

## NOTICE OF MEETING

# OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Monday, 28th January, 2019, 7.00 pm - Civic Centre, High Road,  
Wood Green, N22 8LE**

**Members:** Councillors Lucia das Neves (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair),  
Mahir Demir, Ruth Gordon and Adam Jogee

**Co-optees:** Mark Chapman (Parent Governor Representative), Luci Davin (Parent  
Governor Representative) and Yvonne Denny (Co-opted Member - Church  
Representative (CofE))

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 - 10)**

To agree the minutes of the meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

#### **7. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS (PAGES 11 - 34)**

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

Housing and Regeneration – 17<sup>th</sup> December 2018.

Children and Young People – 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018.

Environment and Community Safety – 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018.

#### **8. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR CIVIC SERVICES**

Verbal Update.

#### **9. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT 2019-2020 (PAGES 35 - 60)**

#### **10. BUDGET SCRUTINY; PANEL FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS. (PAGES 61 - 192)**

**11. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (PAGES 193 - 224)**

**12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

**13. FUTURE MEETINGS**

25 March 2019

29<sup>th</sup> April 2019

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

Friday, 18 January 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

;

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 14TH JANUARY, 2019, 19.00-21.40hrs.**

**PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Lucia das Neves (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Mahir Demir, Ruth Gordon and Adam Jogee**

**Co-optees: Mark Chapman, Luci David and Yvonne Denny**

**5. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

Noted.

**6. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**7. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**8. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Jogee declared an interest in respect of item 10 on the agenda, as he was the EU Nationals Ambassador.

**9. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS**

None.

**10. MINUTES**

The Chair noted that there were quite a few outstanding actions, and having discussed with the Committee it was felt that going forward, the Committee needed to be more stringent with setting deadlines for reports coming back to Overview and Scrutiny, or at least a response as to why it may not be possible to provide a report.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings held on 19 November 2018 and 6 December 2018 be approved as a correct record.**

**11. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS**

The Committee noted the minutes of the Scrutiny Panels. The Chair referred to the green flag reports for parks, and standards of parks and requested that this was

investigated further as part of the work of the Environment and Community Safety Panel.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the Scrutiny Panels be noted.**

**12. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR STRATEGIC REGENERATION**

Councillor Adje – Cabinet Member for Strategic Regeneration – provided a brief outline of his recent Cabinet activities. He and the Leader had met with the Haringey Business Alliance to discuss the development of a business pledge. The Haringey Business Alliance were pleased with the pledge, and were happy that the Council was engaging with businesses in a meaningful way. Further work would be undertaken in relation to formally recognising businesses which made a positive contribution locally and borough-wide. There was a focus on employment and apprenticeships for local residents.

Councillor Adje responded to questions from the Committee:

- Adult Education was not broken down into people with or without disabilities, and there was a wide range of initiatives available. Councillor Adje would provide the prospectus of the team to the Committee.
- The Council were looking to work with all businesses to identify barriers to trading, and to encourage growth where possible. The main places being targeted were Tottenham High Road and Wood Green High Road. One strategy was to encourage the letting of empty premises on a meanwhile basis so that there were fewer empty premises along the high roads.
- Officers had been requested to review the Business Strategy as a whole, and to identify what was working, and to build on these, and to remove the strategies which did not work. A briefing on the 'quick-wins' could be provided.

Actions:

- Councillor Adje to provide information on education available for adults, and whether specific programmes were available for those with disabilities.
- Overview and Scrutiny Committee members to be invited to attend walk-about sessions with Councillor Adje when looking at the high roads and local businesses.
- Councillor Adje to provide information on meanwhile uses for empty premises – whether there was a strategy, and why the Council want to use empty properties in that way.
- Councillor Adje to provide information on funding for HEST apprenticeships, and the Council's approach to apprenticeships.
- Councillor Adje to provide an overview of business support, including results so far from the review.

The Chair thanked Councillor Adje for attending.

**13. BUDGET SCRUTINY - PRIORITY X**

*Clerks note: The Chair varied the order of the agenda to take item 10 before item 9. The minutes follow the order of the agenda.*

### Councillor Connor in the Chair

Richard Grice – Director for Customers, Transformation and Resources – and Councillor Tucker – Cabinet Member for Corporate Services and Insourcing – provided an update on the budget proposals for Priority X.

The total savings for Priority X were small as the bulk of savings had been made in previous budgets. 95% of the savings were being achieved in two programmes of work. The Front Office and Back Office (FOBO) programme would look at the processes and systems which support the way the organisation works. This was a significant programme of change, and would involve reviewing processes, removing unnecessary changes, and replacing with automation in some cases. It was likely that this would result in a loss of around 100 posts. The other savings programme was the vacation and re-letting of office space in Alexandra House. This was a challenging target, but should save £1m, although it was noted that the savings would not be realised until the space had been let.

The Council were also looking at how insourcing would work in the organisation, and it was acknowledged that if more services were directly provided, there would be more opportunities available to redeploy staff who had been affected by other budget cuts.

In regard to advertising, there was a new contract for street furniture advertising, which had been let en-bloc, so the income would be provided up front. The income for future years had been estimated based on potential new street furniture becoming available for advertising.

The Committee requested the following:

- An update to be provided on the FOBO programme as a whole – which roles were likely to be cut, how the staff could be redeployed, the timeline for the programme, and how / when it would be appropriate for Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be involved. This was requested for the end of March 2019.
- Information to be provided on staff insourcing – the financial implications and when it would be appropriate for Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be involved.
- For the OSC agenda pack for 28 January to include the previous savings for Priority x, proposed savings for 19/20, and the total of these, along with the Capital information which had been provided in the Cabinet papers.
- For clarification on whether the capital spend on the IT and buildings upgrade was for buildings or for IT.
- Further information to be provided on raising revenues through libraries, and the radical ways of working programme.

The Chair thanked all for attending.

#### 14. HARINGEY BREXIT PREPAREDNESS

Joe McBride - Leader & Cabinet Support Team Manager – introduced the report as set out. The Chief Executive had tasked a working group of officers to consider the key areas and services which could be affected by Brexit. Coporate Board had agreed that the Council would pay the fee for the application for settled citizenship status for Council staff. The Leader had written to all EU residents in the Borough, and Councillor Jogee had been appointed the EU Citizens Ambassador. Regular conversations were taking place with London Councils and the Home Office in relation to community cohesion, and a local resident meeting had been arranged for 4 February 2019.

Joe McBride responded to questions from the Committee:

- The cost to the Council of paying the settled citizenship status fee would be around £20,000 – a commitment had been made that these fund would be made available.
- The Council were applying to the Home Office for a grant to fund schemes to raise awareness of the resettlement process, and to highlight this to people who do not access Council services, or feel that they do not have to go through the process. Marcus Garvey and Wood Green libraries had been identified for suitable hubs to provide help and guidance on completing the online application.
- FAQs would be provided to residents at the public meeting on 4 February – this information can also be made available for Councillors.
- The Director for Finance was exploring current government funding and assessing the impact that Brexit could have on the borough – this could be shared with the Committee at their meeting in April.

**Action: Clerk**

The Chair thanked all for attending.

#### 15. CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Joanna Sumner – Assistant Director for Strategy and Communications – introduced the report as set out. She explained that it had been anticipated that the work would have been more fully formed, however the development of the Fairness Commission had taken priority over other areas. The implementation of the Fairness Commission would be used to inform how the Council approached consultation and engagement. A resident engagement pledge had been reproduced in the Borough Plan, and a residents panel would be set up to explore this further.

The Committee requested that a further report be provided to the Committee when more information was available.

The Chair thanked Joanna Sumner for attending.

#### 16. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

**RESOLVED that:**



- i. The work programmes for the main Committee and Scrutiny Panels at Appendix A be noted;
- ii. The scope and terms of reference of the reviews by the Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel review on Special Education Needs and Disability (Appendix B), and the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel on Plastic Waste (Appendix C) be approved; and
- iii. Councillor Culverwell be appointed as a replacement for Councillor James on the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel.

**17. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

**18. FUTURE MEETINGS**

CHAIR: Councillor Lucia das Neves

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank

**Overview and Scrutiny  
Action Tracker**

<b>Mtg. Date</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Who by</b>	<b>Completed</b>
14 <sup>th</sup> January	Government funding options and further analysis on the potential impact on the Borough would be shared with the Committee at their meeting in April.	Will be taken to the April meeting.	Jon Warlow/Clerk	Ongoing
14 <sup>th</sup> January	An update to be provided on the FOBO programme as a whole – which roles were likely to be cut, how the staff could be redeployed, the timeline for the programme, and how / when it would be appropriate for Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be involved. This was requested from the end of March 2019.	Update will be brought to the April meeting.	Richard Grice	Ongoing
14 <sup>th</sup> January	Information to be provided on staff insourcing; the financial implications and when it would be appropriate for Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be involved.		Richard Grice.	Ongoing
14 <sup>th</sup> January	For the OSC agenda pack for 28 January to include the previous savings for Priority x, proposed savings for 19/20, and the total of these, along with the Capital information which had been provided in the Cabinet papers.	Included in budget report.	Rob Mack	Y
14 <sup>th</sup> January	Clarification on whether the capital spend on the IT and buildings upgrade was for buildings or for IT.	The Libraries IT and Building upgrade budget is specific to the library service and used to fund both building and IT infrastructure for that service. Hornsey Library is recorded as a separate line due to the substantial nature of that specific refurbishment project.	Richard Grice	Y
14 <sup>th</sup> January	Further information to be provided on raising revenues through libraries, and the radical ways of working programme.	These proposals are in development and final detail will be presented as future transformation business cases.	Richard Grice	Ongoing
14 <sup>th</sup> January	Councillor Adje to provide information on education available for adults, and whether specific programmes were available for those with disabilities.		Cllr Adje	Ongoing
14 <sup>th</sup>	Overview and Scrutiny Committee members to be		Cllr Adje	Ongoing

