to stimulate and develop the market so it was better tuned to meet demand.

During this discussion, a number of issues were considered in relation to the consultation which had taken place in relation to a proposal to close Osborne Grove Nursing Home, following concerns about the quality of care and safety of residents. The Chair advised that these issues would be addressed fully under the Cabinet Member Q&A (item 11 on the agenda). This was agreed and the Panel went on to consider a range of issues in relation to:

- Work that was taking place through the Providers' Forum.
- Ways to develop additional home based reablement capacity.
- The Home from Hospital Service, provided by the Bridge Renewal Trust.
- The commissioning of additional intermediate care beds to support different levels of need.

In conclusion, Mr Everson commented that the approach, reflected in Haringey's Design Framework, had resulted in significant improvements to the experience of residents and in their outcomes. The Panel was informed that decisions about residents' short and long term care needs were now no longer made for them from a hospital bed, but alongside them in an environment more like, or that was, home. The following points were considered in relation to the reablement service:

- It was noted that the service could now respond within 24 hours of a resident's discharge, providing opportunities for 849 residents to benefit from reablement intervention in 2016/17, compared to 459 in 2015/16.
- The fact that refocusing and re-specifying the service had helped to reduce unit costs from £45 to £23 per person.
- The facilitation, on average, of 10 discharges per week through reablement from March 2017 to October 2017. It was noted that this had reduced the time that residents spent in hospital by saving 2-3 bed days per discharge.

- That, on average, since April 2017, 76% of people with complex needs who had been supported by reablement had recovered sufficiently from their crisis situation in hospital and did not require a long-term social care service. It was noted that this potential cost avoidance to Adult Social Care, attributed to transforming reablement, was reported at £1.1 million.

AGREED:

- (a) That the update on Haringey's Design Framework for Integrating Health and Social Care be noted.
- (b) That an item on Haringey's Design Framework for Integrating Health and Social Care, with further information provided on targets, outcomes and the financial implications for each discharge from hospital pathway, be included in the Panel's future work programme for 2018/19 (date TBC).

24. PRIMARY CARE UPDATE

Cassie Williams, Assistant Director of Primary Care Quality and Development, introduced the report as set out. This provided an update on Care Closer to Home and Primary Care Estates.

The Panel was informed partners involved in the Health and Social Care Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) had identified various priority areas, including Care Closer to Home. As set out in sections 1.1 – 1.3 of the report, the Panel was informed key areas of the workstream included: Extended Primary Care Access; Care Closer to Home Integrated Networks (CHINs); and Primary Care Quality Improvement Support Teams (QISTs). Ms Williams provided further information on each of these and informed the Panel that Haringey CCG was working with partners to deliver the various goals, set out in the report.

In terms of estates, the Panel was informed that in November 2016 Haringey CCG had been advised that they had been provisionally successful in three bids to the NHS England Estates and Technology Transformation Fund. The Panel was informed that this could potentially provide £11 million of capital for the development of new primary care facilities in Wood Green, Tottenham Hale and Green Lanes. It was noted that these areas had previously been identified as high priorities in Haringey CCG's estates strategy.

The Panel was informed that in order to secure the money, it was necessary to submit project initiation documents (PIDs) and, if successful, business cases would be developed. Ms Williams explained PIDs had been submitted during quarter 1 of 2017/18 and that outline business cases would be submitted for approval before the end of October 2017. It was noted that the goal was for each site to be built by 2020/21.

In response to questions, Ms Williams informed the Panel that whilst these three sites were the highest priorities for Haringey, it was acknowledged there were also other areas requiring estates solutions over the next 3-5 years.

During the discussion a range of topics were considered, including:

- Various issues in relation to GP registration, practice boundaries, and the registration criteria for new patients.
- Issues relating to primary care and estate regeneration.
- Extending access, including GP appointments for Haringey residents at weekends and evenings.

AGREED:

- (a) That the Primary Care Update, on Care Closer to Home and Estates, be noted.
- (b) That an update on Primary Care be included in the Panel's future work programme for 2018/19 (scope and date TBC).

25. CABINET MEMBER Q&A

The Chair welcomed Cllr Jason Arthur, Cabinet Member for Finance and Health, and Cllr Bernice Vanier, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Culture, to the meeting.

In response to questions concerning portfolio responsibilities for Corporate Plan Priority 2, Cllr Arthur explained that he was responsible for Public Health; Health Devolution Pilots; Health and Social Care Integration; and working with the CCG and NHS. Cllr Vanier confirmed that the following areas of responsibility related to her portfolio: Adult Social Care; Adults with Disabilities and Additional Needs; and Safeguarding Adults.

Cllr Arthur provided an update on issues relating to protecting Haringey home care workers. The Panel was informed that the Council had recently signed up to UNISON's ethical care charter. It was noted that this set out a series of commitments to protect the rights of home care workers'. Cllr Arthur explained that under the charter, the Council was committed to replacing zero hours contracts with guaranteed hours, and to make full payment for travel time between home care visits. In response to questions, the Panel was informed that the new code would mean the commissioning of home care visits would always be shaped by what was best for the person being cared for and the care worker, not by the need to meet a certain quota of visits or complete care duties in a set timeframe.

Cllr Arthur went on to provide updates on a number of issues, including:

- The work that was taking place across Haringey to support "Stoptober", a campaign, backed by Cancer Research and the British Heart Foundation, aimed at encouraging the nation's 8 million smokers to give up.
- Sexual health services in Haringey and across London. The Panel was informed of recent improvements with information, advice, testing and treatment for a range of

conditions available online 24 hours a day, as well as a host of services at clinics, pharmacies and GP practices.

- Better Care Funding, including details of an open letter, written in partnership with Islington Council, to Jeremy Hunt, Secretary of State for Health. Cllr Arthur explained he had submitted a letter, in partnership with Cllr Janet Burgess MBE, Islington Council's Executive Member for Health & Social Care, to highlight the vital role played by the Better Care Fund and to raise concerns about a series of changes which had been made to the conditions attached to the release of the funding.

Cllr Arthur also provided an update on the Haringey and Islington Wellbeing Partnership, including work that was taking place to engage local residents, while issues were also considered in relation to the Sustainability and Transformation Partnership for North Central London.

Cllr Vanier provided an update on a number of issues, including:

- The Disability Related Expenditure Disregard Proposal. It was noted that a report would be considered by Cabinet in November 2017. It was explained that this report would set out the findings of the consultation and would contain recommendations with regards to the proposal to bring disability related expenditure disregard more in line with other London Boroughs by April 2018.
- The fact the Council was working with Haringey CCG to develop a draft respite policy. The Panel was informed that the policy intended to provide clarity for carers, service users and practitioners around a joint approach to respite care provision in the borough for children, young people and adults.
- An update concerning the Meals on Wheels Service. In response to questions, the Panel was informed that as set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy, the Council was considering withdrawing subsidy from the Meals on Wheels Service. It was explained that a report would be considered by Cabinet in October 2017. This report would outline findings from the public consultation.

In response to questions, concerning savings and costs associated with day care closures, the Panel was informed that further information would be provided as part of the Panel's special meeting on budget monitoring, scheduled for 16 November 2017. The Panel also received an update on a feasibility study, that was being prepared by Property Services, concerning the future use of the Haven Day Centre site.

The rest of the Q&A session was spent considering issues relating to the proposal to close Osborne Grove Nursing Home following concerns about the quality of care and safety of residents. It was noted the home provided accommodation, personal and nursing care for adults over 65 with complex health needs and had capacity for 32 beds across 4 units and that there were currently 18 occupants.

The Panel was informed that on 6 and 7 December 2016, a Care Quality Commission (CQC) inspection had highlighted serious concerns around the care of residents in Osborne Grove. These included but were not limited to the areas of:

- Medicine management and administration.
- Record keeping and documentation.
- The moving and handling of residents.

In response to questions, the Panel was advised that four enforcement warning notices had been issued against the council for breaches of the legal requirements relating to the quality of care and support with compliance deadlines of 17 February and 31 January. The following points were noted by the Panel:

- The council had developed a clear action plan to address areas of concern highlighted within the stated timescales.
- A number of improvement measures were implemented and a joint improvement steering group assembled to closely examine progress and compliance.
- Further CQC inspections on 22 and 30 March 2017 noted that despite the service improvement plans and interventions, the service had failed to meet compliance standards and progress has not been made at the pace that is expected.

In response to questions, the Panel was informed that consequently, on 20 June 2017, a decision was taken at a Cabinet Member signing to undertake a period of consultation with Osborne Grove residents, their families and carers on the proposal to close the nursing home.

In addition, it was noted that on 26 and 27 July, the CQC had conducted an unannounced inspection at Osborne Grove. The Panel was advised that significant improvements had been made since the last CQC inspection in March 2017. It was noted that Osborne Grove had complied with the following three of the four warning notices served:

- Safe care and treatment
- Meeting nutritional and hydration needs
- Good governance

The Panel agreed that they were happy to hear about these improvements and noted work that had been undertaken by both operational and corporate staff. However, the Panel was informed that whilst some improvements were being realised, as evidenced in the recent CQC inspection report, with the level of resourcing and management oversight required to achieve these, concerns remained that the pace and sustainability of these improvements remained a considerable risk moving forward. The following points were noted by the Panel:

- Although the home was no longer in special measures, it was rated 'requires improvement' in three of five areas covered by the comprehensive inspection, namely safe, responsive and well-led.

- The CQC rating for Osborne Grove fell below commissioning standards set by the council and staffing levels had not been reduced despite a reduction in occupancy of residents by almost 50%.
- The 2017/18 Quarter 1 Finance Report Cabinet paper reflected that the measures required to secure service improvements had come at a cost – with the projected overspend in excess of £700,000.

In response to questions, the Panel was informed, in light of the recent CQC inspection report, that the Council had agreed to extend the consultation period by one month. This was to ensure residents, their families and carers had sufficient time to make an informed decision on the proposals.

The Panel raised a number of concerns and were informed that the proposal to cease operating the home had not been arrived at easily. The Panel was informed that the Council expected residents in care settings to be treated with utmost professionalism and dignity at all times, and that standards at Osborne Grove were still below the high benchmark that was demanded.

During the discussion a number of issue were considered, including:

- A suggestion, from the Panel, that neighbouring authorities and partner authorities be asked to contribute to service improvements at Osborne Grove to help safeguard capacity for the local health and care economy across North Central London.
- In response to questions about the cost of beds, the Panel was informed that the cost per bed at Priscilla Wakefield House was lower when compared to Osborne Grove.
- The fact that various issues at the home were entrenched and linked to ineffective management and significant competency and performance issues.
- The importance of communicating the outcome of the consultation and Cabinet's final decision on the proposal relating to Osborne grove to residents, their families and carers. The Panel was informed that Cabinet was expected to make a decision on the proposal before Christmas.

In response to questions, a brief update was provided on the proposals outlined in the 5 year MTFS for 2017/18 – 2021/22. This included an update on the options appraisal for Osborne Grove.

AGREED:

- (a) That the update from the Cabinet Member for Finance and Health be noted.
- (b) That the update from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Culture be noted.

- (c) That update concerning Osborne Grove Nursing Home be noted and the commitment to carry out an options appraisal be supported by the Panel.
- (d) That the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Culture be asked to consider the concerns raised by the Panel (outlined in the minutes above) and the suggestion that further input be sought from neighbouring/partner authorities before Cabinet be asked to make a decision on the proposal to close Osborne Grove Nursing Home.

26. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer, provided an update on the proposed work programme for the remainder of the 2017/18 municipal year. During the discussion it was agreed that the Haringey Development Vehicle item, listed under “future items to be confirmed”, should be updated to read “to consider health related issues and concerns relating to estate regeneration”.

AGREED: That subject to the additions, comments and amendments, referred to under agenda items 9, 10, 11 and 12 , the areas of inquiry outlined in Appendix A of the Work Programme Update be approved and recommended for endorsement by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

27. FOOT CARE UPDATE

The Chair informed the Panel that Andrea Cronin, Commissioning Manager, Haringey CCG, had been provided an update, for noting, on the Whittington Health Podiatry and Foot Health Service.

AGREED: That the update on the Whittington Health Podiatry and Foot Health Service be noted.

28. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

29. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to item 15 as shown on the agenda in respect of future meeting dates, and Members noted the information contained therein’.

CHAIR: Councillor Pippa Connor

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HOUSING AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON MONDAY, 2ND OCTOBER, 2017, 6.30 - 9.35 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Emine Ibrahim (Chair), John Bevan, Zena Brabazon, Gail Engert, Martin Newton and Ann Waters

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillors: Peray Ahmet, Mark Blake, Vincent Carroll, Kirsten Hearn, Noah Tucker and Elin Weston

15. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

17. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

19. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

The Chair informed the Panel that Paul Burnham, from Haringey Defend Council Housing, had made a request to speak in relation to agenda item 8, Haringey Development Vehicle – Verbal Update. It was noted that this request would be taken as part of agenda item 8.

20. MINUTES - 7 MARCH 2017

AGREED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2017 be approved as a correct record.

21. MINUTES - 22 JUNE 2017

AGREED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2017 be approved as a correct record.

22. HARINGEY DEVELOPMENT VEHICLE - VERBAL UPDATE

The Chair welcomed Cllr Elin Weston, Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Lyn Garner, Strategic Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development, and Richard Grice, Interim Director of Transformation and Resources, to the meeting. It was explained that the Leader of the Council, on 31 August 2017, had made a decision to nominate these individuals to represent the Council on the Haringey Development Vehicle Board.

It was also noted that Cllr Weston, Ms Garner and Mr Grice had participated in shadow HDV board meetings during the summer of 2017. The Chair stated that, despite ongoing scrutiny of the HDV, the Panel had not been made aware of the shadow board.

In response to questions, Ms Garner explained arrangements for the shadow board had been outlined in a report to Cabinet, in February 2017, to approve the selection of Lendlease as preferred bidder. Ms Garner went on to highlight section 6.44 of the Cabinet report, outlined below:

“It is intended that shadow board arrangements will be put in place with the preferred bidder ahead of financial close to enable the board to form, establish itself and begin to function in an informal way (though the board cannot take any formal decisions until the HDV is formally incorporated).”

The Panel was informed that during the summer the shadow HDV board had met informally on three occasions: 22 June; 2 August; and 30 August. However, due to a legal challenge, it was explained that the Council and Lendlease had agreed to suspend these meetings. The Panel was also informed of a HDV Shadow Board Dinner, held on 24 April.

It was noted that the shadow board meetings had been informal and did not have the power to make any decisions or give directions to staff, nor to otherwise exercise any of the functions defined for the HDV Board in the legal agreements. Following a discussion about the role of the HDV Board and the importance of its effective functioning, Cllr Weston and Ms Garner both explained that it had been worth investing time in the preparatory stages in order to build the relationships on which the formal functioning would depend.

The Panel was informed that council officers and members nominated to the HDV Board would owe general fiduciary duties to the Board, when sitting on the Board. The Panel was informed that it was normal for such obligations to be imposed on the members, via the Members' Agreement, to act in the best interest of the LLP and not to act in conflict with its interests. However, the Panel was asked to note that these principles did not apply to the shadow HDV board as these would only apply upon the establishment of the LLP and creation of the HDV Board.

In response to questions about the 3 July 2017 Cabinet meeting, concerning the approval of the legal documentation to establish the joint venture, the HDV Board and its first set of business plans, Cllr Weston advised she had been acting in her capacity as member of the local authority. The Panel was also asked to note that Cllr Weston

had taken advice from the Monitoring Officer, before the Cabinet meeting, who advised attendance at shadow board meetings did not amount to either a disclosable pecuniary interest nor prejudicial interest requiring disclosure.

During the discussion, the process for approving a revised Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy was considered. It was noted that the policy would set out rehousing commitments for secure and assured tenants, and for leaseholders required to move due to regeneration. The Panel was informed that the policy would be considered by Cabinet in October 2017 and that it would take precedence over the HDV legal agreements i.e. the Right to Return was paramount over a single move.

Paul Burnham, from Haringey Defend Council Housing, asked a number of questions in relation to RSL tenants in the Northumberland Park regeneration area. Mr Burnham stated there was no mention of RSL tenants in the HDV legal documents and asked what the arrangements were for their rehousing. In order to provide clarity, Ms Garner agreed to provide the Panel with a written response on these issues. **ACTION**

The Panel raised a number of issues concerning service charges and asked whether these would be affordable to returning social housing tenants or whether any increases would effectively render the promise to return as meaningless. In response to questions, Ms Garner explained it was likely services charges would increase from current levels. However, it was acknowledged costs associated with services charges were complex. This was because they related to the level of service provided and would differ from block to block. In order to provide clarity, Ms Garner agreed to provide the Panel with a written response on these issues. **ACTION**

In addition, the Panel asked to receive further information on the following:

- An update on how and when minutes from shadow board meetings would be published. **ACTION**
- Further information in relation to the preparatory work that had been undertaken, in relation to branding, to ensure the HDV could go live in a timely fashion. Details and dates were requested in relation to the pitches and what had been paid for, when, and by who. **ACTION**
- Further information concerning the transfer of land to Duke's Aldridge Academy formerly Northumberland Park Community School. **ACTION**
- Once updated, the Panel asked to receive a copy of the revised Members' Agreement. **ACTION**

Ms Garner agreed to provide the Panel with a written response on each of these issues. **ACTION**

AGREED:

- (a) That the update concerning the Haringey Development Vehicle be noted.

(b) That the Strategic Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development be asked to provide the Panel with a written response to the issues highlighted above.

Clerk's Note - The response from the Strategic Director of Regeneration, Planning and Development is attached as an annex to the minutes

23. MOVING TOWARDS GOOD GROWTH IN HARINGEY

Helen Fisher, Director of Regeneration, introduced the report as set out, concerning emerging ideas and ideas about good and inclusive growth.

The Panel was informed that these ideas and concepts had gained increased prevalence over recent years, with growing evidence that the proceeds of national and regional growth had predominately benefited a small section of the population. It was noted that researchers and practitioners had recently begun to coalesce around the umbrella term "Inclusive Growth" to describe policies and programmes with the central objective of generating shared prosperity where no one was left behind.

In response to questions about defining inclusive growth, Ms Fisher explained that the most prominent definition of inclusive growth had been established by the Royal Society of Arts. It was noted that their Inclusive Growth Commission (2017) had cited some key principles for delivering inclusive growth:

- Develop a shared vision for the place, owned by leaders in government, business, the VCS and local communities
- Establish a whole system endeavour, integrating social and economic policy and infrastructure investment around measurable outcomes for individuals.
- Develop a whole life-cycle approach, recognising that individuals require different types of support at different stages of life.

Ms Fisher went on to explain that prominent research and evidence from early practitioners had outlined a number of changes that were needed to ensure growth was inclusive. These included:

- The fact that outright economic growth was no longer enough. With income inequality and rising costs of living it was recognised that there must be a focus on the quality of growth.
- Economic and technological changes required more holistic, place-based leadership involving public and private sector leaders and the communities they served.
- A recognition that investing in education, training and health and wellbeing for the whole population generates greater and more sustainable economic growth while ensuring now one was left behind.

In response to questions, the Panel was informed that the ideas underpinning inclusive growth had influenced the Mayor of London and GLA's adoption of three

“Good Growth” principles: Empowering People; Making Better Places; and Growing Prosperity. Ms Fisher explained that these themes would underpin the next London Plan and the GLA’s overall approach to regeneration, as set out in sections 6.21 – 6.27 of the report. It was noted that Haringey had committed to playing its part in meeting London’s challenges through the significant regeneration programmes underway across the borough.

During discussion, it was noted that inclusive growth had emerged as a key theme over recent years and had been adopted and championed by international organisations. Case studies from across the world were also considered, including lessons learnt from:

- Louisville, USA: America’s “Compassionate City”
- New York City, USA: Career Pathways Framework
- Rotterdam, Netherlands: National Programme Rotterdam South
- Bristol, UK: Bristol City Office

The Panel agreed that proactively empowering and investing in communities and people was key in helping to ensure the benefits of growth were translated into meaningful outcomes for all.

In conclusion, it was highlighted that Haringey was home to some of London’s most significant regeneration initiatives, often located in areas where the population was affected by high deprivation. Building on work Haringey had already done, the Panel agreed the Council needed to include proactive policy and project work to ensure all residents were able to participate in shaping the future of their area and to benefit from the investment in their communities.

The Chair thanked officers for their comprehensive report and suggested its contents be used when scrutinising other issues, including in-depth project work, set out in the Panel’s work programme report (agenda item 12).

AGREED: That the update concerning emerging ideas about good and inclusive growth be noted.

24. PROPERTY LICENSING - UPDATE

The Chair welcomed Cllr Peray Ahmet, Cabinet Member for the Environment, and Alison Crowe, Programme Manager, to the meeting and Cllr Ahmet introduced the report.

The Panel was informed the report provided information on the progress that had been made to date in respect of extending the Additional Licensing scheme and introducing a Selective Licensing scheme for single dwelling houses.

In response to questions, the Panel was advised that in order to bring forward either an additional or selective licensing scheme the Council needed to satisfy legislative

criteria. It was noted that this was particularly important when presenting a case for selective licensing, as set out in section 6.2 of the report.

The Panel was asked to note that both schemes needed to be supported by a robust evidence base and that a full public consultation exercise was required before a scheme could be introduced.

In response to questions, Ms Crowe explained various data sets (from within the Council and the Metropolitan Police) had been brought together and analysed, as set out in section 6.3 of the report.

In terms of consultation, the following points were noted:

- Public consultation would take place between November 2017 – February 2018.
- The consultation would go beyond borough boundaries.
- Information would be provided to explain why the Council was proposing a licensing scheme and why alternative remedies were insufficient.
- Information would be provided to demonstrate how the schemes would tackle specific problems and how they would relate to other measures.

In response to questions, Ms Crowe explained the consultation was likely to attract a negative response from landlords and the Council needed to look at what support could be provided to support landlords.

The Panel was informed that work was ongoing to analyse data and to meet requirements set out by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). It was noted that officers had met with colleagues from DCLG to discuss initial proposals for licensing across Haringey and to seek further guidance on how best to present the evidence base. It was noted that feedback from the DCLG had included:

- The need for selective licensing to address problems in individual streets/areas.
- Ward based schemes offered a blanket approach and it was unlikely problems relating to the private sector dwellings existed across the ward.
- Clarity was needed in terms of the problems that were trying to be addressed and the desired outcomes.

From the analysis to date, the following points were noted:

- There were pockets of problematic single family private sector dwellings in the borough.
- HMOs were problematic and required blanket regulation.

- Using various data sets, officers had estimated an increase in the private sector stock (overall) to 35,000. It was noted HMOs could be as high as 50% of this total.
- Previous national studies, and findings from Haringey, highlighted many HMOs: Operated under the radar, unregulated; Increased the risk of fire; Were owned by absent or rogue landlords; Were unsafe and often occupied by vulnerable tenants.
- An additional licensing scheme could cover up to 50% of the borough's private sector stock.
- Evidence suggested that a selective licensing scheme was needed in some areas, as outlined in section 6.3 of the report.

In conclusion, the Panel was informed that a borough wide scheme would go some way to improving the lives of residents and would increase the Council's powers to act. In addition, the Panel was informed that it was likely officers would recommend a selective licensing scheme that would fall within the 20% threshold. It was noted that desired outcomes from the selective licensing scheme would include: improved housing conditions and ASB, crime and environmental crime associated with private sector dwellings. The Panel was informed that a report on these issues would be presented to Cabinet in November 2017.

AGREED: That the update on property licensing be noted.

25. VIABILITY ASSESSMENTS - SCRUTINY PROJECT UPDATE

Emma Williamson, Assistant Director for Planning, introduced the report as set out.