January	invited to attend walk-about sessions with Councillor Adje when looking at the high roads and local businesses.			
14 <sup>th</sup> January	Councillor Adje to provide information on meanwhile uses for empty premises – whether there was a strategy, and why the Council want to use empty properties in that way.		Cllr Adje	Ongoing
14 <sup>th</sup> January	Councillor Adje to provide information on funding for HEST apprenticeships, and the Council's approach to apprenticeships.		Cllr Adje	Ongoing
14 <sup>th</sup> January	Councillor Adje to provide an overview of business support, including results so far from the review.		Cllr Adje	Ongoing
14 <sup>th</sup> January	A further consultation and engagement report was requested in due course.	Ongoing	Joanna Sumner	Ongoing
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Panel Chairs to pick up outstanding actions from Panel Minutes.	Ongoing.	Panel Chairs	Ongoing
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Further information requested around scheme with British Library.	Briefing sent to the Chair on 15 <sup>th</sup> January.	Steve Carr	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Briefing requested on how the Council supported local businesses.	Briefing sent to the Chair on 15 <sup>th</sup> January.	Steve Carr	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	A paper on town centre managers requested at a future Committee meeting.	Paper requested.	Helen Fisher	N
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Briefing requested around how the Council supported local apprenticeship schemes.	Briefing sent to the Chair on 15 <sup>th</sup> January.	Steve Carr	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Further information requested around what was an acceptable level of litter.	Response sent to Members at on 7 <sup>th</sup> January.	Charlotte Pomery	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Further information requested on the fact that 20% of Council tenants seemingly lived in non-decent homes.	Response sent to Members at on 7 <sup>th</sup> January.	Charlotte Pomery	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Send round the information from the Haringey Stat meeting on youth violence.	Response sent to Members at on 7 <sup>th</sup> January.	Charlotte Pomery	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Come back with details on the response rate for the Residents Survey.	Response sent to Members at on 7 <sup>th</sup> January.	Charlotte Pomery	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Panel to pick up need for coordination between the CCG and Council on savings.	Ongoing	Cllr Connor / Cllr Berryman	
19 <sup>th</sup>	Formal quarterly performance briefings for OSC	Request agreed.	Charlotte Pomery	Y

November	Members to pick up key risks and likely cost impact.			
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Updated budget scrutiny timetable to be circulated.	Timetable circulated.	Jon Warlow	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Budget documents to include information around risk modelling and the impact of proposed savings on service delivery.	Request agreed by Finance.	Jon Warlow	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Feedback figures on the staff churn rate.	Figures circulated to the Chair on 23 <sup>rd</sup> November.	Richard Grice	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Dates for further fire safety evidence gathering sessions to be circulated.	Complete	Rob Mack	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Feedback requested on link between homelessness and betting shop proliferation	Study from University of Lincoln circulated on 4 <sup>th</sup> January.	Daliah Barrett	Y
19 <sup>th</sup> November	Circulate review on clustering of betting shops.	Report circulated.	Rob Mack	Y
2 <sup>nd</sup> October	Children and Young People's Panel agreed to look into CAMHS waiting lists as part its work programme and report back to the Committee	Added to work plan for Year 2.	Cllr Demir	Y
2 <sup>nd</sup> October	Adults and Health Panel would monitor the development of a co-design approach as part of its work programme.	Added to the work plan.	Cllr Connor	Y
2 <sup>nd</sup> October	Head of Organisational resilience agreed to brief Councillors on the role of Members in an emergency incident.	Outstanding	Andrew Meek	N

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HOUSING AND  
REGENERATION SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON MONDAY, 17TH  
DECEMBER, 2018, 6.30 - 10.10 pm**

**PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Dawn Barnes, Isidoros Diakides, Ruth Gordon (Chair),  
Bob Hare, Yvonne Say and Daniel Stone**

**26. 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'.

**27. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence had been received from Cllr Sarah Williams.

**28. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**30. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS**

None.

**31. MINUTES**

In relation to the action point in the minutes about anti-social behaviour on the Love Lane estate it was noted that the response from Sean McLaughlin, Managing Director of Homes for Haringey, had said that Estates Watch system [involving a high-spec CCTV and intercom system in the communal areas of the blocks to monitor problems, speak directly to perpetrators and direct police] would be rolled out from April 2019.

However, Cllr Barnes said that the reports of anti-social behaviour were continuing and suggested that the Safer Neighbourhood Team should be involved to support residents during the winter months.

In relation to the item in the minutes on the Tottenham and Wood Green landowner forums, Peter O'Brien, Assistant Director for Area Regeneration, reported that a paper had been submitted to a meeting of the Housing & Regeneration sub-group on 4<sup>th</sup> December. The steer from Members at that meeting was to cease the Tottenham landowner forum and to take more time to consider political representation on the Wood Green landowner forum. Members had been keen to stress that the Borough remained pro-business and wanted to ensure that there are mechanisms and structures for effective engagement with businesses and landowners in line with the draft Borough Plan and the Business Pledge. These proposals remained in draft until such time as the Council's wider approach to business engagement had been established through the Borough Plan process.

In relation to the action point in the minutes about loading bays potentially being placed at the front of retail premises rather than rear access as part of the redevelopment of the Wood Green High Road area, Cllr Adje confirmed that this was indeed the case with minivans used to deliver goods to the High Road, as happens in a similar way elsewhere in London. However, this was predominantly a planning issue and so further questions would need to be directed to those responsible for planning policy.

**AGREED: That the minutes of the Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 15th November 2018 be approved as an accurate record.**

### **32. SCRUTINY OF THE 2019/20 DRAFT BUDGET / 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2019/20-2023/24)**

Helen Fisher, Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, introduced the report on the 2019/20 draft budget and the five-year Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2019/20 to 2023/24 with a focus on Priority 4 (Economy/Regeneration) and Priority 5 (Housing). The Council's overall proposed budget reductions are £7m in 2019/20 rising to £12.8m by 2023/24 but it is currently estimated that £6.5m of further budget reductions will be required to address the current gap in 2019/20.

The figures for Priorities 4 and 5 are included in Appendix B of the report. This shows a significant drop in the budget for Priority 4 from 2019/20 but this is mainly due to movements out of Priority 4 into Priority 3. It also shows gradual reductions in the Priority 5 budget which is mainly due to savings in the Temporary Accommodation budget. The Priority 4 budget (£4.7m in 2018/19) and Priority 5 budget (£19.8m in 2018/19) combined represents less than 10% of the overall Council budget. The figures from the revised plan are £6.3m for Priority 4 (which comprises of £18.4m of expenditure and £12m of income) and £15.8m for Priority 5 (which comprises of £55.8m of expenditure and £40m of income).

Responding to a query on the overall staffing budget, Helen Fisher agreed to provide further details about this to the panel in writing. **(Action – Helen Fisher)** Overall staff



numbers across the whole directorate is around 240 but this shifts significantly and often involves agency staff for certain functions. A staffing structure chart was circulated to the panel with details of the senior management within the directorate. The directorate was increasingly moving towards a model of bringing in more planning income and external funding to reduce the impact on the General Fund. Peter O'Brien, Assistant Director for Regeneration, said that the regeneration budget was around £3.3m with around £1.7m to £1.8m coming from the General Fund with the rest covered largely by external funding.

On property services, Helen Fisher said that additional agency staff had been brought in to help with ongoing work to meet the increased income target but it would be better to move to permanent posts in this area. Some properties had not had a rent review for 10-15 years so assets owned by the Council are being reviewed and there is a large backlog to work through. This included reviewing the conditions and health and safety compliance of the properties as well as the rent levels. On a query about the void rate and current rental income, Helen Fisher said that this information would need to be provided in writing. **(Action – Helen Fisher)** It would not be possible to provide an estimate of how much additional rental income could be brought in as this would only be known as each property is reviewed. As an example, one recently reviewed property had seen the rent increase by 50%. The impact of rent increases on local businesses also needed to be taken into account. It was expected that the review would be completed within the next year. Policy direction in this area came from the Strategic Property Board which is chaired by Cllr Ejiofor. Cllr Ibrahim said that many of the tenants of these properties are small businesses, sometimes based on council estates with local people relying on their services, so it was important to be cautious as substantial rent rises could make these businesses unviable.

The panel then examined each of the specific budget proposals.

### **EC1 - Carbon Management**

This proposal involves a saving to the General Fund of £60,000 from the Carbon Management Service by using some of the planning income to support this instead. Helen Fisher confirmed that this change would not result in any staff cuts or an increase in the planning fees as it only involves a shift in the source of funds. The risk of not receiving sufficient income through the planning fees was considered to be low.

Asked which part of the planning service would therefore be carrying the subsequent reduction, Helen Fisher said that the income generated was over and above what was required to pay for the planning service so the money was used to support various other services across the Council that support the planning function. Asked about possible funding for tree work from planning fees Helen Fisher said that this is on the agenda to be resolved but no commitment has yet been made.

### **EC2 - Reduction in consultancy budget**

This proposal involves a reduction in the consultancy budget from £250,000 to £175,000. Asked whether there was any scope to bring more of these functions in-

house, Helen Fisher said that the consultancy budget tends to be used for technical specialist advisers. The directorate does not have, for example, architects, people who can do surveys of ground conditions, quantity surveyors or people to do very detailed financial modelling in-house. It would not make sense to employ this range of people full-time so it is necessary to bring these skills in on a case-by-case consultancy basis.

Asked whether there was scope to reduce the consultancy budget further, Helen Fisher said that it was be difficult to estimate what skills would be required as part of the forthcoming housing delivery projects. If it is possible and efficient to bring more staff in-house that this would be done. But at present it was not possible to commit to reducing the consultancy budget any further.

Asked why the use of agency staff was not being reduced, Helen Fisher said that the Major Works team and Property team had been over-reliant on agency staff and so staffing restructures were anticipated in January/February in order to obtain more permanent staff. This wouldn't necessarily generate any revenue savings because the Property team is growing and the Major Works team's savings would be capitalised. In relation to the Planning team there is a balance to be struck as having too many permanent staff can be a problem if there are not enough planning applications coming in.

Asked how much is spent on consultants altogether, including those categorised as capital costs, Peter O'Brien said that it would be difficult to say as there are so many different projects ongoing but further details could be provided in writing. **(Action – Peter O'Brien)**

The panel recommended that consideration be given to further reducing consultancy costs and that senior managers should always examine whether functions can be carried out another way rather than through consultants.

### **EC3 - Deletion of senior post**

This proposal involves saving £225,000 by deleting the Director of Regeneration post and streamlining the senior management level. This was Helen Fisher's post but as she is currently acting up as Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development that post is effectively vacant at present.

The panel was provided with a staffing structure chart. Panel members commented that the structure is currently inconsistent with a Director, two Assistant Directors and a Head of Department all on the same second tier level. Helen Fisher said that this proposal was at an early stage and would be tidied up with a flatter management structure but the overall aim was to deliver savings without impacting negatively on any member of staff.

#### **EC4 - Tackling uncrystallised debt**

This proposal involves bringing in more income by tackling uncrystallised debt in the commercial portfolio including from a backlog of outstanding rent reviews and lease renewals. Asked why the agency surveyor that had commenced at the end of June had achieved only two rent settlements, Helen Fisher said that preparation had been started on many others and that good progress was being made overall. A progress update could be provided to the panel in future if required. Asked about underutilised properties in the commercial portfolio, Helen Fisher said that the Council had not historically been as good as it could have been in terms of asset management. The capital programme included some proposals on investing in some of those properties to bring them back into use. This is the start of the process however and so it was not yet possible to give assurances on the level of any future revenue generation. In addition, this is specialist work and the skills in this area difficult to obtain which sometimes leads to reliance on agency staff.

#### **EC5 - Outdoor media advertising**

This proposal involves generating new income through the introduction of outdoor media advertising on the Council's commercial estate. Asked why there was no new income projected for 2019/20, Helen Fisher said that sites were in the process of being identified through a piece of consultancy work and then planning permission and marketing of the sites would be required so this is why there is an anticipated delay. Asked how much other nearby boroughs were able to raise through this kind of work, the consultants would be doing some benchmarking of this as part of their work. It is anticipated that more detail on this would be available by January which could be provided to the panel. **(Action – Helen Fisher)**

Asked why consultants are required for this work, Helen Fisher said that the Property team is small and so it would take some time to be able to get this work done. It was hoped that in future the team would be more geared up to do this kind of work but at the moment this is not the case. Asked about the cost of the consultancy work in this case, Helen Fisher said she would need to find out and provide this information to the panel in writing. **(Action – Helen Fisher)**

Asked whether this approach clashes with the aim of a good local environment without street clutter Helen Fisher said that this is why it is important that the process goes through the planning system. Cllr Barnes said that because of these issues, although achieving income in 2019/20 would be welcome, it is also important not to rush the implementation.

The panel agreed to support the proposal with the recommendations that:

- Consideration is given to whether it would be possible to obtain some revenue in 2019/20.
- Consideration is given to avoiding excessive street clutter when implementing the scheme.

### **HO1 - Temporary accommodation reduction plan**

This proposal involves reducing the current budget of £7.1m for Temporary Accommodation including by increasing the supply of lower-cost temporary accommodation through a new Purchase Repair & Management Joint Venture Partnership. Asked why this involves a partnership, Cllr Ibrahim said that while this is a joint venture it doesn't require the Council to put any land or capital in and allows the Council to have some level of control over the rent levels which are currently very high within the Temporary Accommodation market and the quality of conditions in the accommodation which can sometimes currently be poor.

Asked why Homes for Haringey (HfH) couldn't perform this function independently, Cllr Ibrahim said that this would involve the purchase of properties which HfH wouldn't necessarily have the funds for. Helen Fisher added that there are a number of initiatives here including a Purchase Repair and Management (PRAM) scheme which would involve an external partner buying up properties and carrying out repairs and maintenance while the Council's role is to ensure tenants for these properties. The Council will then own these properties within 30-40 years. However, the recent lifting of the HRA borrowing cap by the government means that there are now more options available to consider. A paper on this would be brought to Cabinet in March. The Community Benefit Society would involve the Council increasing the level of acquisitions and this stock would be managed by HfH. More information could be provided to the panel in future about each of the different models. The Panel agreed that this should be brought back to the panel as a separate future agenda item, perhaps in March. **(Action – Helen Fisher)**

Asked whether the £920,000 saving on Temporary Accommodation budget for 2019/20 could be achieved, Helen Fisher said that the Council was able to use an unallocated portion of the Flexible Homeless Support Grant received from the government but that in the longer-term the initiatives that had been discussed would help to bring the budget down.

### **HO2 – Capitalisation of Development team salary costs**

This proposal involves charging the salaries of development team staff to the HRA rather than the General Fund. This does not represent an actual saving as such, only reduced pressure on the General Fund. It is possible that further staff could be migrated in this way in future. There would still be £764,000 in the budget for development team staff costs but it was not possible to say whether this could be reduced further until it was known what programmes and initiatives would need to be delivered.

### **PL1 – Additional HMO licensing scheme**

This proposal relates to Priority 3 and would therefore be scrutinised by the Community and Environment scrutiny panel, but due to its relevance to housing policy

this had been included in the agenda pack for the Housing & Regeneration scrutiny panel for their comments:

- Panel members generally welcomed the Licensing Scheme as a positive policy aimed at tackling poor quality housing.
- There were mixed comments in relation to the fee levels – one member commented that costs equating to 80p per week per tenant were quite low and questioned whether the fees could be increased. However, other members noted that they understood the intention of the scheme to be cost neutral and aimed at improving housing quality and not to raise funds. Members also questioned whether landlords would end up passing on the cost of the scheme to their tenants.
- Panel members also expressed concerns about displacement. Similar schemes elsewhere had been linked to high levels of evictions and they didn't want to see people in vulnerable circumstances being put into a worse situation as an unintended side-effect. They asked how people in such circumstances would be assessed and supported where necessary.
- Panel members asked whether there were already staff in place to carry out the new work or whether new staff need to be recruited.
- Panel members asked why there was no additional income for 2019/20. The delay to 2020/21 seemed unambitious as earlier implementation and more resources to do this work could generate gains for the Council more rapidly.

### **Capital Schemes**

On the Wood Green Regeneration (Capital Scheme 480), Peter O'Brien commented that this covers a wide range of capital investments in the Wood Green area over several years including on highways, parks, health centre, schools and community infrastructure. The assumption is that this will be funded from various sources including CIL and Section 106 money.

Peter O'Brien said that the Strategic Investment Pot (Capital Scheme 481), related to an external grant for various uses including for a broadband project covering Haringey and other north London boroughs and for the Productive Valley Fund which is similar to the Opportunity Investment Fund but with a focus on the Upper Lea Valley.

Helen Fisher said that the Strategic Property funding (Capital Scheme 482), is a pot of money that had been identified to cover a range of different things including property acquisitions and capital investment into the Council's commercial property portfolio. Each project within this will be subject to a detailed business case.

On the Wholly Owned Company (WOC) (Capital Scheme 512), Helen Fisher said that this was the funding required to establish the WOC and support housing delivery. The amount of funding set out may reduce significantly as the development activity moves into the HRA.

On a query about why the Muswell Hill Flats (Capital Scheme 513), which involved 6 flats being fitted out, were being used for shared ownership and not temporary

accommodation Helen Fisher said that the Council is working with the CCG to open a GP surgery on the ground floor and is currently looking at whether the 6 flats on the upper floors could be used for social rent. The Panel supported the proposal on the condition that the flats were not used for shared ownership.

Panel members commented that insufficient detail had been provided on the capital proposals that involved, in some cases, investment of millions of pounds. Helen Fisher responded that areas such as the Strategic Property funding were part of a long-term strategic approach and therefore information specific acquisitions were not available because they had not happened yet. In addition, individual projects within these allocations would need to go back to Cabinet for approval before they can go ahead.

After some discussion the panel concluded that more detailed information about each of the capital proposals should be brought to the next meeting of the panel for scrutiny on 15<sup>th</sup> January. This could include more information about the sources of the funding and what it would be used for.

**AGREED: That comments on PL1 be passed to the Community & Environment scrutiny panel ahead of its budget scrutiny meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> December.**

**AGREED: That an agenda item for scrutiny of the main Capital schemes for Priorities 4 & 5 be added for the meeting of the Panel on 15<sup>th</sup> January.**

**AGREED: That the panel note the revenue proposals for Priorities 4 & 5 in the 2019/20 Draft Budget and MTFS for 2019/20 to 2023/24 and that a list of recommendations be provided to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee ahead of its meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> January.**

**33. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**34. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- 15<sup>th</sup> January 2019
- 14<sup>th</sup> February 2019
- 14<sup>th</sup> March 2019

CHAIR: Councillor Ruth Gordon

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY 18TH DECEMBER 2018**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Mahir Demir (Chair), Dana Carlin, James Chiriyankandath, Julie Davies, Josh Dixon and Tammy Palmer**

**Co-opted Member: Yvonne Denny (Church representative) and Luci Davin (Parent Governor representative)**

### **25. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

### **26. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Mr Chapman.

### **27. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **28. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

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

None.

### **30. MINUTES**

#### **AGREED:**

That the minutes of the meeting of 8 November 2018 be approved.

### **31. SCRUTINY OF THE 2019/20 DRAFT BUDGET/5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2019/20-2023/24)**

Councillor Weston, the Cabinet Member for Children and Families, stated that she felt that the proposed budget savings were both deliverable and achievable. Of particular note was the fact that they strengthened early help and protected front line services.

Anne Graham, the Director of Children's Services, reported that all service areas had been looked at for savings but the priority had been on deliverability. They had been very conscious that a number of previous savings proposals had proven to be non achievable and a lot of work had taken place to ensure that the current proposals avoided this. Paul Durrant, Senior Business Partner from Corporate Finance, reported that it had been acknowledged that some more recent savings proposals had been unrealistic. Any proposals that were not considered to be sufficiently robust had been taken out during the current exercise. A more collaborative approach had been followed that acknowledged the true cost of running the Children's Service. The Panel noted that only 20% of proposed savings in previous years had actually been achieved.