Ms Williamson commented that during 2015/16 the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel had conducted a review of the viability assessment process in Haringey. It was noted that the Panel had made a number of recommendations and that the Council's response to the report had been considered by Regulatory Committee on 17 January 2017 and agreed by Cabinet on 25 January 2017.

In response to questions, Ms Williamson stated the majority of the Panel's recommendations had been agreed and went on to provide an update in terms of the progress that had been made in implementing them. As part of this, the Panel was asked to note the recommendations and subsequent action taken, set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

During the discussion it was noted that the Panel's recommendations had been put forward to improve the consistency and transparency of the viability assessment process. Ms Williamson explained that the development of a London Wide Viability Protocol would also improve the consistency of the process across London.

The Panel thanked officers for their work in helping to ensure the Planning Service was doing all it could to ensure processes used in Haringey were as rigorous as possible.

AGREED: That the actions being taken, as a result of the Panel’s recommendations relating to the viability assessment process in Haringey, be noted.

26. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Christian Scade, Principal Scrutiny Officer, provided an update on the proposed work programme for the remainder of the 2017/18 municipal year.

During the discussion, it was agreed an update on temporary accommodation should be considered by the Panel in November 2017. In addition, the Panel queried why the Community Infrastructure Levy rate was lower in north Tottenham compared to the south of Tottenham and suggested further scrutiny was required during 2017/18.

AGREED:

- (a) That subject to the additions and comments above, the areas of inquiry outlined in Appendix A of the Work Programme Update be approved and recommended for endorsement by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- (b) That the scoping document for the Social Housing Scrutiny Project, outlined in Appendix B of the Work Programme Update be approved and recommended for endorsement by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

27. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

28. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to item 14 as shown on the agenda in respect of future meeting dates, and Members noted the information contained therein’.

CHAIR: Councillor Emine Ibrahim

Signed by Chair

Date

SCRUTINY RESPONSES -final

- (1) During the discussion, the process for approving a revised Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy was considered. It was noted that the policy would set out rehousing commitments for secure and assured tenants, and for leaseholders required to move due to regeneration. The Panel was informed that the policy would be considered by Cabinet in October 2017 and that it would take precedence over the HDV legal agreements i.e. the Right to Return was paramount over a single move.

Schemes led by the Haringey Development Vehicle are fully covered by this policy. This question only arises because the draft revised Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy, placing priority on the right of return, was published towards the very end of the HDV business plan preparation process. The Right of Return is an absolute right for every tenant as set out in the ERRPP, and as agreed at Cabinet on 20 July 2017 wording in the Land Assembly Agreement is being reviewed to ensure there is no ambiguity on this point. You can view the revised ERRPP Cabinet report on the council's website here: <https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=118&MId=8290&Ver=4>

- (2) Paul Burnham, from Haringey Defend Council Housing, asked a number of questions in relation to RSL tenants in the Northumberland Park regeneration area. Mr Burnham stated there was no mention of RSL tenants in the HDV legal documents and asked what the arrangements were for their rehousing. In order to provide clarity, Ms Garner agreed to provide the Panel with a written response on these issues.

The Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy enables the Council to extend the commitments made to Council tenants to Housing Association tenants "where the Council has a strategic interest" in the scheme. This has been included in the policy specifically to capture schemes like Northumberland Park, where the Council is promoting the regeneration scheme. As above, this would not have been in the HDV business plans because the draft revised Estate Renewal Rehousing and Payments Policy was only published towards the very end of the HDV business plan preparation process. Arrangements for meeting any additional costs of rehousing residents that need to be rehoused under the policy will need to be part of the business plan for each regeneration scheme. With particular regard to any scheme at Northumberland Park, there are currently no firm plans at all and so it would be premature to assume that RSL tenants will be included until further work and engagement has been carried out.

- (3) The Panel raised a number of issues concerning service charges and asked whether these would be affordable to returning social housing tenants or whether any increases would effectively render the promise to return as meaningless. In order to provide clarity, Ms Garner agreed to provide the Panel with a written response on these issues.

Service charges will be levied on a non-profit basis and therefore will be directly related to the level of service provided. Enhanced management and design of the scheme will help to minimise service charges but with the enhancement in the level of service compared to that currently provided, there may be an increase. This level of service charges will be benchmarked to make sure that it is fair and affordable as well as considering other mechanisms to minimise costs, particularly for those living in affordable homes. Management of homes is an issue addressed through the Section 105 consultation and so further detail will be developed as residents provide feedback.

- (4) An update on when and how minutes from the shadow board meetings will be published.

The minutes from the Board meetings are currently in the process of being approved by Board members. The minutes will be published on the Council website.

- (5) Further information in relation to the preparatory work that had been undertaken, in relation to branding, to ensure the HDV could go live in a timely fashion. Details and dates were requested in relation to the pitches and what had been paid for, when, and by who.

As part of the HDV communications strategy (as identified on the published council risk register), some preparatory work has been undertaken to explore the purpose, values and brand of the new organisation and Lendlease have appointed a branding agency to take this work forward in the future. It is common practice when setting up a new organisation for this kind of preparatory work to be done. Pitches took place on 11 May, 18 May and 07 June 2017. Whilst the council has taken a public decision to establish the HDV, the new organisation – including any name or brand – will of course not be fully developed or launched prior to the HDV being formally established, and would be a decision for the board of the new organisation.

- (6) Please provide further information concerning the transfer of land to Duke's Aldridge Academy, formerly Northumberland Park Community School

When a school becomes an academy under the Academies Act 2010, local authorities are required to reach an arrangement with the school concerned to grant the academy a long leasehold interest in the land occupied by the school using a "model lease". This is in accordance with the guidance issued by the Secretary of State: "Academy conversion: land transfer advice". In instances where arrangements cannot be reached the Secretary of State can compel local authorities to transfer the land under schedule 1 of the Academy Act 2010. In the case of Northumberland Park Community School (which became part Duke's Aldridge Academy), the school became an Academy on 01 September 2017, and a long lease for a term of 125 years was granted for the school site on 01 September 2017.

- (7) Once updated, the Panel asked to receive a copy of the revised Members' Agreement.

This will be included in the delegated decision report to approve the agreement to establish the HDV, which will be published in the normal fashion.

- Report for:** Budget Scrutiny Panels
- Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel, 14th December 2017
 - Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel, 18th December 2017
 - Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel, 19th December 2017
 - Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel, 21st December 2017
 - Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 11th January 2018

Item number:

Title: **Scrutiny of the Draft 5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2018/19-2022/23)**

Report authorised by: Clive Heaphy, Chief Finance Officer and s151 Officer

Lead Officer: Oladapo Shonola, Lead Officer Budget & MTFS

Ward(s) affected: N/A

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

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 To consider and comment on the Council's draft 5 year (2018/19 to 2022/23) Medium Term Financial Strategy proposals relating to the Scrutiny Panels' remit.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Committee consider, and provide recommendations to the 29 January Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018/2019 to 2022/2023 and savings proposals relating to Priority X.

3. Background information

- 3.1 The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Constitution, Part 4, Section G) state: "The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall undertake scrutiny of the Council's budget through a Budget Scrutiny process. The procedure by which this operates is detailed in the Protocol covering the Overview and Scrutiny Committee".
- 3.2 Also laid out in this section is that "the Chair of the Budget Scrutiny Review process will be drawn from among the opposition party Councillors sitting on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee shall not be able to change the appointed Chair unless there is a vote of no confidence as outlined in Article 6.5 of the Constitution".

4. Overview and Scrutiny Protocol

- 4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Protocol lays out the process of Budget Scrutiny and includes the following points:
- a. The budget shall be scrutinised by each Scrutiny Review Panel, in their respective areas. Their reports shall go to the OSC for approval. The areas of the budget which are not covered by the Scrutiny Review Panels shall be considered by the main OSC.
 - b. A lead OSC member from the largest opposition group shall be responsible for the co-ordination of the Budget Scrutiny process and recommendations made by respective Scrutiny Review Panels relating to the budget.
 - c. Overseen by the lead member referred to in paragraph 4.1.b, each Scrutiny Review Panel shall hold a meeting following the release of the December Cabinet report on the new Medium Term Financial Strategy. Each Panel shall consider the proposals in this report, for their respective areas. The Scrutiny Review Panels may request that the Cabinet Member for Finance and Health and/or Senior Officers attend these meetings to answer questions.
 - d. Each Scrutiny Review Panel shall submit their final budget scrutiny report to the OSC meeting in January containing their recommendations/proposal in respect of the budget for ratification by the OSC.
 - e. The recommendations from the Budget Scrutiny process, ratified by the OSC, shall be fed back to Cabinet. As part of the budget setting process, the Cabinet will clearly set out its response to the recommendations/ proposals made by the OSC in relation to the budget.

5. Draft 5 year MTFS (2018/19 – 2022/23)

- 5.1 In July of this year the Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the MTFS (2018/19 – 2022/23) planning timetable and budget scrutiny process for 2018/19. As set out in that report, work commenced on a new five year MTFS in July 2017 and a draft MTFS is now in place for consideration by Cabinet.
- 5.2 After taking into account anticipated funding reductions, demand pressures and a review of the base financial position including the achievability of previously agreed savings and new savings proposed, there is an underlying gap of approximately £15m in the budget and further action will need to be taken by the council to bridge this budget gap.
- 5.3 The savings proposals to be considered by Scrutiny panels are split into two categories:
- MTFS savings previously considered as part of 2017/18 budget setting (Appendix C), but further savings are expected to be delivered from these savings options in 2018/19; and
 - New savings proposals submitted as part of this year's (2018/19) budget setting (Appendix E).

5.4 Scrutiny panel recommendations relating to 2017/18 savings that were previously considered in December 2016/January 2017 which also form part of the 2018/19 budget setting are attached at Appendix D.

5.5 This meeting is asked to consider the proposals relating to the services within its remit and to make draft recommendations to be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 29th January 2018 for discussion, prior to approval and referral to Cabinet for consideration in advance of the Full Council meeting in February 2018. For reference the remit of each Scrutiny Panel is as follows:

- Priority 1 – Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel
- Priority 2 – Adult and Health Scrutiny Panel
- Priority 3 – Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel
- Priority 4 – Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
- Priority 5 – Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
- Priority X – Overview and Scrutiny Committee

5.6 As an aide memoire to assist with the scrutiny of budget proposals, possible key lines of enquiry are attached at Appendix A. This report is specifically concerned with Stage 1 (planning and setting the budget) as a key part of the overall annual financial scrutiny activity.

5.7 Appendix B sets out the summary of the draft five year MTFS by priority area.

6. Contribution to strategic outcomes

6.1 The Budget Scrutiny process for 2018/19 will contribute to strategic outcomes relating to all Council priorities.

7. Statutory Officers comments

Finance

7.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report. Should any of the work undertaken by Overview and Scrutiny generate recommendations with financial implications then these will be highlighted at that time.

Legal

7.2 There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report.

7.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution (Part 4, Section G), the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should undertake scrutiny of the Council's budget through a Budget Scrutiny process. The procedure by which this operates is detailed in the Protocol, which is outside the Council's constitution, covering the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Equality

7.4 The Equality Act 2010 places a 'General Duty' on all public bodies to have 'due regard' to:

- Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation

- Advancing equality of opportunity
 - Fostering good relations
- In addition, the Council complies with the Marriage (same sex couples) Act 2013.

7.5 The Act covers nine protected characteristics which are:

- age
- disability
- gender and gender reassignment
- pregnancy and maternity status
- marriage and civil partnership
- ethnicity
- religion or belief
- sexual orientation

7.6 The Public Sector Equality Duty came into force on 5 April 2011. The broad purpose of the equality duty is to integrate consideration of equality and good relations into the day-to-day business of public authorities - in shaping policy, in delivering services and in relation to their own employees, and for these issues to be kept under review. If we do not consider how a function can affect different groups in different ways, it is unlikely to have the intended effect. This can contribute to greater inequality and poor outcomes.