Ms Graham felt that the proposed savings in social work staffing carried some risk but greater stability in the workforce was more efficient. Councillor Weston stated that the budget for children and young people's services had been reduced by about one third due to the government's austerity policies. It had become progressively more difficult to identify savings. Ms Graham reported that savings were also intended to be realised through improved recruitment and retention of foster carers. However, it was also important to ensure that children were allocated to them and care plans were reasonable. The proposals had left some space for manoeuvre. There would always be unforeseen circumstances but the service aimed to ensure they met their savings targets.

The Committee noted that the Finance Service had been required to sign off all of the proposals. Ms Graham stated that the service would not break placements just for the sake of making savings. However, they were happy to agree to children returning home if the service was able to work successfully with the family and if it was safe to do so. Only three such cases had been identified so far as the service was taking a cautious approach. Councillor Weston reported that the service had a moral and legal responsibility to meet the needs of children. A large amount of work went into ensuring that they were placed in the right setting for them. They sought to be as realistic as possible in their projections but the service was ultimately demand led.

The Panel noted that the Staffing and Remuneration Committee had considered a report on the recruitment and retention of social workers within the Children's Service at its meeting on 17 December and it was agreed that this would be circulated to Panel Members.

The Panel considered in detail the proposals relating to its terms of reference as follows:

- *P1; Reducing Agency Spend on Social Work Staff;*  
In answer to a question, Ms Graham reported that the posts that were most difficult to recruit to were those that were front line. These were demanding and often stressful posts. There was a lot of mobility amongst staff and a significant number were choosing to work for agencies now. In answer to another question, she stated that the service was seeking to strengthen learning and development for staff and work was taking place with partners to progress this so that learning could be undertaken together, which had the added benefit of building stronger relationships.



- *P2: Reducing Operational Costs;*

In respect of the reducing the management costs of running Children's Centres, the Panel noted that these would affect the three centres that were directly run. The aim was to rationalise management costs across them whilst improving the quality of practice. The Cabinet Member reported that consultation had taken place with relevant trade unions. Gill Gibson, Assistant Director for Early Help and Prevention, agreed to provide further details of the proposed reductions. The reductions in management staffing were intended to be achieved through voluntary redundancies and there had already been a number of applications. Council Policies for organisational change would be followed

Panel Members commented that voluntary redundancy had a cost and those who might wish to take advantage of it often had specific skills that the Council should be looking to retain.

In respect of the proposal to deliver more support to less complex cases through the greater use of family support workers, the Panel noted that there would still be some social worker input as appropriate.

- *P3: Reducing the Cost of Placements;*

The Cabinet Member reported that targets for the recruitment and retention of foster carers had been achieved for this year. In answer to a question, Ms Gibson reported that promoting independence amongst SEND children was a priority. However, independent travel training would only be offered to those young people placed out-of-borough where this was appropriate. Training was already being offered successfully for those placed in-borough.

In answer to a question, Ms Gibson reported that promoting independence amongst SEND children was the priority. However, independent travel training would only be offered to those young people placed out-of-borough who were felt to have the potential to benefit from it. Training was already being offered successfully for those placed in-borough.

In respect of the proposed savings in supported housing for young care leavers, Ms Graham reported this proposal was concerned with managing the market better and commissioning at a cheaper rate. In reference to the timely provision of adaptations, Ms Gibson reported that there was evidence that these were taking too long at the moment and the aim was to address this. In answer to a question, she stated that consideration was being given to using independent occupational therapists (OTs). It was noted that a lot of work was taking place in Adults Services to improve the speed in which adaptations were undertaken and Children's Services were working closely with colleagues in Adults Services to ensure that adaptations took place in a timely way in future.

- *P4: Reducing the number of Looked After Children;*

In answer to a question, Ms Graham stated that there were currently no plans by the Council and other boroughs to replace the London refuge for young runaways that had closed. It was nevertheless an interesting idea and could be considered at a later stage. She stated that where young people were at a very

high level of risk, consideration could be given to moving them out of the borough.

- *P5: Providing Educational Psychology and Advisory Teacher services to schools;*

In answer to a question, Ms Gibson reported that Haringey's services in these areas were well respected and valued by schools and a good level of interest had been expressed by them already.

- *Capital Programme;*

In respect of the proposal concerning Fortismere School, the Panel noted that the proposal was to assist the school initially with the sale and development of a portion of their land. Any capital used for this would be recovered from the development in due course. A full business case would be developed. The Cabinet Member reported that no decision had been taken on the proposal yet but including this in budget enabled one to be taken at the appropriate time should the Council decide to go ahead. In answer to a question, she stated that Fortismere was probably in a unique position compared to other schools in the borough due to the higher projected land values.

Panel Members commented that this appeared to be a disproportionately high amount of money to invest in a single school, particularly in the light of its foundation status. Concern was expressed at the potential impact of the further expansion of the Sixth Form at Fortismere on other schools within the borough. As it was a foundation school, it had been able to expand several times whilst community schools were not. It was also the case that the consent of the Secretary of State for Education was required for the disposal of any surplus land that was currently used for education purposes.

The Cabinet Member responded that the impact on other schools of any further increase in the size of the Sixth Form at Fortismere would be considered as part of any process leading to a decision on the proposal. However, a large number of young people went outside of the borough for post 16 education. The capital funding proposal was nevertheless focussed on regeneration rather than sixth form expansion and it was being led by the Cabinet Members for Strategic Regeneration and Corporate Services and Insourcing. She did not know whether an initial approach had yet been made to the DfE regarding the possible disposal of surplus land.

The Panel requested further information about the proposal and, in particular, the amount that would be required next year.

The Panel stated that they had a high level of confidence that the proposals within the MTFS would be deliverable. They also appeared to be achievable and realistic. They also welcomed the transparent and collaborative approach and the income generation that was proposed.

**AGREED:**

1. That the report on the recruitment and retention of social workers within the Children's Service that was considered by the Staffing and Remuneration Committee at its meeting on 17 December be circulated to Panel Members (**Action – Rob Mack**);
2. That further details of the proposed budget reductions arising from the rationalisation of the management of Children's Centres and the capital proposal in respect of Fortismere School, including the amount of funding that would be required next year, be circulated to the Panel (**Action – Gill Gibson/Eveleen Riordan/Paul Durrant**).

### **32. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - COMMUNITIES**

Councillor Mark Blake, Cabinet Member for Communities, reported on key developments within his portfolio as follows:

- A bid from Haringey to the Mayor's Young Londoners fund had been successful. More details on this would be provided in due course;
- A successful bid for funding had also been made for the Project Future initiative to the Big Lottery fund. This was a community based, youth led mental health service aimed at young men aged 16-25 who were involved in offending and affected by serious youth violence and run in partnership with the Council, Mind in Haringey and Barnet, Enfield and Haringey Mental Health;
- Reports on the Serious Youth Violence strategy and Children at Risk were due to be considered by the Cabinet in March. Consultation had been undertaken with young people in developing these. This had been facilitated by the Godwin Law Foundation. There had also been a fruitful meeting with local MPs;
- The Council's Corporate Delivery Unit was currently looking at school exclusions and alternative provision. He would welcome input from the Panel on these issues;
- He congratulated the Director of Children's Services on the outcome of the recent OFSTED inspection. Although the outcome had been good, there were nevertheless areas where the Council acknowledged it needed to improve. He was delighted that Bruce Grove Youth Centre had been praised by the report, particularly after it had previously been threatened with closure. One key area that needed to be developed further was the strategic response to criminally exploited children. A seminar on reducing the criminalisation of children was being planned as part of the development of this.

Panel Members expressed concern at the increase of violent crime. It was felt that there might be a lack of awareness of its impact in the west of the borough. Young people often did not report crime. There was a lack of youth provision in the west and it was difficult for young people to find safe places to socialise. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that a significant number of young people had been victims of muggings and other crime. There was a need for schools to acknowledge the problem. Although there were now new resources for youth provision, there was nowhere near as much as was required. Whilst the Police had an important role to play in addressing violent crime, he wanted to see earlier engagement with young people.

In answer to a question, Ms Gibson reported that the Bridge Renewal Fund had just completed a mapping exercise of existing youth provision provided by the voluntary and community sector. It was intended to improve signposting of services for young people that currently existed. In respect of the successful bid for Young Londoner funding, the successful evaluation of the impact of the project was critical.

Panel Members highlighted the fact that secondary schools had all received Building Schools for the Future (BSF) via the Council and there had been an expectation that facilities would be available for community use in the evenings. However, many schools had diminished their commitment to this. Schools had been badly affected by the growth in violent crime and a conversation needed to take place with them regarding how they could collaborate with the Council in responding to it by making their buildings more available.

In answer to a question, the Cabinet Member stated that the £3 million that had been earmarked for the Onside project had been capital rather than revenue funding. In answer to another question, he stated that there was a need to galvanise a community response to the increase in violent crime. This needed to involve a range of partners and the Council would use its leverage to encourage involvement. There was a particular need for youth provision in areas of the borough other than Tottenham, such as Wood Green and Hornsey. He acknowledged that there were particular issues with the involvement of schools that needed to be addressed.

**33. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

**AGREED:**

That the work plan for the Panel be noted.

CHAIR: Councillor Mahir Demir

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY, 18TH DECEMBER, 2018, 6.30 pm**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Sygrave, Eldridge Culverwell, Scott Emery, Adam Jogee (Chair), Julia Ogjehor, Reg Rice, Matt White and Barbara Blake**

### **38. 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'.

### **39. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **40. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

The Chair advised that there was a late item of urgent business around Green Flags, which would be dealt with at Item 11.

### **41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In relation to Item 11, Cllr Culverwell declared that he was the Vice-Chair of the Friends of Finsbury Park.

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

None.

### **43. MINUTES**

The Committee were advised that the Council had been successful in a bid to the Mayor's Fund to establish a detached youth work team and to set up youth work apprenticeships. The Cabinet Member advised that a briefing to all Members would be provided on this. **(Action: Cllr M. Blake).**

The Panel were also advised that the Tottenham Futures project had secured funding from the Big Lottery Fund, which would ensure its continuation for at least three years.