7.7 Every person can identify with a combination of these characteristics; we all have an age, a disability status, a gender, our own beliefs and a sexual orientation. It is not the purpose of equalities monitoring to put people in boxes but to ensure that all groups of people have their needs met.

7.8 Haringey Council believes the Equality Impact Assessment process is an important way of informing our decision making process.

7.9 Tackling inequality 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, as well as the ambition for the Council's Borough Plan, which will set the vision for Haringey from 2018 to 2022.

7.10 The new savings proposals in this report are currently at a high level and will be developed further as new operating models, service changes and policy changes are progressed and implemented. Equalities impact assessments will be developed as part of this process. Where there are existing proposals on which decisions have been taken, existing equalities impact assessments will be signposted.

7.11 Any comments received will be taken into consideration and a further update will be brought to Cabinet in February 2018.

8. Use of Appendices

Appendix A – Key lines of enquiry for budget setting

Appendix B – 5 year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2018/19 – 2022/23) - Cabinet

12th December 2017

Appendix C – 2017 Budget (Savings) Proposals

Appendix D – 2017 (Prior Year) Overview & Scrutiny Recommendations

Appendix E – 2018 (New) Budget Proposals

9. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Background papers: 5 year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2018/19 – 2022/23) -
Cabinet 12th December 2017

Financial Scrutiny: Understanding your Role in the Budget Process

This document summarises issues and questions you should consider as part of your review of financial information. You might like to take it with you to your meetings, and use it as an aide-memoir.

Overall, is the MTFS and annual budget:

- A financial representation of the council's policy framework/ priorities?
- Legal (your Section 151 Officer will specifically advise on this)?
- Affordable and prudent?

Stage 1 – planning and setting the budget

Always seek to scrutinise financial information at a strategic level and try to avoid too much detail at this stage. For example, it is better to ask whether the proposed budget is sufficient to fund the level of service planned for the year rather than asking why £x has been cut from a service budget.

Possible questions which Scrutiny members might consider –

- Are the MTFS, capital programme and revenue budget financial representations of what the council is trying to achieve?
- Does the MTFS and annual budget reflect the revenue effects of the proposed capital programme?
- How does the annual budget relate to the MTFS?
- What level of Council Tax is proposed? Is this acceptable in terms of national capping rules and local political acceptability?
- Is there sufficient money in “balances” kept aside for unforeseen needs?
- Are services providing value for money (VFM)? How is VFM measured and how does it relate to service quality and customer satisfaction?
- Have fees and charges been reviewed, both in terms of fee levels and potential demand?
- Does any proposed budget growth reflect the council's priorities?
- Does the budget contain anything that the council no longer needs to do?
- Do service budgets reflect and adequately resource individual service plans?
- Could the Council achieve similar outcomes more efficiently by doing things differently?

Stage 2 – Monitoring the budget

It is the role of “budget holders” to undertake detailed budget monitoring, and the Executive and individual Portfolio Holders will overview such detailed budget monitoring. Budget monitoring should never be carried out in isolation from service performance information. Scrutiny should assure itself that budget monitoring is being carried out, but should avoid duplicating discussions and try to add value to the process. Possible questions which Scrutiny members might consider –

- What does the under/over spend mean in terms of service performance? What are the overall implications of not achieving performance targets?
- What is the forecast under/over spend at the year end?
- What plans have budget managers and/or the Portfolio Holder made to bring spending back on budget? Are these reasonable?
- Does the under/over spend signal a need for a more detailed study into the service area?

Stage 3 – Reviewing the budget

At the end of the financial year you will receive an “outturn report”. Use this to look back and think about what lessons can be learned. Then try to apply these lessons to discussions about future budgets. Possible questions which Scrutiny members might consider –

- Did services achieve what they set out to achieve in terms of both performance and financial targets?
- What were public satisfaction levels and how do these compare with budgets and spending?
- Did the income and expenditure profile match the plan, and, if not, what conclusions can be drawn?
- What are the implications of over or under achievement for the MTFS?
- Have all planned savings been achieved, and is the impact on service performance as expected?
- Have all growth bids achieved the planned increases in service performance?
- If not, did anything unusual occur which would mitigate any conclusions drawn?
- How well did the first two scrutiny stages work, were they useful and how could they be improved?

HARINGEY COUNCIL MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - APRIL 2018 - MARCH 2023
Appendix 1

	2017/18	Movement	2018/19	Movement	2019/20	Movement	2020/21	Movement	2021/22	Movement	2022/23
Services	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Priority 1	55,913.43	(1,748)	54,165.18	(310)	53,855.18	0.00	53,855.18	0.00	53,855.18	0.00	53,855.18
Priority 2	91,173.29	679.82	91,853.11	10.29	91,863.41	65.05	91,928.46	188.71	92,117.17	319.10	92,436.28
Priority 3	29,073.90	(1,660)	27,413.90	(150)	27,263.90	0.00	27,263.90	0.00	27,263.90	0.00	27,263.90
Priority 4	5,372.53	(50)	5,322.53	0.00	5,322.53	0.00	5,322.53	0.00	5,322.53	0.00	5,322.53
Priority 5	19,959.01	(50)	19,909.01	(120)	19,789.01	0.19	19,789.20	(0)	19,788.96	0.00	19,788.96
Priority X	38,759.28	(226)	38,533.78	(3,725)	34,808.78	(1,500)	33,308.78	(20)	33,288.78	0.00	33,288.78
Non Service Revenue	15,510.83	1,360.14	16,870.97	11,360.25	28,231.22	4,666.28	32,897.50	6,175.24	39,072.74	6,584.18	45,656.92
Total Budget Requirement	255,762.27	(1,694)	254,068.48	7,065.54	261,134.03	3,231.52	264,365.55	6,343.72	270,709.26	6,903.28	277,612.54
Unidentified Savings	0.00		0.00		9,941.05		11,163.08		12,698.74		13,073.41
Balanced Budget Position	255,762.27		254,068.48		251,192.98		253,202.46		258,010.52		264,539.14
Funding											
New Homes Bonus	5,711.50	(3,012)	2,699.78	0.00	2,699.78	0.00	2,699.78	0.00	2,699.78	0.00	2,699.78
Adult Social Care Grant	1,195.00	(1,195)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Revenue Support Grant	38,590.00	(38,590)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Council Tax	93,773.00	8,143.77	101,916.77	4,627.88	106,544.65	2,695.04	109,239.69	4,354.84	113,594.53	4,528.61	118,123.14
Retained Business Rates	22,084.00	86,423.98	108,507.98	(3,526)	104,981.51	1,921.29	106,902.79	438.77	107,341.56	2,000.00	109,341.56
Top up Business Rates	54,232.00	(54,232)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Main Funding	215,585.50	(2,461)	213,124.54	1,101.40	214,225.94	4,616.32	218,842.26	4,793.61	223,635.87	6,528.61	230,164.49
Public Health	20,742.00	(539)	20,202.71	(525)	19,677.44	0.00	19,677.44	0.00	19,677.44	0.00	19,677.44
Other core grants	10,652.76	2,587.66	13,240.43	4,049.17	17,289.60	(2,607)	14,682.76	14.45	14,697.21	0.00	14,697.21
Contribution from /to Reserves	8,782.00	(1,282)	7,500.00	(7,500)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL FUNDING	255,762.26	(1,695)	254,067.67	(2,875)	251,192.98	2,009.49	253,202.46	4,808.06	258,010.52	6,528.61	264,539.14

Corporate Priority 1

Enable every child to have the best start in life, with high quality Education

Ref	Proposal	2017-18 £000's	2018-19 £000's	2019-20 £000's	2020-21 £000's	2021-22 £000's	Total £000's	Current Budget	Current Staff	Delivery Risk RAG
1.1	Service Redesign and Workforce	300	150	-	-	-	450	10,601	545	Amber
1.2	Early Help & Targeted Response	62	100				162	12,583	47	Amber
1.3	Family Group Conferencing	200	100	-	-	-	300	30	n/a	Green
1.4	Family Based Placements	100	175	-	-	-	275	12,583	147	Amber
1.5	Care Leavers - Semi Independent Living	25	75	-	-	-	100	1,699	147	Amber
1.6	Adoption and Special Guardianship Order payments	150	148	310	-	-	608	2,739	147	Amber
1.7	New Models of Care		1,000				1,000	pooled budgets	pooled workforce	Red
	Total	2,762	1,748	310	-	-	4,820			

Corporate Priority 3

A clean and safe borough where people are proud to live

3.1	Charge Green waste - income generation	375	375				750	N/A	N/A	Amber
3.2	Charging for Bulky Household Waste	300	100				400	N/A	N/A	Green
3.3	Charging for Replacement Wheelie Bins	100	50				150	N/A	N/A	Green
3.4	Charging for recycling bins and increasing residual bins for RSLs, Managing Agents, Developers etc...	50	50				100	N/A	N/A	Green
3.5	Flats Above Shops -Provision of bags - Service reduction	120					120	N/A	N/A	Green
3.5	Reduce Outreach/ Education team - Service reduction	50	65				115	N/A	N/A	Green
3.6	Closure of Park View Road R&R - Service reduction	115	115				230	N/A	N/A	Green
3.7	Veolia Operational Efficiencies	200					200	N/A	N/A	Green
3.7	Rationalisation of Parking Visitor Permits	125	225				350	N/A	N/A	Green
3.8	Relocation of Parking/CCTV processes and appeals		380				380	N/A	13	Amber
3.9	Sustainable Transport in CO2 Parking Permit Charge	100	300				400	N/A	N/A	Green
	Total	1,535	1,660	-	-	-	3,195			

Corporate Priority 1

Enable every child to have the best start in life, with high quality Education

Ref	Proposal	2017-18 £000's	2018-19 £000's	2019-20 £000's	2020-21 £000's	2021-22 £000's	Total £000's	Current Budget	Current Staff	Delivery Risk RAG
Corporate Priority X		Enabling								
6.1	Shared Service Centre - new delivery model for shared services		250	1,500	1,500		3,250	9,025	336	Green
6.2	Alexandra House - Decant		250	750			1,000	n/a	n/a	Green
6.3	Closure of internal Print Room		51				51	1,364	22	Green
	Total		551	2,250	1,500	-	4,301			
	Overall Total (Pre-Agreed) Savings		3,959	2,560	1,500	-	12,316			

Children's Services - Service Redesign and Workforce

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Children's Services
Responsible Officer:	Director of Children's Services
Reference:	Children's Services - Service Redesign and Workforce
Type of saving:	Efficiency saving/service redesign
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
In relation to the contact service this will impact on parents and carers in need of using the service.	More responsive service which will contribute to a more timely service for this cohort
In relation to the Independent Reviewing Service this will impact on the looked after children cohorts	A greater level of independence from the service should ensure better outcomes for looked after children
In relation to the front door assessment proposal, this should impact on families accessing social care services	Ensuring that only those families in need of social care services are in receipt of them, rather than engaging with families that do not meet the threshold for intervention.

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: A number of pieces of work are included within this proposal which together contribute to savings across the workforce. This includes:</p> <p>Contact Service Reconfiguration of the service based around typical contact need (sessional evening & weekend) in order to reduce the cost of contact per hour, alongside the introduction of a rota system which enables a reduction of</p> <p>Independent Reviewing Officers This function is currently provided in-house and could be externally commissioned to yield savings. This would also enable a much greater level of independent challenge, supporting the delivery of better outcomes for our looked after children. This proposal will also enable a greater level of accountability across this function which would be set out within the procurement and contract process.</p> <p>Reduction in Agency Spend Actively reduce the levels of agency by converting posts to permanent staff alongside developing a strong retention strategy to ensure this is a sustainable proposal.</p> <p>Service Redesign It is proposed that we redesign our services, as a consequence of managing demand into social care, which will enable the service to appropriately reduce the workforce to better meet need.</p> <p>This proposal will be delivered by ensuring that only those that require social care services are assessed, based upon the Thresholds of Need partnership document.</p> <p>Those that are provided with support will receive it in a more timely and effective way, through the implementation of new practice tools which strengthen our work with families. This will also enable cases to be progressed through</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Employees	Workforce Data
Current budget	10,601		545
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	300	Year 1	10
Year 2	150	Year 2	30
Year 3	0	Year 3	
Year 4	0	Year 4	
Year 5	0	Year 5	
Total	450	Total	40

Rationale

Contact Service

At present the service delivers contact across the year at £81 per hour. However contact is typically required after school, during the evenings or at weekends and there is an opportunity to reduce the hourly unit cost by reconfiguring the service so that workforce availability is matched to service need

Independent Reviewing Officers

This is a statutory requirement and a number of other local authorities have externally commissioned the service to release workforce savings. Some initial analysis has indicated that a new delivery model could provide a £100k saving.

Reduction in Agency Spend

Although there have been some success in efforts to reduce the number of agency by recruiting permanent staff over 16/17, there is a need to continue this work in order to build a robust and sustainable workforce whilst releasing savings across 17/18.

Service Redesign

By more effectively managing demand, a reduction in the workforce could be delivered which would better meet need. This would mean that by ensuring that only those that require social care services are assessed, practitioners can more effectively focus upon families who need a service. Those that are provided with support will receive it in a more timely way, through the implementation of new practice tools which strengthen and support our work with families. This will also enable cases to be progressed through the system more efficiently.

Key benefits - financial and non-financial

Contact Service

Financial: £80k

Non-Financial: More flexible pool of resources for this function based upon need.

Independent Reviewing Officers

Financial: 100k

Non-Financial: Increased levels of independence and scrutiny as well a more flexible pool of resources

Reduction in Agency Spend

Financial: £120k

Non-Financial: More sustainable and robust workforce

Front Door Assessments

Financial: £150k

Non-Financial: Increase the timeliness of assessments and permanency planning

Internal dependencies and external constraints

- Commissioning and Procurement dependencies related to the IRO service
- Implementation of the Recruitment and Retention Strategy
- Market dependencies: Availability of permanent staff

Procurement strategy:

Yes - this saving includes a reduction of staff

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	300	150	0	0	0
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated	0	0			
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	300	150			0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	300	450	450	450	450
Payback Period: Not applicable					

Early Help & Targeted Response

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Early Help & Targeted Response
Responsible Officer:	AD Early Help & Prevention/Head of Targeted Response and Youth Justice
Reference:	Early Help
Type of saving:	New delivery model
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL	
Proposal:	<p>Through the implementation and delivery of the Targeted Response offer as part of the Early Help model it is anticipated that escalation in the number of Looked After Children would be prevented and the associated saving delivered. This will be as a consequence of enabling supporting families to remain together where possible.</p> <p>This work would also contribute to the prevention of further escalation of the number of looked after children, by providing the right support at an earlier point.</p> <p>This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct work with children and parents, - Improving school / home relationships and behaviour management approaches, - Supporting positive parental attitudes & behaviours as well as a range of other services which support assessment and decision making.
Rationale:	<p>We believe that children are best supported in strong and resilient families and want to promote this by offering a range of early help and targeted support services to enable families to do this where possible. This will decrease the demand for social care intervention, specifically for looked after children, whilst providing better outcomes for children and their families.</p>

Benefits:
Financial: £162k
Non-Financial: A reduction in children needing to become looked after.

Procurement strategy:
n/a

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Fewer Children and Young People in Care	Improve lives of children and young people

SUMMARY				
	Financial Data		Workforce Data	
	£000			
Base Data				
Current budget	12,583	Employees	47	
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees		
	Year 1	62	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	100	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3	0	Year 3	
	Year 4	0	Year 4	
	Year 5	0	Year 5	
	Total	162	Total	0

Internal dependencies and external constraints:
none

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	62	100			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	62	100			
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	62	162	162	162	162
Payback Period: Not applicable					

Family Group Conferencing

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Looked After Children
Responsible Officer:	AD Safeguarding & Social Care/Head of Quality Assurance
Reference:	Family Group Conferencing
Type of saving:	New delivery model
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Fewer Children and Young People in Care	Improve lives of children and young people

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: This proposal relates to increasing the use of Family Group Conferences (FGC), to support those children who have just become looked after by the council or are on the edge of care, so that they can safely be returned home or remain with their families. This will enable better outcomes for families and also reduce the cost of placements.</p>
<p>Rationale: Haringey Council continues to experience high demand for statutory services, including a persistently high number of children and young people becoming Looked After. Whilst decision-making and application of thresholds have both been strengthened over the past 18 months, any further net reductions in Looked After Children (LAC) will require different forms of intervention with families before a child is accommodated. Family Group Conferencing is an internationally recognised evidence-based intervention, which originated in New Zealand, and has shown good results in diverting of children from coming from care and reduction in dependency on specialist services, by increasing family capacity to make decisions and increased resilience.</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Workforce Data	
Current budget	30	Employees	n/a
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	200	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	100	Year 2	n/a
Year 3	0	Year 3	
Year 4	0	Year 4	
Year 5	0	Year 5	
Total	300	Total	0

Key benefits:

Phase 1 of this project delivers on the cross-cutting theme of Value for Money, by replacing the commissioned service with a new, tested provider.

Phase 2 is expected to have an immediate, measurable impact on reducing the length of time a proportion of children and young people remain in care who are currently represented in the social care Looked After Children numbers.

Phase 3: is expected to have medium term (2017/18), measurable impact on reducing the length of time a proportion of children and young people remain in care who are currently represented in the social care Looked After Children numbers. It will achieve this through three measurable benefits

- Decrease the number of children coming into care, with a focus on 15-17 age group
- Increase the number of children/young people returned home
- Reduce the number of short term placements (1week – 6months)

Phase 4 is expected to extend the outcomes from Phase 3 with further positive impacts on the number and duration of cases within other parts of the Children's Social Care system, such as subject to Child in Need or Child Protection plans, and Care Leavers. It achieves this through delivering on two key cross-cutting themes from the Corporate Plan:

- Prevention and early intervention – supporting families to solve their problems before they become too entrenched and to reduce their need for statutory services.
- Working together with our communities – the Family Group conferences model supports wider Council efforts to build family and community resilience by giving a child's wider network a central role in co-producing positive outcomes for the child.
- Providing better outcomes for young people within the criminal justice system

Internal dependencies and external constraints:

Dependent on having an appropriate Looked After Children cohort who would benefit from Family Group Conferences

Procurement strategy:

By May 2017 award a block contract for a Family Group Conferences supplier.

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated	330	160	0	0	0
Reduced benefits due to					
Additional Cost Estimated	130	60	0	0	0
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	200	100	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	200	300	300	300	300
Payback Period: 1 years					

Family Based Placements

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Looked After Children
Responsible Officer:	AD Safeguarding & Social Care/Head of Children in Care
Reference:	Family Based Placements
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL

Proposal:

By increasing the range and type of in-house foster carers, alongside strengthening our Independent Fostering Agency arrangements, young people will be enabled to remain more locally, in appropriate family based placements which better meet their needs and achieve improved outcomes.

An initial review had indicated that there are a small number of children currently in residential placements where we could deliver care closer to home, which would also be better value for money.

This will mean that children and young people are provided with placements that better meet their needs as part of our ambition to deliver high quality care for our Looked After Children.

Rationale: Analysis has indicated that by offering more family based placements, savings could be achieved, with a focus on those children who would most benefit from being appropriately stepped down into in-house foster care or Independent Fostering Agency.

Benefits:

Financial: £275k

Outcome: Will better meet the needs of Looked After Children more locally

Procurement strategy:

A commissioning exercise would need to be undertaken with an Independent Fostering Agency.

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Looked After Children cohort positively impacted via more appropriate care offer	Better permanency outcomes for Looked After Children

SUMMARY

	Financial Data	Workforce Data
Base Data	£000	
Current budget	12,583	147
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees
Year 1	100	Year 1 n/a
Year 2	175	Year 2 n/a
Year 3	0	Year 3
Year 4	0	Year 4
Year 5	0	Year 5
Total	275	0

Internal dependencies and external constraints:

This saving is dependent on the availability of appropriate foster carers and Independent Fostering Agency arrangements

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	100	175	0	0	0
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	100	175	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	100	275	275	275	275
Payback Period: not applicable					

Care Leavers: Semi-Independent Living

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Care Leavers
Responsible Officer:	AD Safeguarding & Social Care/Head of Children in Care
Reference:	Care Leavers: Semi-Independent Living
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL	
Proposal:	Review the current Semi Independent Living cohort and where appropriate, consider easing the transition to financial independence more efficiently, where care leavers have successfully been supported to live independently. This provision of support would remain in line with statistical neighbours and aligned with the Supporting Housing proposal.
Rationale:	The Leaving Care Service has a function to support the transition of living independently for care leavers. Analysis has suggested that an indepth review would identify cases where payments could be ceased and clarify for future.

Benefits:
Financial: £100k

Procurement strategy:
N/A

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Reducing dependence; building financial independence; careleavers living as other young people in the community but with support.	Improved independence for care leavers; better tenancy sustainment; higher employment rates for vulnerable young people.

SUMMARY				
	Financial Data		Workforce Data	
Base Data	£000			
Current budget	1,699	Employees	147	
Savings/Invest (up to)	£000		Change in employees	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2
	25	75	n/a	n/a
	0	0		
	0	0		
	0	0		
Total	100		0	

Internal dependencies and external constraints:
None

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated	25	75			
Reduced benefits due to					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	25	75	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	25	100	100	100	100
Payback Period: Not applicable					

Adoption and Special Guardianship Order Payments

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Permanency
Responsible Officer:	AD Safeguarding & Social Care/Head of Children in Care
Reference:	Adoption and Special Guardianship Order Payments
Type of saving:	Efficiency savings
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL

Proposal:
The proposal is based upon a review of support provision across adoption and Special Guardianship Orders, with a view to bringing the council in line with comparator boroughs and achieve savings through changes in the policy in three areas:

Payments for Adoptive Parents (£298k)
To refresh the payment policy for adoptive parents in order to reduce the spend in this area by limiting the length of time financial support is provided.

Special Guardianship Order Payments (£250k)
To refresh the payment policy for Special Guardianship Order payments in order to reduce spend in this area by making this by exception rather than a standard practice

Adoption Transport Allowances (£60k)
To review and refresh the adoption transport allowance in order to reduce spend in this area.

Rationale:

Payments for Adoptive Parents
Whilst it is common practice for support to be offered to adoptive parents this should be provided as an outcome of decisions following the financial capacity assessment. It is thought that by refreshing the policy and implementing it from April 2017, it is possible to reduce payments by having a clear process to follow which includes provision of assessed and time limited financial support.

Special Guardianship Order Payments
To refresh the payment policy for Special Guardianship Order payments in order to reduce spend in this area by making bringing payments in line with other local authorities. Initial analysis indicates that savings could be yielded by implementing these changes going forward but it would be highly challenging to do this retrospectively.

Adoption Transport Allowances
There is a need to review the transport payment offer for adoption as there are currently significant transport payments being made. Early analysis indicates that there could be a monthly saving once this expenditure is brought into line.