Public consultation was underway with the Young People at Risk Strategy, due to be approved by Cabinet in March 2019. The Cabinet Member advised that he was

looking to speak to some of the young people interviewed by the Godwin Lawson Foundation, as part of their report on Youth at Risk, as part of the wider engagement process for the Young People at Risk Strategy.

The Panel noted that a launch event to establish a foundation for Tanesha Melbourne-Blake was due to take place on 20<sup>th</sup> December at Bruce Grove.

The Cabinet Member advised the Panel that a number of recent incidents had taken place in and around Wood Green. The Cabinet Member advised that this would feed into the ongoing work around Wood Green and efforts to establish a youth hub in the area.

In response to a request for an update on the Gangs Matrix, the Cabinet Member advised that he was part of an external reference group which met with Police and MOPAC colleagues. The group received a report from the Information Commissioner's Office which was highly critical of the Metropolitan Police. A response to that report was due from the Police as the next step. The Cabinet Member noted some concerns about the mapping process for the Gangs Matrix and that this was less successful than a similar process for community supervision of prisoners on licence.

The Panel requested further information in relation to apprenticeships and sought assurances about when a paper would be brought back to the Committee. The Panel also raised concerns with the recent incident outside the Vue cinema in Wood Green and requested that further information be provided. The Panel suggested that more work needed to be done to understand the reasons for the perceived increase in these type of incidents. The Panel also requested further information on the youth hub, including whether there would be a catchment area and what could be done to overcome postcode barriers. The Cabinet Member agreed to bring a presentation to the next meeting to update the Panel on the above issues raised in relation to young people. **(Action: Cllr M Blake/Clerk).**

In relation to the previous minutes, the Panel chased an update on CS1 and also around the island bus stop near the corner of Wightman Road and Turnpike Lane. **(Action: Clerk).**

The Panel requested further information in relation to the alternative savings considered as a result of the shortfall in achieving income targets for bulk waste. In response, officers advised that for some of the recycling rates that Veolia did not achieve, the money was used to cross-subsidise some of the issues on bulk waste. Officers advised that the budget item later in the agenda would look at how the Council could develop and refine this for the coming municipal year.

## **RESOLVED**

- I. That the minutes of the meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2018 be agreed as a correct record.

#### 44. UPDATE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SCRUTINY REVIEW ON CYCLING

The Panel received a progress update for noting on the Scrutiny Review into cycling undertaken by a previous iteration of the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel in 2016. The final report was approved by Cabinet on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The Panel had previously received a progress update on the recommendations in January 2018. The report was introduced by Neil Goldberg, Transport Planning Officer and was included in the agenda pack at pages 9-73. The following was noted in discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel noted that, there had been a reduction in the provision of bike hangers across the borough and queried whether this was a budgetary issue. The Panel commented that perhaps there was some capacity to charge users for bike hangers. In response, officers advised that demand out-stripped supply and acknowledged that this was primarily a budget issue. Officers also acknowledged that they were looking into a range of funding options including charging and asking for corporate sponsorship.
- b. The Chair reiterated that a separate schools charter should be developed for Haringey and suggested that this was something the Panel could pick up with the Cabinet Member outside of the meeting. **(Action: Chair)**.
- c. The Chair also raised concerns with abandoned bikes chained to lampposts and urged that they should to be removed as swiftly as possible. Officers agreed to feed this information back. **(Action: Neil Goldberg)**.
- d. Panel members fed back that a number of community representatives had cautioned that the annual bike ride with Councillors had not happened for some time. In response, officers agreed to pick this up and ensure that it took place in future. **(Action: Neil Goldberg)**.
- e. The Panel enquired whether the east/west cycle route would be expanded into Tottenham. In response, officers advised that the future cycle route two would run from Tottenham Hale to Finsbury Park and that they were working with TfL to finalise this. There was also an opportunity to finalise a route from Northumberland Park to Finsbury Park. Officers advised that, in future, there was the potential for a lot more cycle traffic through Wood Green and that this would provide the Council with an opportunity to improve infrastructure in the area
- f. The Panel raised concerns about whether the Transport Forum was adequately engaged with residents in the east of the borough. In response, officers acknowledged that in recent meetings there had been significantly more residents from the west of the borough but advised there were transport groups in place across Haringey.
- g. In response to a question, officers agreed to feedback on what the technical definition of a corner was in relation to parking restrictions and whether there were any measurements used in the definition. **(Action: Neil Goldberg)**.
- h. The Panel raised safety concerns with the introduction of contraflows in relation to cyclists, as well as motorists and pedestrians. In relation to a question about consultation responses and how these were factored into proposed transport schemes, officers advised that they listened to feedback from residents and that consultation responses were part of the consideration process undertaken by the Cabinet Member.

- i. The Cabinet Member thanked the Panel for their comments and provided some further feedback on the priorities for her portfolio. The Cabinet Member advised that the administration was looking at different ways to fund cycle routes, commenting that they were subsidised for the first three years. The Cabinet Member noted with interest the point about whether a charge could be introduced for bike hangers with an exemption for those that could not afford it. The Cabinet Member also advised that she would take on board the point about inclusivity within the transport forum. The Cabinet Member also suggested that perhaps the Council could assist residents with the cost of purchasing bikes.

## RESOLVED

That the Panel noted the progress made to date in achieving the recommendations agreed by Cabinet (Appendix 2 of the report).

## 45. AIR QUALITY

The Committee received a report which provided an overview on the current and proposed future actions concerning air quality. Copies of the existing Air Quality Action Plan along with a table of measures proposed as part of the draft Air Quality Plan for 2018-2023 were attached to the report as appendices. Ian Kershaw, Regulatory Services Manager introduced the report as set out in the agenda pack (pages 73-171). In discussion of the report and appendices, the following points were raised:

- a. In response to a question, officers advised that Haringey was part of a London-wide network for air quality and that significant amount of learning from best practice from other boroughs was undertaken.
- b. In response to concerns about the level of air quality in Crouch End, given its low-lying position within the borough, officers advised that they did not have exact figures for Crouch End specifically but that no areas within the Borough exceeded European guidelines or standards for air quality. Officers advised that air quality was not generally monitored in specific geographic locations, instead measurements were taken to monitor both hotspots, which tended to be main arterial roads, as well as background levels of air quality. Officers also cautioned that the design of high streets could have a significant impact on air quality, such as the presence of two/three storey buildings on either side of Green Lanes.
- c. In response to a question about whether the levels of air quality monitoring had been reduced in recent years, officers advised that static monitoring levels had remained the same for at least the last two years and that there certainly had been no reduction in budgets for that area.
- d. In response to a query about whether an overall reduction in public transport usage was monitored, officers advised that monitoring was carried out by the Mayor's Office and that this would include analysis of any modal shift. Officers agreed to get this information from TfL, draw out the information for Haringey and would circulate to the Committee. **(Action: Neil Goldberg)**.
- e. The Panel queried whether the air quality action day was limited to two half-day sessions. In response, officers advised that the action day was mainly focused



- on vehicle idling outside of schools but that a range of other activities were undertaken as well.
- f. In response to a query about the outcome of the air quality business engagement project in Crouch End, officers advised that they were still pulling together the evaluation on this but acknowledged that there was a low level of take up from local businesses.
  - g. Officers stressed that that role of the Air Quality Action plan was to set out how the Council as a whole and its partners were going to improve air quality levels.
  - h. In relation to a question around vehicle idling and the development of no-idling zones, officers acknowledged that this was something that was being looked at and that it was anticipated a policy would be brought forward, early in the new year.
  - i. The Panel sought clarification about why TfL had stopped monitoring for PM10 and PM 2.5 particles given their impact on public health. In response, officers advised that levels no longer exceeded European standards across London and that this was why TfL no longer monitored them.
  - j. The Panel acknowledged that the Air Quality Plan for 2018-2023 was still in draft format but requested that the format be amended to make it easier to follow. The Panel suggested that the format should reflect the previous Air Quality Action Plan.
  - k. The Panel raised concerns with the effect of smoke from charcoal ovens in restaurants in and around Green Lanes. In response, officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that the service was looking at the possibilities for expanding the existing smoke free zone.
  - l. The Panel highlighted the impact of street trees on air quality levels and their role in carbon capture. The Panel expressed concern that trees were not being replaced as a result of budget cuts. In response, officers advised that trees were still replaced and that there was a dedicated team who looked at this. In response to concerns about specific examples of where trees had not been replaced, officers cautioned that there may be specific reasons why trees were not replaced such as an unsuitable location or due to the time of year. Officers agreed, that if Panel members wanted to email examples of where trees had not been replaced that they would look into those and get back to the Panel. **(Panel Members/David Murray).**

## **RESOLVED**

- l. That the Panel noted the contents of the report and current draft Air Quality Action Plan.

## **46. BUDGET SCRUTINY**

The Committee received a report along with the 5 year draft budget/Medium Term Financial Strategy (2019/20-2023/24), the previous year's budget recommendations put forward in relation to Priority 3 and the 2019 (new) budget proposals. In addition to this, the proposed areas of capital spend for Priority 3 were sent out as an addendum report which was circulated with the agenda pack. The Panel also received feedback from the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel on 17<sup>th</sup> December, in relation to the savings proposal around an additional HMO licensing scheme (PL1). David Murray, Assistant Director for Environment and Neighbourhoods introduced the report.

The Cabinet Member for Environment advised the Committee that in developing the budget proposals with officers that she was keen to ensure that the implications for any saving put forward were fully understood. The Cabinet Member advised that it was important to understand the wider costs of implementing each saving and whether there may be unintended consequences. The Cabinet Member emphasised that the proposals put forward were realistic.

In addition to making savings, the Cabinet Member outlined that there were also revenue raising opportunities within Priority 3 which, it was hoped, had been utilised in these proposals. In light of the challenging financial picture, the Cabinet Member set out that she and officers were committed to making the savings targets but were also looking to preserve core services.