Benefits:
Financial: £608k

Procurement strategy:
n/a

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Financial implications for Adopters and guardians	Increased equitability of support

SUMMARY

	Financial Data	Workforce Data
Base Data	£000	
Current budget	2,739	Employees 147
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees
(up to)	Year 1	Year 1
	150	n/a
	Year 2	Year 2
	148	n/a
	Year 3	Year 3
	310	n/a
	Year 4	Year 4
	0	
	Year 5	Year 5
	0	
	Total	Total
	608	0

Internal dependencies and external constraints:
This saving is based upon implementation of policy changes

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	150	148	310	0	0
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	150	148	310	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	150	298	608	608	608
Payback Period: Not applicable					

New Models of Care

Priority	1
Current Service Area	Children's Social Care and Health
Responsible Officer:	Director of Children's Services/AD Commissioning/Director of Public Health
Reference:	New Models of Care
Type of saving:	New Delivery Model
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: There are potentially further savings achievable across Priority 1 through partnerships and joint working including: integration with Haringey CCG, development of an Accountable Care Partnership with Islington Council and both Haringey and Islington CCGs, transformation across North Central London cluster, and shared services with other authorities.</p> <p>These savings have not yet been quantified but we anticipate joint working will add at least £1m by 18/19 to the achievement of savings targets for P1.</p>
<p>Rationale: In the context of the MTFS, it is important that services explore opportunities to work together to improve service offer through integration and Value for Money.</p>

<p>Benefits: Financial: £1m</p>
--

<p>Procurement strategy: N/A</p>

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
More efficient pathways for accessing care	More efficient pathways for accessing care

SUMMARY				
Base Data	Financial Data	£000	Workforce Data	
Current budget	pooled budgets	Employees	pooled workforce	
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees		
(up to)	Year 1	0	Year 1	
	Year 2	1,000	Year 2	tbc
	Year 3	0	Year 3	
	Year 4	0	Year 4	
	Year 5	0	Year 5	
	Total	1,000	Total	0

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints:</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)		1000			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	1000			
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	1000	1000	1000	1000
Payback Period: n/a					

Green Waste Charging

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Green Waste Charging
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Version:	1.0

PROPOSAL	
Proposal:	Charging for Garden Waste: Stopping the current free weekly universal green waste collection service and reverting to a weekly opt in charged green waste collection service. The charge would be set at £75 per annum.
Rationale:	Green garden waste is household waste for which a charge can be made for the collection. The service will be paid for by those who opt in only rather than a contract cost which is funded universally by all residents.

Key benefits:	An estimate of £150K has been deducted and includes, call centre, IT development, container costs administration and any additional treatment/disposal costs. By charging for green waste and proposing that we provide composting bins 'at costs' we will be encouraging residents to deal with their waste sustainably at source.
----------------------	--

Procurement strategy - N/A

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Free garden waste collection service stops	Resident satisfaction rates decrease
	Potential increase in fly tipping
	Reduction in recycling rate - 2%
	Potential greater contamination of Dry Recycling
	Increased side waste

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	375	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	375	Year 2	n/a
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	750	Total	0

Internal dependencies and external constraints:	Chargeable service will be fully administered by Veolia. Develop IT booking provision. Will need to complete a communications plan.
--	---

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	375	375			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	375	375	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	375	750	750	750	750
Payback Period: n/a					

Charge for Bulky Household Waste

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Charge for Bulky Household Waste
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Stopping a free bulk waste collection service to a	Fly tipping may increase
	Increased use of R & R
	Resident Satisfaction may be reduced
	Could increase side waste

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To move from a free bulk collection service for recyclables to a standard bulky waste collection service where a charge of £25 would be levied for the collection of up to 4 items plus £10 for each additional item.</p>
<p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 24 London boroughs charge for all bulky collections. - 10 offer some form of concession. - In North London – only Hackney and Waltham Forest also have some element of free bulky collections - Evidence from Newham saw a 75% reduction demand with no discernible increase in fly-tipping when they introduced a charge. - Modelled a 60% drop in demand for bulky collections from 30,850 p/a to 11500 p/a. <p>Impact on recycling rate will be low as material will still go to the bulk waste recycle facility at Edmonton.</p>

SUMMARY				
	Financial Data		Workforce Data	
Base Data	£000			
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A	
Savings/Invest	£000		Change in employees	
	Year 1	300	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	100	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	400	Total	0

Key benefits
Total savings and Income generated has been estimated at £400K pa based on the demand levels noted above and an average price of £35 per collection.

Internal dependencies and external constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likely to lead to increase in tonnage through Reuse & Recycling centres. - Veolia will need to develop with the Council an IT online booking system. - A Communications plan will need to be developed.

Procurement strategy
N/A

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	300	100			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	300	100	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	300	400	400	400	400
Payback Period: n/a					

Charging for replacement wheelie bins

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Charging for replacement wheelie bins
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Free service becoming chargeable for new or replacement residual and recycling bins	May discourage recycling
	Increase in stolen bins
	Impact on resident satisfaction

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Charging for new and replacement containers to residents for both recycling and residual bins.</p>
<p>Rationale: Based on the assumption that once the charge is introduced demand for containers will reduce by 50%, resulting in the number of requests for containers reducing from 8,000 to 4,000. The savings are made up of two components, the reduction in the current contractual sum (£100K) together with a profit of £11.00 per bin equating to an annual sum of £50K. It is assumed that both recycling and residual bins will be charged for.</p> <p>Creates a value to the bins – engender greater responsibility for looking after bins and responsible waste management. Some other local authorities charge for replacement containers – Enfield and Brent for example.</p> <p>The Outreach team would continue to vet requests to encourage recycling and correct use and allocation of containers.</p>

SUMMARY				
Base Data	Financial Data	Workforce Data		
	£000			
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A	
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees		
	Year 1	100	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	50	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	150	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: Total Income generated has been estimated at £100K in the 1st year and £50k in the following year based on the demand levels noted above.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Continued outreach team to determine residents needs. Risk that if this policy is announced in advance it could lead to a demand on containers whilst still free. New IT / online payment system to be developed with Veolia.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy N/A</p>
--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	100	50			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	100	50	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	100	150	150	150	150
Payback Period: n/a					

Charging for recycling bins and increasing residual bins for RSLs, Managing Agents, Developers etc...

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Charging for recycling bins and increasing residual bins for RSLs, Managing Agents, Developers etc...
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Free service to Managing agents/developers becoming chargeable for supply/replacement of Communal Recycling bins - possibility of costs being passed to residents	May discourage recycling Charging for recycling bin hire would make flats policy consistent with schools bin charges
	Could increase levels of stolen bins
	Could increase side waste

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Extend charging of managing agents/developers for hire/replacement of communal recycling bins and review communal residual bin hire charge</p>
<p>Rationale: Currently managing agents of blocks of flats are charged £145/year (£2.80/week) for Communal Residual Waste bin hire but Communal Recycling bins are made available free of charge, at the council's expense for supply, repair/maintenance and replacement. Set Recycling Hire @ £145/year (£2.80/week); Additional Income = £100K Increase Residual hire charge by 20% to £3.40 per week = £20K additional income</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
	Year 1	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3	Year 3	
	Year 4	Year 4	
	Year 5	Year 5	
	Total	Total	0
	50		
	50		
	100		

<p>Key benefits: Total Income generated has been estimated at £50K pa.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Income not guaranteed</p>

<p>Procurement strategy: N/A</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	50	50			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	50	50	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	50	100	100	100	100
Payback Period: n/a					

Reduce Education & Outreach Team

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops - Neighbourhood Action
Reference:	Reduce Education & Outreach Team
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Stopping /Reducing service
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Potentially less engagement/ communications with residents on waste minimisation, recycling and waste collection issues	Reduced recycling
	Increased fly tipping
	Residents satisfaction levels reduced

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: Restructure entire Veolia Communications, Education & Outreach function and reduce Education/Outreach team by 50%.</p> <p>Rationale: Following changes in the Veolia contract with service level reductions and changes in legislation relating to recycling (i.e. TEEP) the need for Veolia to have all the tools to deliver performance targets has reduced. Therefore it is proposed to reduce the educational and outreach team and review how the remaining resources can be used more effectively by working more closely with Council's communication team.</p> <p>Key benefits: The proposed changes would deliver a savings of £115K pa.</p>

SUMMARY				
Base Data	Financial £000		Workforce	
Current budget	N/A		Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000		Change in employees	
	Year 1	50	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	65	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	115	Total	0
<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Review and negotiation of contractual performance targets/ payment mechanism with Veolia. There will be a greater need for the outreach team to support the other income/service change proposals as set out in this document. Therefore savings split over two years.</p>				

<p>Procurement strategy:</p>
<p>Personnel Implications: Up to 4 Veolia staff members could be made redundant. The Council will be liable for redundancy payments.</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	50	65			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	50	65	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	50	115	115	115	115
Payback Period: n/a					

Close Park View Road R&R

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Commercial & Ops
Reference:	Close Park View Road R&R
Responsible Officer:	Waste Strategy Manager
Type of saving:	Stopping /Reducing service
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Reduction of an R&R site	Reduction in resident satisfaction
	Potential increase in fly tipping

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To close the Park View Road Reuse and Recycling Centre</p>
<p>Rationale: Historically Haringey has had only one Reuse and Recycling Centre, which has been a small site on Park View Road (PVR), Tottenham. The borough now has a larger second site in the centre of the borough, which can cater for the waste which is currently deposited at PVR. The impact of the closure of PVR is assumed to be minimal as those who wish to responsibly dispose of their waste in a car will travel to an alternative site within the NLWA network, including the Western Road site. As part of its DCO application NLWA intend to add to the current network by building a new R&R site at Edmonton in 2020/21. The PVR site is earmarked for redevelopment as part of the wider regeneration proposals for residential housing/ new school on Ashley Road Depot. Relocating the site locally (Sedge Road) has been considered, however the cost of this site has been estimated at a £1m plus and would not deliver the £230K revenue savings. Also the site could be made redundant with the building of the new R&R site at Edmonton.</p>

SUMMARY				
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Workforce Data		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A	
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees		
	Year 1	115	Year 1	n/a
	Year 2	115	Year 2	n/a
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	230	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: Revenue savings of £230K paid to NLWA through the levy payment.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Value of the regeneration site at Ashley Road has been calculated on the site being vacant, including the PVR R&R. The capital receipt for this site is helping to fund the proposed new depot site/ development at Marsh Lane.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy: Personnel Implications: London Waste Limited will need to relocate or make redundant up to 5 staff</p>
--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	115	115			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	115	115	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	115	230	230	230	230
Payback Period: n/a					

Rationalisation of Visitors Permits and increase in hourly permit charge.

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Traffic Management
Reference:	Rationalisation of Visitors Permits and increase in hourly permit charge.
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Residents will have to pay more for VP	Less VPs issued
Residents aged between 60 and 75 will no longer be entitled to a concession	More journeys undertaken by walking, cycling or public transport

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: This involves a review of the Visitor Parking (VP) Permit scheme, rationalising provision of permits and bringing charges in line with other boroughs, see below.</p> <p>Proposals also involve reducing the concessionary entitlement, which currently offers a 50% reduction in charge to residents aged 60 years or over, and those registered disabled (this group is also allowed double the normal allocation of permits). In future it is proposed that this concession will be limited to those aged 75 years or over. No change is proposed to those residents registered as disabled.</p> <p>The proposals include a reduction in the range of different types of VP permits offered, reducing unnecessary overheads. This will involve removing the two hourly, weekend and two weekly Permits. It is proposed to increase the VP from 35p to 80p per hour.</p>
<p>Rationale: For a borough with Inner London parking pressures the cost of an hourly visitor permit is low, which in turn does not help to manage demand for parking space and encourage residents and visitors to walk, cycle or use public transport. Rationalisation of the number of permits will help the administration of the scheme and reduce overheads.</p>

SUMMARY			
	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data	£000		
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Year 1	125	Year 1	n/a
Year 2	225	Year 2	n/a
Year 3		Year 3	
Year 4		Year 4	
Year 5		Year 5	
Total	350	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: This would involve removing the current limit on the number of hourly permits that may be purchased, but increasing charges from 35p per hour to either; -60p per hour, which would generate in the region of an additional £250k annually or -80p per hour, which would generate in the region of an additional £300k annually Both estimates take account of a possible reduction in the numbers purchased The concession change would result in a saving of £50K.</p>
--

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: Will require IT development and working closely with Customer Services</p>
--

Procurement strategy:

N/A

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	125	225			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	125	225	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	125	350	350	350	350
Payback Period: n/a					

Relocating Parking/CCTV Back office Processing & Appeals

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Traffic management
Reference:	Relocating Parking/CCTV Back office Processing & Appeals
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	New delivery model
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
None	None

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To relocate 1st stage parking appeals and CCTV enforcement processing outside London. A number of operating models will be considered. Final 2nd stage appeals will be retained by the Council.</p>
<p>Rationale: Services delivered outside of London attract reduced cost due to a number of factors which includes accommodation costs and staffing costs as well as benefits in being able to recruit more readily. The London Borough of Islington successfully operate an in house service provision in Manchester. We are also aware that the London Boroughs of Barnet, Enfield and Waltham Forest operate 1st stage appeals outside of London through a third party provider.</p>

SUMMARY				
Base Data	Financial Data		Workforce Data	
	£000		Employees	
Current budget	N/A		Employees	13
Savings/Invest	£000		Change in employees	
	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1	Year 1
	Year 2	380	Year 2	13
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	380	Total	13

<p>Key benefits: A reduction in operating costs of £380K</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IT systems will have to be developed and aligned between offices. - Finding suitable accommodation to relocate staff. - The potential recruitment of new staff.