The following points were raised in discussion of the report and its appendices:

- a. The Committee sought clarification around the structural funding gap in 2020/21 of £18.4m that was identified in the report. The Committee also sought clarification on how this was possible if the Council had a legal duty to set a balanced budget. In response, officers advised that there was a legal obligation to set a balanced budget for next year i.e. 2019/20 and that the budget gap for next year was £6.5m. Officers acknowledged that closing a £6.5m gap was a significant challenge. The Committee was advised that the budget as currently presented was draft and that the £6.5m gap would need to be met by the time the final budget was agreed by Full Council in February.
- b. Officers advised that the government had released the provisional settlement agreement for local government and that this suggested an additional circa £1.2m of additional grant funding which would be used to plug some of the budget gap. A robust budget challenge process was underway, involving senior officers, to identify the remaining £5m-5.5m shortfall before February.
- c. In response to a question about the impact of the proposed savings on services within Environment and Neighbourhoods, officers advised that focus had been on looking at how services could be provided in a different way whilst maintaining quality standards. One example given was around LED lighting where standards could be maintained whilst also generating savings. Another area of focus outlined by officers was looking at how to generate efficiencies from some of the big contracts. Officers reiterated that they had been robust in their attempts to ensure that the savings put forward were achievable and sustainable.
- d. The Committee commented that where the budget proposals put forward were based on income generation, such as the additional HMO Licensing, that this should be made clearer. **(Action: Kaycee Ikegwu).**
- e. The Committee queried why there was no income forecast in the first year for the additional HMO Licensing scheme proposal. In response, officers advised that it was a five year licence and that there was an inevitable bedding-in period during the first year. Officers had made a decision to profile the income at £400k per year starting in year two. It was envisaged that revenue levels would build during years one and two and would likely reduce in later years as compliance was achieved.
- f. In response to a question, officer confirmed that revenue from HMO licensing was ring-fenced. However, there were currently staff in the Housing

- Improvement team being financed through the General Fund, which would be offset to allow a saving to the Council as whole.
- g. The Committee requested that any additional HMO licensing scheme be tenant focused and that the Council monitor whether this has any impact on eviction rates. In response, officers acknowledged these concerns and reassured the Panel the impact on tenants was built into the evaluation and monitoring processes.
  - h. The Committee expressed concerns with the proposal to cease funding for the police partnership team (PL11). It was suggested that this seemed to be entirely contrary to priorities identified in the new Borough Plan. The Committee commented that, as part of the consultation process for the Borough Plan, fear of crime was identified as the biggest concern for residents in the east of the Borough and the second biggest concern for residents in the west of the Borough. It was suggested that this saving would have a disproportionate effect on the east of the borough as it is where the police team were mostly utilised. It was also suggested that this could be contrary to the agenda of the Fairness Commission.
  - i. In relation to PL11, the Committee raised concerns that without Council funding this team would cease to exist. The mitigation stated that issues would be passed to local SNTs, however the Panel felt that the whole point of the team was to deal with issues that can't be dealt with by local SNTs. The Committee suggested that the £200k saving would have a significant impact and would likely incur costs elsewhere.
  - j. Panel members queried about Council Tax precept that goes towards the Metropolitan Police and questioned why the Council was having to contribute to further additional funding towards police resources. In response, officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that discussions in relation to how the impact on local policing resources would be mitigated were ongoing. The Committee was advised that the partnership team was funded through a BOGOF scheme announced by MOPAC and that there was some suggestion that this could be withdrawn. Officers were waiting for further confirmation on this.
  - k. In response to a question around parking income, officers advised that all parking revenue was ring-fenced and could only be spent on transport related activities.
  - l. The Committee raised concerns with the proposal for an additional HMO licensing scheme (PL1), questioning how feasible the income targets were year-on year. The Committee suggested a proposal should be put forward in relation to viability of the income levels proposed.

In light of the above discussion, the following budget recommendations were agreed:

- a. The Panel recommended that Cabinet reconsider the proposed saving in relation to flexible police resources. In particular, consideration should be given to whether this would have a disproportionate impact on the east of the borough, which had a higher number of victims of crime. Cabinet should also consider whether this proposal was reflective of the fairness agenda. The Panel also felt that this saving proposal was contrary to the priorities identified in the new Borough Plan around tackling crime. Fear of crime was one of the main issues identified by residents as part of the consultation in response to the new Bough Plan. PL 11.

- b. The Panel sought firm assurances from Cabinet that the additional HMO licensing scheme would be tenant focused and that the Council would monitor whether there was any impact on tenants, such as eviction rates and homelessness. PL1
- c. The Panel were concerned about how the Council would ensure that the stated income levels for the additional HMO licensing scheme were met. The Panel requested further information how the Council would meet the stated income targets, including a breakdown of the financial profiling. PL1

## **RESOLVED**

That the Panel considered and provided recommendations to Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the 2019-20 Draft Budget/MTFS 2019/20 to 2023/24 and savings proposals in relation to Priority 3.

### **47. WORK PROGRAMME AND DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENT FOR SCRUTINY REVIEW**

The Panel considered the Environment and Community Safety work plan as well as a draft scoping document for a Scrutiny Review around plastic waste. There were no amendments proposed to the work plan.

The Panel requested that the scoping document be circulated via email and Panel members would feedback comment to the clerk. **(Action: All)**.

### **48. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

The Panel received a verbal update from David Murray, AD for Environment and Neighbourhoods around green flags. The following points were noted:

- a. 20 out of 22 of Haringey's green parks had been mystery shopped in two batches. The Panel noted that this was a fairly unprecedented level of scrutiny.
- b. Within the first batch, 9 of the 11 parks reviewed met the required standard for green flags. Within the second batch, officers were contesting a number of the gradings awarded and the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods had met with the Keep Britain Tidy Group (KBTG) to discuss concerns on a number of issues. KBTG have subsequently responded and officers are following up on that response.
- c. The first batch of mystery shopping reports were available on the Council's website. Officers advised that, following the conclusion of Purdah, they would be sending out the reports from the second round of inspections that were not being disputed to Friends of Parks groups and local Ward Councillors, as well as publishing them on the Council's website. Officers advised that they would look to conclude conversations with KBTG on the disputed investigations before publishing them.
- d. Officers were working on the issues flagged for improvement and the two green flags that had been taken down had since been reinstated.
- e. Improvements identified for Finsbury Park would be factored into the plans for the 150 year anniversary of the park next year.
- f. The Cabinet Member advised the Panel that the Council was committed to being transparent with residents and was committed to working closely with the

Friends of Parks groups. The Cabinet Member also set out that she was committed to driving up standards in parks and open spaces and would work with Keep Britain Tidy Group to achieve this.

The following was noted in response to the discussion of the update:

- a. The Chair thanked officers for their update and suggested that there may be some learning for the future around being as proactive as possible in terms of information sharing and setting out the reasons behind the delay in publishing the reports. Officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that they were continuing to work with the Cabinet Member to ensure an open dialogue with residents.
- b. Members of the Panel expressed frustration about the slow information flow from the Council around parks and litter, particularly during the busy summer period. Officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that changes had been made to the cleansing schedule of parks in response to the issues that arose during the summer. Officers reiterated that work was ongoing with the Cabinet Member to improve communications with residents and to do so in a timely manner.
- c. The Panel enquired about the level of litter collected in parks which was recycled. In response, officers agreed to come back to the Panel with this information. **(Action: David Murray).**

#### 49. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The future meeting dates were noted as:

7<sup>th</sup> February 2019.

11<sup>th</sup> March 2019.

CHAIR: Councillor Adam Jogee

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report for:** Overview & Scrutiny Committee 28 January 2019

**Item number:**

**Title:** Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2019/20 – 2021/22

**Report authorised by:** Jon Warlow, Director of Finance (S151 Officer)

**Lead Officer:** Thomas Skeen, Head of Pensions, Treasury & Chief Accountant  
[thomas.skeen@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:thomas.skeen@haringey.gov.uk) 020 8489 1341

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

**Report for Key/  
Non Key Decision:** Non Key decision

**1. Describe the issue under consideration**

1.1 To present the Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2019/20 – 2021/22 to this Committee for scrutiny before it is presented to Corporate Committee and then Full Council for final approval.

**2. Cabinet Member Introduction**

2.1 Not applicable.

**3. Recommendations**

3.1 That the proposed updated Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2019/20 – 2021/22 is scrutinised and comments made prior to its presentation to Corporate Committee and Council for approval.

**4. Reasons for decision**

4.1 The CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice requires all local authorities to agree a Treasury Management Strategy Statement including an Investment Strategy annually in advance of the financial year.

**5. Alternative Options Considered**

5.1 None

**6. Background information**

- 6.1. The CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice requires that the Treasury Management Strategy Statement is formulated by the Committee responsible for the monitoring of treasury management, is then subject to scrutiny before being approved by Full Council. In Haringey, the Corporate Committee is responsible for formulating the Treasury Management Strategy Statement for recommendation to full Council through Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Any comments by Overview and Scrutiny will be reported to Corporate Committee. Training will be provided in advance of the meeting by Arlingclose, the Council's Treasury advisor.
- 6.2. The summary set out in Appendix 1 is to bring to members' attention the key elements of the proposed strategy being considered.
- 6.3. The Council's policy regarding LOBO loans has been updated, see paragraph 4.10-4.12 of Appendix 2, the Treasury Management Strategy Statement.

## **7. Contributions to Strategic Outcomes**

- 7.1 The treasury strategy will influence the achievement of the Council's budget.

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

### Finance and Procurement

- 8.1 The approval of a Treasury Management Strategy Statement is a requirement of the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice and CIPFA Prudential Code.
- 8.2 Financial Comments are contained throughout the treasury management strategy statement.

### Legal

- 8.3 The Assistant Director of Corporate Governance has been consulted on the content of this report. The Council must make arrangements for the proper administration of its financial affairs and its power of borrowing is set out in legislation.
- 8.4 The Council is required to determine and keep under review its borrowing and in complying with this requirement it must have regard to the code of practice entitled the "Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities" as published by CIPFA from time to time.
- 8.5 As mentioned in this report the CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice and the CIPFA Prudential Code requires the Council to agree a



Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) (including an Investment Strategy). In considering the report Members must take into account the expert financial advice available within it and any further oral advice given at the meeting of the Committee.