<p>Procurement strategy A full procurement of the service would need to be undertaken, taking between 12 to 18 months</p>
<p>Personnel Implications: If agreed up to 13 staff would be relocated or transferred (TUPEd) to a new provider. Staff not willing to relocate will face compulsory redundancy.</p>

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)		380			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	380	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	380	380	380	380
Payback Period: N/A					

Permits CO2 charging regime

Priority	3
Current Service Area	Sustainable Transport
Reference:	Permits CO2 charging regime
Responsible Officer:	Head of Traffic Management
Type of saving:	Increase in income
Version:	1.0

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Increased cost for those resident with higher CO2 emissions.	Residents select vehicles with lower CO2 emissions
	Improved air quality
	Reduced vehicles

PROPOSAL
<p>Proposal: To review the existing CO2 charging regime and change the banding linked to the DVLA scheme. Also to remove the additional charge per vehicle per household.</p>
<p>Rationale: The council's transport policies aim to reduce the harmful emissions from transport and improve air quality. As a result the Council introduced a CO2 emissions based permit charging structure in 2008. It is proposed to review the existing charges and introduce the same CO2 banding as used by the DVLA.</p> <p>It also intended to remove the current incremental increase for additional cars per household as this has proved to be difficult to administrater.</p>

SUMMARY			
Base Data	Financial Data £000	Employees	Workforce Data
Current budget	N/A		N/A
Savings/Invest			
Year 1	£000	Change in employees	Year 1
	100		n/a
Year 2	300		n/a
Year 3			
Year 4			
Year 5			
Total	400	Total	0

<p>Key benefits: To charge vehicles with higher CO2 emissions. It is expected the charging regime will increase revenue up to £400K.</p>

<p>Internal dependencies and external constraints: New charging for bands will require IT development/costs. Permit charge increase will be subject to statutory consultation.</p>

<p>Procurement strategy N/A</p>
--

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	100	300			
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	100	300	0	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	100	400	400	400	400
Payback Period: n/a					

Shared Service Centre

Priority	X
Current Service Area	Shared Service Centre

Proposal:	
	6.3

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
No impact on residents	N/A

Current budget	9,025	Employees	336
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Total	<u>3,250</u>	Total	<u>0</u>

BENEFITS CASE

Detailed description:

- i. Carry out a high-level options review (November 2016)
- ii. Carry out a detailed options appraisal including cost and benefit analysis (April 2017)
- iii. Members agree new Service Delivery Model (June 2017)
- iv. Complete Transition to New Service Delivery Model (April 2018)

Benchmark and industry standard savings for shared services have been used to establish likely savings.

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	0	250	1500	1500	
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	250	1500	1500	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	250	1750	3250	3250
Additional Cost Estimated					

COMMERCIAL CASE

Procurement strategy :

Procurement Strategy is dependant on the option chosen. Factors influencing timescale will include:

- The requirement to tender;
- Availability of appropriate existing Shared Service model;
- Need to bespoke standardised processes.

FINANCIAL CASE

Key benefits

Financial - delivery of proposed MTFS savings. The benefits shown have yet to be verified through a detached business case but are an indication of when the savings would be realised. Confirmation of exact costs, benefits and timescales will be known once a detailed business case is prepared

Non-financial - improved service delivery through partnership working with other organisations, including access to better IT systems and sharing of improved processes and procedures

Funding Position	Total	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
	(project life)					
Revenue funding from existing budget	0	TBC				
Revenue funding required – new	0					
Project Management costs	0					
Capital funding from existing budget	0	0	0	0	0	0
Capital funding required – new	0	0	0	0	0	0

MANAGEMENT CASE

Describe the delivery of the preferred option, including the approach to Project, project and change management, and the governance arrangements:

The preferred option for new delivery model for back-office services has yet to be determined as it is subject to an options review.

The Programme Management Office is currently leading a high-level options review. This will include alternative delivery models, risks, benefits, implementation costs and transition timescales.

Internal dependencies and external constraints:

Front-office services - significant potential synergies with front office services; needs of both services need to be considered as part of any future service delivery option

Personnel - significant impact on staff; could be subject to TUPE, and requirement to consult with Trade Unions and Staff

Alexandra House - Decant

Priority	X
Current Service Area	All

Proposal:	
	6.3

Impact on Residents		Outcomes	
No impact on residents		N/A	
Current budget	N/A	Employees	N/A
Savings/Invest	£000	Change in employees	
Total	1,000	Total	0

BENEFITS CASE

Detailed description:

The proposal is to vacate 5 floors of Alexandra House in 2017 and the remaining floors in the following twelve months. Realisation of savings will depend on renegotiation of rent as we vacate the building or our ability to sub-let those floors we do vacate. Hence, the cost/benefit model assumes savings appearing in 2018/19 and 2019/20.

Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18 £k	2018-19 £k	2019-20 £k	2020-21 £k	2021-22 £k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)		250	750		
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)					
Additional Cost Estimated					
Net Impact Cost/(Savings)	0	250	750	0	0
Cumulative Cost/(Savings)	0	250	1000	1000	1000
Additional Cost Estimated					

Closure of internal print room

Priority	X
Current Service Area	Communications

Proposal:
 To close the internal print service with a saving of £50.5K in the year 2018/19. The current bulk print service is only 65% utilised.

We will utilise our existing print framework to use suppliers which can continue to deliver a high volume and responsive service.

Resources required:
 N/A

What needs to happen and when?
 Work with Committee Services to reduce the demand for printed agendas, looking at IT solutions which allow councillors to mark up PDFs using their laptop or tablet. This development is already in the workplan of the new Shared Digital Service.

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
No impact on residents	N/A

Base Data		£000		
Savings/Invest		£000	Change in employees	
		Year 1	Year 1	
	Year 2	51	Year 2	1
	Year 3		Year 3	
	Year 4		Year 4	
	Year 5		Year 5	
	Total	51	Total	1

This page is intentionally left blank

Final Budget Scrutiny Recommendations – January 2017

Cross-Cutting Issues		Recommendation	Member Response
<p>In the context of continuing difficult financial circumstances, and in respect of learning from the experience of the MTFS to date OSC agreed scrutiny should be locked in to the process both of monitoring budget and performance and of evaluating strategy, considering risks and setting out mitigation.</p>		<p>Cabinet should regularly monitor progress on achievement of savings, and report regularly on: budget, including achievement of savings, projections; risk; and mitigation.</p>	<p>Cabinet does regularly monitor progress on achievement of savings, and report regularly on: budget, including achievement of savings, projections; risk; and mitigation.</p>
		<p>Cabinet members and priority leads as appropriate should report in October 2017 to their scrutiny panels on: financial performance, risks and mitigation plans, alongside regular reporting on overall priority performance and quarterly briefings meetings for panel chairs on performance, budget and risk.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>Cabinet member for finance should then report to OSC on overall progress against budget, risks and mitigation.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Children & Young People Scrutiny Panel (Priority 1)</p>			
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Response
1.6	Adoption and Special Guardianship Payments	That a report be submitted to the Panel in due course on the impact of the implementation of the refreshment of the payment policy	Noted
1.7	New Models of Care	That an update on progress with the development of the new models be submitted to a future meeting of the Panel.	Noted
N/A	Other Comments	That serious concern be expressed at the lack of detail within the proposals in respect of risk modelling and that a further report on progress in	A further report on progress around delivering the savings will be submitted to the panel before the end of 2017.

		delivering the savings and their impact upon service delivery be submitted to the Panel as soon as these became clear and before the end of 2017.	
Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel (Priority 3)			
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Response
3.2	Charging for Bulky Household Waste	That concern be expressed at the potential for the proposal to lead to an increase in fly tipping and the achievability of the additional income specified and, in the light of this, the following take place: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A communications campaign with emphasis on the current penalty of £400 for fly tipping; • Consideration of an increase in the level of the penalty; and • Quarterly monitoring of the impact, benchmarked from the date of implementation of the proposal and, in addition, a full review after a year. 	Noted
3.3	Charging for Replacement Wheelie Bins	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That there be discretion to waive the charge if there is evidence of bins being damaged during collection; 2. That bins be made more clearly identifiable as being from Haringey; 3. That the potential for the proposal to impact adversely on income levels be noted; and 4. That the impact on the number of replacement bins requested be monitored. 	Noted
3.6	Closure of Park View Road R&R	That the impact of closure be monitored closely for any impact on the level of fly tipping	Noted

	- Service reduction		
3.7	Rationalisation of Parking Visitor Permits	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The age for concessionary rate be reduced from 75 to 65; and 2. That future increases in price be staged 	Noted
3.8	Relocation of Parking/CCTV processes and appeals	That concern be expressed about the proposal and that a full report on the issue, including an equalities impact assessment, be submitted to overview and scrutiny once market testing has taken place and before a decision is taken on procurement by Cabinet.	Noted

This page is intentionally left blank

Corporate Priority 2

Empower all adults to live healthy, long and fulfilling lives

Ref	Proposal	2018-19 £000's	2019-20 £000's	2020-21 £000's	2021-22 £000's	2022-23 £000's	Total £000's	Current Budget £000's	Current Staff	Delivery Risk RAG
2.1	Haringey Learning Disability Partnership - Demand/Market/Operational Management	1,140	1,140	1,430	1,430	1,430	6,570	24,588	N/A	Amber
2.2	Mental Health - Demand/Market/Operational Management	390	390	490	490	490	2,250	9,352		Amber
2.3	Physical Support - Demand/Market/Operational Management	860	860	1,070	1,070	1,070	4,930	24,320		Amber
	Total	2,390	2,390	2,990	2,990	2,990	13,750	58,260		

Corporate Priority 4

Drive growth and employment from which everyone can benefit

4.1	Consultancy Spend (Tottenham Regeneration)	50		-	-	-	50	1,604	38	Green
	Total	50	-	-	-	-	50	1,604	38	

Corporate Priority 5

Create homes and communities where people choose to live and are able to thrive

5.1	Reduction in Housing Related Support budget	50	120	-	-	-	170	8,652		Amber
	Total	50	120	-	-	-	170			
	Total (Pre-Agreed) Savings	2,490	2,510	2,990	2,990	2,990	13,970			

Savings and Investment Pro-forma

Financial (Savings) information to be presented on incremental basis

Priority	2
Current Service Area	Haringey Learning Disability Partnership
Reference:	Maximising independence for Adults with LD
Council-Wide Saving (Yes/No)	No

Over five years, the Haringey Learning Disability Partnership, working jointly with Children's Services and with key partners such as the Clinical Commissioning Group and the London Borough of Islington, will implement a coherent strategy that aims to bring Haringey's demand and spending on adults with learning disabilities in line with our statistical neighbours and limit growth in spending in line with population growth. This strategy will require the following actions, which will realise benefits cumulatively as it is implemented:

Demand management

- Improved Transitions from CYPS to ASC
- Application of indicative needs bandings
- Assistive Technology to reduce the need for live-in or double-handed care
- Strengths-based assessment and support planning, with annual review