Equalities

8.6 There are no equalities issues arising from this report.

**9. Use of Appendices**

9.1 Appendix 1 – Summary of Treasury Management Strategy Statement

9.2 Appendix 2 – Treasury Management Strategy Statement  
2019/20 – 2021/22.

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

10.1 Not applicable.

## Appendix 1

### Summary of Treasury Management Strategy Statement

The CIPFA Treasury Management Code of Practice requires all local authorities to agree a Treasury Management Strategy Statement and various annually in advance of the financial year. The key areas of the strategy are how much borrowing the Council needs to do, where should temporary surplus cash be invested and the Council's limits for various aspects of treasury management.

### Borrowing

The Council borrows to fund capital expenditure. As part of the financial planning process, it is determined how much capital expenditure should be funded through borrowing. The Council has an existing borrowing portfolio and the amount it is proposed to borrow is calculated by reference to capital expenditure to be funded through borrowing and the loans maturing in the year. The expected amount of borrowing is set out in table 1. The strategy also sets out the sources of borrowing the Council could use.

### Investments

The Council invests temporary cash surpluses on a daily basis. When considering where to invest, the Council considers security first – will the money be returned, then liquidity – how quickly will it be returned and then finally yield – what rate of interest will be earned.

The Council is required to agree a framework within which officers can make investments. This consists of a lending list of institutions with credit, monetary and time limits (set out in table 3 of the strategy) and officers cannot lend the Council's monies to any institution not on this list. Part of the framework is the setting of a minimum credit rating - this means that if any institution on the lending list falls below the minimum, then investments would cease and if possible monies would be withdrawn immediately.

## London Borough of Haringey

### Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2019/20

#### 1. Introduction

- 1.1. Treasury management is the management of the Authority's cash flows, borrowing and investments, and the associated risks. The Authority has borrowed and invested substantial sums of money and is therefore exposed to financial risks including the loss of invested funds and the revenue effect of changing interest rates. The successful identification, monitoring and control of financial risk are therefore central to the Authority's prudent financial management.
- 1.2. Treasury risk management at the Authority is conducted within the framework of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's *Treasury Management in the Public Services: Code of Practice 2017 Edition* (the CIPFA Code) which requires the Authority to approve a treasury management strategy before the start of each financial year. This report fulfils the Authority's legal obligation under the *Local Government Act 2003* to have regard to the CIPFA Code.
- 1.3. Investments held for service purposes or for commercial profit are considered in section 6 of this report.
- 1.4. The single largest external variable that frames the context of the Council's treasury strategy for 2019/20 is Brexit. This strategy has been reviewed and updated in light of this, and provides the Council with the means and flexibility to deal with a range of eventualities or outcomes as necessary.

#### 2. External Context - provided by the Council's appointed treasury advisor, Arlingclose

- 2.1. **Economic background:** The UK's progress negotiating its exit from the European Union, together with its future trading arrangements, will continue to be a major influence on the Authority's treasury management strategy for 2019/20.
- 2.2. UK Consumer Price Inflation (CPI) for October was up 2.4% year/year, slightly below the consensus forecast and broadly in line with the Bank of England's November Inflation Report. The most recent labour market data for October 2018 showed the unemployment rate edged up slightly to 4.1% while the employment rate of 75.7% was the joint highest on record. The 3-month average annual growth rate for pay excluding bonuses was 3.3% as wages continue to rise steadily and provide some pull on general inflation. Adjusted for inflation, real wages grew by 1.0%, a level still likely to have little effect on consumer spending.
- 2.3. The rise in quarterly GDP growth to 0.6% in Q3 from 0.4% in the previous quarter was due to weather-related factors boosting overall household consumption and construction activity over the summer following the weather-related weakness in Q1. At 1.5%, annual GDP growth continues to remain below trend. Looking ahead, the BoE, in its November Inflation Report, expects GDP growth to average around 1.75% over the forecast horizon, providing the UK's exit from the EU is relatively smooth.

- 2.4. Following the Bank of England's decision to increase Bank Rate to 0.75% in August, no changes to monetary policy has been made since. However, the Bank expects that should the economy continue to evolve in line with its November forecast, further increases in Bank Rate will be required to return inflation to the 2% target. The Monetary Policy Committee continues to reiterate that any further increases will be at a gradual pace and limited in extent.
- 2.5. While US growth has slowed over 2018, the economy continues to perform robustly. The US Federal Reserve continued its tightening bias throughout 2018, pushing rates to the current 2%-2.25% in September. Markets continue to expect one more rate rise in December, but expectations are fading that the further hikes previously expected in 2019 will materialise as concerns over trade wars drag on economic activity.
- 2.6. **Credit outlook:** The big four UK banking groups have now divided their retail and investment banking divisions into separate legal entities under ringfencing legislation. Bank of Scotland, Barclays Bank UK, HSBC UK Bank, Lloyds Bank, National Westminster Bank, Royal Bank of Scotland and Ulster Bank are the ringfenced banks that now only conduct lower risk retail banking activities. Barclays Bank, HSBC Bank, Lloyds Bank Corporate Markets and NatWest Markets are the investment banks. Credit rating agencies have adjusted the ratings of some of these banks with the ringfenced banks generally being better rated than their non-ringfenced counterparts.
- 2.7. The Bank of England released its latest report on bank stress testing, illustrating that all entities included in the analysis were deemed to have passed the test once the levels of capital and potential mitigating actions presumed to be taken by management were factored in. The BoE did not require any bank to raise additional capital.
- 2.8. European banks are considering their approach to Brexit, with some looking to create new UK subsidiaries to ensure they can continue trading here. The credit strength of these new banks remains unknown, although the chance of parental support is assumed to be very high if ever needed. The uncertainty caused by protracted negotiations between the UK and EU is weighing on the creditworthiness of both UK and European banks with substantial operations in both jurisdictions.
- 2.9. **Interest rate forecast:** Following the increase in Bank Rate to 0.75% in August 2018, the Authority's treasury management adviser Arlingclose is forecasting two more 0.25% hikes during 2019 to take official UK interest rates to 1.25%. The Bank of England's MPC has maintained expectations for slow and steady rate rises over the forecast horizon. The MPC continues to have a bias towards tighter monetary policy but is reluctant to push interest rate expectations too strongly. Arlingclose believes that MPC members consider both that ultra-low interest rates result in other economic problems, and that higher Bank Rate will be a more effective policy weapon should downside Brexit risks crystallise when rate cuts will be required.
- 2.10. The UK economic environment remains relatively soft, despite seemingly strong labour market data. Arlingclose's view is that the economy still faces a challenging outlook as it exits the European Union and Eurozone growth softens. While assumptions are that a Brexit deal is struck and some agreement reached on transition and future trading arrangements before the UK leaves the EU, the possibility of a "no deal" Brexit still hangs over economic activity (*at the time of writing this commentary in mid-December*). As such, the risks to the interest rate forecast are considered firmly to the downside.

- 2.11. Gilt yields and hence long-term borrowing rates have remained at low levels but some upward movement from current levels is expected based on Arlingclose's interest rate projections, due to the strength of the US economy and the ECB's forward guidance on higher rates. 10-year and 20-year gilt yields are forecast to remain around 1.7% and 2.2% respectively over the interest rate forecast horizon, however volatility arising from both economic and political events are likely to continue to offer borrowing opportunities.
- 2.12. A more detailed economic and interest rate forecast provided by Arlingclose is attached at Appendix A.
- 2.13. For the purpose of setting the budget, it has been assumed that new investments will be made at an average rate of 1.0%, and that new long-term loans will be borrowed at an average rate of 3.0%.

### 3. Local Context

- 3.1. On 31<sup>st</sup> December 2018, the Authority held £384.2m of borrowing and £56.9m of investments. Forecast changes to borrowing balances are shown in the balance sheet analysis in table 1 below.

3.2. Table 1: Balance sheet summary and forecast

	31.3.18 Actual £m	31.3.19 Estimate £m	31.3.20 Forecast £m	31.3.21 Forecast £m	31.3.22 Forecast £m
General Fund CFR	343.3	437.1	562.3	660.4	726.1
HRA CFR	248.7	248.9	260.1	310.7	485.0
<b>Total CFR</b>	<b>591.9</b>	<b>686.0</b>	<b>822.4</b>	<b>971.0</b>	<b>1,211.1</b>
Less: Other debt liabilities *	-34.0	-30.3	-26.5	-22.8	-19.0
<b>Loans CFR</b>	<b>557.9</b>	<b>655.7</b>	<b>795.9</b>	<b>948.3</b>	<b>1,192.1</b>
Less: External borrowing **	-365.4	-383.8	-357.7	-350.4	-340.4
Less: Internal borrowing	-192.6	-192.6	-182.1	-182.1	-182.1
<b>New Borrowing Required (cumulative)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>256.1</b>	<b>415.8</b>	<b>669.6</b>

\*finance leases and PFI liabilities and transferred debt form part of the Authority's total debt

\*\* shows only loans to which the Authority is committed and excludes optional refinancing

- 3.3. The capital plans which underpin the borrowing requirement above are dealt with in the council's main budget report (in particular the Capital Strategy section). All of the Council's capital programme is robustly scrutinised and tested to ensure that the capital plans are affordable and prudent. The above shows the three year effects of the Council's capital programme, however all capital plans are assessed in their entirety (i.e. some schemes are for a greater than 3 year time frame).

- 3.4. The Council's HRA business plan is still developing in light of the debt cap removal, and as such, the HRA borrowing element is still under active review. The figures above represent the most up to date figures at the time of publication of this report, however, given the timing of other reports that form part of the Council's budget process, it may be the case that the HRA figures differ slightly from those published within the Council's main budget report, which will be the final figures.
- 3.5. The underlying need to borrow for capital purposes is measured by the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR), while usable reserves and working capital are the underlying resources available for investment. The Authority's current strategy is to maintain borrowing and investments below their underlying levels, sometimes known as internal borrowing.
- 3.6. The Authority has an increasing CFR due to the capital programme, but minimal investments and will therefore be required to borrow up to £670m over the forecast period.
- 3.7. CIPFA's *Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities* recommends that the Authority's total debt should be lower than its highest forecast CFR over the next three years. Table 1 shows that the Authority expects to comply with this recommendation during 2019/20.