Market management

- Expand Supported Living units for adults with learning disabilities
- Deregistration of current residential providers
- Avoid residential and facilitate step-downs from residential where VfM
- Developing the market for Day Opportunities and Personal Assistants
- Specialist brokerage capacity for Learning Disabilities care packages
- Outcomes based commissioning from providers on Positive Behaviour Support
- Joint commissioning of LD services with London Borough of Islington and across the NCL five boroughs

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Preventing, reducing or delaying the need for acute or long-term care	Integration of health and social care services
Maximising independence, choice and control for service users	Better use of resources to meet needs
	Personalised care & support

	Financial Data		Workforce Data
Base Data			
Current budget	24,588	Employees	n/a
Savings/ Invest	£000	Change in employees	
2018/19	1,140	2018/19	
2019/20	1,140	2019/20	
2020/21	1,430	2020/21	
2021/22	1,430	2021/22	
2022/23	1,430	2022/23	
Total	6,570	Total	0

Operational management

- Workforce development on strengths-based assessment and support planning for workers and brokers
- Operational alignment across CCG and Adult Social Care as part of implementing a pooled budget from 2018/19
- Apply 'top up' policy to enable choice of provision while containing cost to the council

Key Policy Decisions

What	When
Direct Payments	Jan-18
Capitalisation of OT capacity	Nov-17
Top-up policy	Oct-17
LD Section 75 agreement	Apr-18
Respite Policy	Jan-18
Fees & Charges	Jun-18

Owner	John Everson
Version	v1.0
Date	06.10.2017

Supporting information not for the public domain

Risk	RAG
Political Move to a pooled budget in 2018/19 with the CCG That the full implementation of our Section 75 agreement with the CCG for LD spending is not based on a sufficient level of budget from either CCG or Council and that overspending/underachievement of targets is shared across the organisations	A
Comms around indicative needs banding That staff, providers or clients misunderstand the council's approach to applying indicative needs bands and challenge the use of this tool for allocation of limited resources, reducing the ability to manage budgets	R
Delivery- Programme management Availability and continuity of transformation support That the lack of transformation resources to support delivery of projects such as Assistive Technology, Direct Payments and Transitions delays the implementation of service changes that will enable this strategy to deliver savings identified	R

Mitigation
Aligned budgets in place for 2017/18 and ongoing discussions via LD Executive and Finance & Performance Partnership Board will be required to establish the budget; agreeing the overall strategy for LD maximising independence to ensure operational alignment around delivering reduced health and care spend.
Developing the policy and approach to indicative needs banding jointly with workers and brokers in services; distinguishing INB clearly from related but different concepts such as 'cap' or 'RAS'; corporate messaging required around the scale of the financial challenge and our approach to maximising independence.
Clear project briefs and supporting business cases for enabling projects being developed by current Transformation Team and will establish the return on investment for these resources.

Savings and Investment Pro-forma

Financial (Savings) information to be presented on incremental basis

Priority	2
Current Service Area	Mental Health
Reference:	Maximising independence for Adults with MH
Council-Wide Saving (Yes/No)	No

Over five years, Adult Social Care will work closely with our delivery partner, Barnet, Enfield & Haringey Mental Health Trust, the Clinical Commissioning Group and our communities to strengthen the prevention and 'enablement' pathways for mental health and to ensure the support we provide minimises the long-run dependency of adults with mental health issues. For those whose needs require a social care intervention, we will develop the market and look at new commissioning arrangements to improve value for money as well as promoting choice and control for the service user. This strategy will require the following actions, which will realise benefits cumulatively as it is implemented:

Demand management

- 'Enablement' pathway, including Primary Care Mental Health Locality Hubs
- Application of indicative needs banding
- Increase take-up of Direct Payments by Mental Health clients
- Strengths-based assessment and support planning, with annual review
- Coordinate response to forensic mental health cases community discharge

Market management

- Expand Supported Living units for adults with mental health needs
- Deregistration of residential mental health providers to become Supported Living
- Avoid residential and facilitate step-downs from residential where VfM
- Specialist brokerage capacity for mental health care packages
- Develop the Clarendon Recovery College provision
- Joint commissioning of Mental Health services across the NCL five boroughs

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Preventing, reducing or delaying the need for acute or long-term care	Integration of health and social care services
Maximising independence, choice and control for service users	Better use of resources to meet needs
	Personalised care & support

	Financial Data	Workforce Data
Base Data		
Current budget	9,352	Employees
Savings/ Invest	£000	Change in employees
2018/19	390	2018/19
2019/20	390	2019/20
2020/21	490	2020/21
2021/22	490	2021/22
2022/23	490	2022/23
Total	2,250	Total
		0

Operational management

- Address recruitment & retention challenges for Mental Health social workers
- Workforce development on strengths-based assessment and support planning for workers and brokers
- Operational alignment across BEH Mental Health Trust and Adult Social Care
- Apply 'top up' policy to enable choice of provision while containing cost to the council

Key Policy Decisions	
What	When
Direct Payments	Jan-18
Capitalisation of OT capacity	Nov-17
Top-up policy	Oct-17
MH Section 75 agreement	Apr-18
Respite Policy	Jan-18
Fees & Charges	Jun-18

Owner	Beverley Tarka
Version	v1.0
Date	06.10.2017

Supporting information not for the public domain

Risk	RAG
Political	
Comms around indicative needs banding That staff, providers or clients misunderstand the council's approach to applying indicative needs bands and challenge the use of this tool for allocation of limited resources, reducing the ability to manage budgets	G
Delivery- Programme management Availability and continuity of transformation support That the lack of transformation resources to support delivery of projects such as Assistive Technology, Direct Payments and Transitions delays the implementation of service changes that will enable this strategy to deliver savings identified	R
Dependency on BEH Mental Health Trust That the less direct influence over delivery of the Mental Health pathway due to the Mental Health Trust being the delivery lead reduces the pace and/or scale of the savings that can be made to MH care purchasing	A

Mitigation
Developing the policy and approach to indicative needs banding jointly with workers and brokers in services; distinguishing INB clearly from related but different concepts such as 'cap' or 'RAS'; corporate messaging required around the scale of the financial challenge and our approach to maximising independence.
Clear project briefs and supporting business cases for enabling projects being developed by current Transformation Team and will establish the return on investment for these resources.

Savings and Investment Pro-forma

Financial (Savings) information to be presented on incremental basis

Priority	2
Current Service Area	Physical Support
Reference:	Maximising independence for Adults needing Physical Support
Council-Wide Saving (Yes/No)	No

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Preventing, reducing or delaying the need for acute or long-term care	Integration of health and social care services
Maximising independence, choice and control for service users	Better use of resources to meet needs
	Personalised care & support

Over the next five years, Adult Social Care, working with the CCG, acute providers and primary care will seek to extend independence, choice and control to those with physical support needs and further strengthen the pathways that prevent, reduce and delay the need for social care. This will offset projected growth, particularly from the 76-85 cohort of older people with physical support needs.

This strategy will require the following actions, which will realise benefits cumulatively as it is implemented:

Demand management

- Use of preventative equipment, adaptations & technology
- Admission avoidance, including falls, working with CCG
- Targeted expansion of reablement, including for cases from community
- Discharge to Assess, Out of Hospital services & intermediate care
- Expand the Assistive Technology offer within reablement & long-term care

Market management

- Develop a more outcomes-focused Homecare offer
- Develop the market for Day Opportunities for older people
- Target intermediate care provision and manage voids
- Expand the provision of ExtraCare supported housing for older people

Operational management

- Continued evaluation and review of BCF-funded services
- Apply 'top up' policy to enable choice of provision while containing cost to the council
- Develop an integrated Occupational Health offer across acute, social and primary care

Base Data	Financial Data	Workforce Data
Current budget	24,320	Employees
Savings/ Invest	£000	Change in employees
2018/19	860	2018/19
2019/20	860	2019/20
2020/21	1,070	2020/21
2021/22	1,070	2021/22
2022/23	1,070	2022/23
Total	4,930	Total
		0

Key Policy Decisions	
What	When
Direct Payments	Jan-18
Capitalisation of OT capacity	Nov-17
Top-up policy	Oct-17
Respite Policy	Jan-18
Fees & Charges	Jun-18
Community Alarms Monitoring & Response	Jun-18

Owner	Beverley Tarka
Version	v1.0
Date	06.10.2017

Supporting information not for the public domain

Risk	RAG
Political iBCF funding to address DTOCs That insufficient real terms investment of iBCF monies reduces the ability of the local authority to address current challenges around Delayed Transfers of Care, leading to future funding being withdrawn	R
Delivery- Programme management Availability and continuity of transformation support That the lack of transformation resources to support delivery of projects such as Assistive Technology, Direct Payments and Transitions delays the implementation of service changes that will enable this strategy to deliver savings identified	R
Diminishing returns to demand management That there turns out to be less scope for further demand reduction beyond the measures successfully instituted in 2016/17 and 2017/18 due to the profile of need in Haringey and that without increased investment in prevention unavoidable demand rises	G

Mitigation
Corporate agreement required about the use of iBCF funding to support the Adults budget in 2018/19 in order to avoid losing future funding
Clear project briefs and supporting business cases for enabling projects being developed by current Transformation Team and will establish the return on investment for these resources.
Establishing the evidence base to evaluate services such as Reablement to understand the current impact and clarify scope for further targeted expansion; focusing the development of a future Assistive Technology offer on known avoidable costs in provision of care; strengthen operational links with Primary Care to maximise prevention, early intervention and condition management.

Savings and Investment Pro-forma

Financial (Savings) information to be presented on incremental basis

Priority	4
Current Service Area	Regeneration
Reference:	
Council-Wide Saving (Yes/No)	No

Following a detailed review of the overall Tottenham Regeneration programme budget, savings from General Fund (£50k) have been identified from 2018/19 on consultancy spend. These proposed savings followed a detailed review with the budget holders to determine what spend could be delayed or reduced to meet the savings the Council is required to make. The impact of reduced spend on consultants will mean that progression of regeneration schemes or projects may be delayed.

Key Policy Decisions	
What	When
N/A	N/A

Supporting information not for the public domain

Risk	RAG
Political	G
Delivery- Programme management	G

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
Delay to progression of some regeneration schemes / projects	Slow the progress of the regeneration programme

Base Data	Financial Data	Employees	Workforce Data
Current budget	1,604,228		38
Savings/ Invest	£000	Change in employees	
2018/19	50	2018/19	0
2019/20		2019/20	
2020/21		2020/21	
2021/22		2021/22	
2022/23		2022/23	
Total	50	Total	

Owner	Helen Fisher
Version	1
Date	Oct-17

Mitigation

Savings and Investment Pro-forma

Financial (Savings) information to be presented on incremental basis

Priority	5
Current Service Area	Housing
Reference:	S56300
Council-Wide Saving (Yes/No)	No

This is a budget that commissions services so does not fund council employees. The current budget (2017/18) still includes the funding due to be transferred to Adults Services following the implementation of the Housing Related Support Review. The split is as follows:

£4,654k to Adults Services
£3,999k to remain in Housing Related Support

Savings offered:

Reduction in Housing Related Support budget by:
Potential Savings for 2018/19 of approx 50k by bringing monitoring roles back into the HRS team from HfH.

Additional savings of approx 120k in 19/20 by recommissioning community based homelessness prevention work.

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
If a BME service is decommissioned, previous	More appropriate and effective services c

Base Data	Financial Data	Employees	Workforce Data
Current budget	8,652,300	Employees	none
Savings/ Invest	£000	Change in employees	
2018/19	50	2018/19	0
2019/20	120	2019/20	0
2020/21		2020/21	
2021/22		2021/22	
2022/23		2022/23	
Total	170	Total	

Key Policy Decisions	
What	When
Homelessness Strategy	Feb-18

Owner	Alan Benson
Version	1
Date	28/09/2017

Supporting information not for the public domain

Risk	RAG
Political	
Lack of appetite to review of BME community groups funding	Amber
Delivery- Programme management Risk averse legal and financial advice	Amber
Capacity to deliver within Homelessness Strategy & Commissioning team	Amber
Improved joint working between LBH and HfH	Amber

Mitigation