## 4. Borrowing Strategy

- 4.1. The Authority currently holds £384 million of loans, as part of its strategy for funding previous years' capital programmes. The balance sheet forecast in table 1 shows that the Authority expects to borrow up to £256m by the end of 2019/20. The Authority may also borrow additional sums to externalise the extent of its existing internal borrowing to satisfy future years' borrowing requirements, providing this does not exceed the authorised limit for borrowing as set out in table 2 of this report.
- 4.2. **Objectives:** The Authority's chief objective when borrowing money is to strike an appropriately low risk balance between securing low interest costs and achieving certainty of those costs over the period for which funds are required. The flexibility to renegotiate loans should the Authority's long-term plans change is a secondary objective.
- 4.3. **Strategy:** Given the significant cuts to public expenditure and in particular to local government funding, the Authority's borrowing strategy continues to address the key issue of affordability without compromising the longer-term stability of the debt portfolio. With short-term interest rates currently much lower than long-term rates, it is likely to be more cost effective in the short-term to either use internal resources, or to borrow short-term loans instead. However, given the size of the Council's capital programme, and the need to diversify the Council's debt portfolio, long term borrowing will also be required during 2019/20, so the strategy will be to fulfil the Council's borrowing requirement with a mixture of long and short term borrowing.
- 4.4. By taking short term borrowing, the Authority is able to reduce net borrowing costs. The benefits of short term borrowing will be monitored regularly against the potential for incurring additional costs by deferring longer term borrowing into future years when long-term borrowing rates are forecast to rise modestly. Arlingclose will assist the Authority with this 'cost of carry' and breakeven analysis. Its output may determine to what extent the Authority borrows additional sums at long-term fixed rates in 2019/20 with a view to keeping future interest costs low, even if this causes additional cost in the short-term.

4.5. Alternatively, the Authority may arrange forward starting loans during 2019/20, where the interest rate is fixed in advance, but the cash is received in later years. This would enable certainty of cost to be achieved without suffering a cost of carry in the intervening period.

4.6. In addition, the Authority may borrow short-term loans to cover unplanned cash flow shortages.

4.7. Sources of borrowing: The approved sources of long-term and short-term borrowing are:

- Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) and any successor body
- any institution approved for investments (see below)
- any other bank or building society authorised to operate in the UK
- any other UK public sector body
- UK public and private sector pension funds (except Haringey Pension Fund, and the London Collective Investment Vehicle)
- capital market bond investors
- UK Municipal Bonds Agency plc and other special purpose companies created to enable local authority bond issues

4.8. **Other sources of debt finance:** In addition, capital finance may be raised by the following methods that are not borrowing, but may be classed as other debt liabilities:

- leasing
- hire purchase
- Private Finance Initiative
- sale and leaseback

4.9. The Authority has previously raised the majority of its long-term borrowing from the PWLB but it continues to investigate other sources of finance, such as local authority loans and bank loans, that may be available at more favourable rates.

4.10. **LOBOs:** The Authority holds £125m of LOBO (Lender's Option Borrower's Option) loans where the lender has the option to propose an increase in the interest rate at set dates, following which the Authority has the option to either accept the new rate or to repay the loan at no additional cost. £75m of these LOBOs have options during 2019/20, and although the Authority understands that lenders are unlikely to exercise their options in the current low interest rate environment, there remains an element of refinancing risk. The Council will repay LOBO loans with no penalty if it can, however, it recognises that lenders are highly unlikely to offer this while the interest rates on existing loans remain above prevailing rates.

4.11. Some LOBO lenders are now open to negotiating premature exit terms from LOBO loans via payment of a premium to the lender. Haringey Council's policy will be to exit LOBO agreements if the costs of replacing the loans, including all premium, transaction and funding costs, generate a material net revenue saving for the Council over the life of the loan in net present value terms, and all costs are consistent with Haringey's approved medium term financial strategy. Whether to repay a LOBO loan will be determined by the S151 Officer, in line with Haringey's constitution.

4.12. When loans are prematurely repaid, there is usually a premium payable to the lender, to compensate them for interest forgone at the contractual rate, where prevailing interest

rates are lower. Haringey would need to refinance LOBOs by raising borrowing for both the original sum borrowed, and the premium payable to the lender. However, this type of arrangement can prove beneficial where interest savings exceed premium costs. Replacing LOBOs, that contain an option for lenders to increase the rate, with fixed rate debt will reduce refinancing and interest rate risk.

- 4.13. **Short-term and variable rate loans:** These loans leave the Authority exposed to the risk of short-term interest rate rises and are therefore subject to the interest rate exposure limits in the treasury management indicators below.
- 4.14. **Debt rescheduling:** The PWLB allows authorities to repay loans before maturity and either pay a premium or receive a discount according to a set formula based on current interest rates. Other lenders may also be prepared to negotiate premature redemption terms. The Authority may take advantage of this and replace some loans with new loans, or repay loans without replacement, where this is expected to lead to an overall cost saving or a reduction in risk.
- 4.15. **Borrowing Limits:** The council's total borrowing limits are set out in the table below. The Authorised Limit sets the maximum level of external borrowing on a gross basis (i.e. not net of investments) and is the statutory limit determined under Section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003 (referred to in the legislation as the Affordable Limit). The Indicator separately identifies borrowing from other long term liabilities such as finance leases. The Authorised Limit has been set on the estimate of the most likely, prudent but not worst case scenario with sufficient headroom over and above this to allow for unusual cash movements.
- 4.16. The Operational Boundary links directly to the Council's estimates of the CFR and estimates of other cashflow requirements. This indicator is based on the same estimates as the Authorised Limit reflecting the most likely, prudent but not worst case scenario but without the additional headroom included within the Authorised Limit. The Operational Boundary and Authorised Limit apply at the total level.
- 4.17. The Chief Finance Officer has delegated authority, within the total limit for any individual year, to effect movement between the separately agreed limits for borrowing and other long-term liabilities. Decisions will be based on the outcome of financial option appraisals and best value considerations. Any movement between these separate limits will be reported to the next meeting of the Corporate Committee.



## 4.18. Table 2 Borrowing Limits

	2018/19 limit	2019/20 limit	2020/21 limit	2021/22 limit
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Authorised limit – borrowing	618.4	752.4	901.0	1,141.1
Authorised limit – PFI & leases	43.3	39.9	35.0	30.1
<b>Authorised limit – total external debt</b>	<b>661.6</b>	<b>792.3</b>	<b>936.0</b>	<b>1,171.2</b>
Operational boundary - borrowing	568.4	702.4	851.0	1,091.1
Operational boundary – PFI & leases	39.9	36.3	31.8	27.3
<b>Operational boundary – total external debt</b>	<b>608.3</b>	<b>738.7</b>	<b>882.9</b>	<b>1,118.4</b>

5. Investment Strategy - Treasury Investments

5.1. The Authority holds invested funds, representing income received in advance of expenditure plus balances and reserves held. In the past 12 months, the Authority's investment balance has generally ranged between £10 and £50 million, and similar levels are expected to be maintained in the forthcoming year. It is a requirement of the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive II that the Council maintains an average investment balance of at least £10m, in order to remain professional client status (see also par 11.6)

5.2. **Objectives:** The CIPFA Code requires the Authority to invest its funds prudently, and to have regard to the security and liquidity of its investments before seeking the highest rate of return, or yield. The Authority's objective when investing money is to strike an appropriate balance between risk and return, minimising the risk of incurring losses from defaults and the risk of receiving unsuitably low investment income. Were balances to be invested for more than one year, the Authority would aim to achieve a total return that is equal or higher than the prevailing rate of inflation, in order to maintain the spending power of the sum invested.

5.3. **Negative interest rates:** If the UK enters into a recession in 2019/20, there is a small chance that the Bank of England could set its Bank Rate at or below zero, which is likely to feed through to negative interest rates on all low risk, short-term investment options. This situation already exists in many other European countries. In this event, security will be measured as receiving the contractually agreed amount at maturity, even though this may be less than the amount originally invested.

**5.4.Strategy:** Given the increasing risk and very low returns from short-term unsecured bank investments, the Authority aims to maintain its policy of utilising highly creditworthy and highly liquid investments such as loans to other local authorities, AAA rated money market funds and the Debt Management Office (part of HM treasury).

**5.5.Business models:** Under the new IFRS 9 standard, the accounting for certain investments depends on the Authority’s “business model” for managing them. The Authority aims to achieve value from its internally managed treasury investments by a business model of collecting the contractual cash flows and therefore, where other criteria are also met, these investments will continue to be accounted for at amortised cost.

**5.6.Approved counterparties:** The Authority may invest its surplus funds with any of the counterparty types in table 3 below, subject to the cash limits (per counterparty) and the time limits shown.

**5.7.Table 3: Approved investment counterparties and limits**

Instrument	Country/ Domicile	Counterparty	Maximum Counterparty Limits £m	Maximum period of investment
Term Deposits	UK	Debt Management Account Deposit Facility (DMADF), Debt Management Office (DMO)	No limit	364 days
Gilts	UK	Debt Management Office (DMO)	No limit	364 days
Treasury Bills	UK	Debt Management Office (DMO)	No limit	364 days
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts	UK	Other UK Local Authorities	£5m per local authority	364 days
Term Deposits/ Call Accounts/ Certificates of Deposit/Covered Bonds	UK or AA+ Rated Country	Counterparties rated at least A- Long Term (or equivalent)	£5m per bank or banking group	364 days
Constant Net Asset Value Money Market Funds (MMFs)	UK/Ireland/ Luxembourg domiciled	AAA-rated Money Market Funds	£10m per MMF; Group limit £50m*	Instant Access

\*These limits apply for both Haringey Council and Haringey pension Fund, so in practice, the limit is £5m per MMF and £25m group limit for the Council, and £25m for the fund.

**5.8.Credit rating:** Investment limits are set by reference to the lowest published long-term credit rating from a selection of external rating agencies. Where available, the credit rating relevant to the specific investment or class of investment is used, otherwise the counterparty credit rating is used. However, investment decisions are never made solely based on credit ratings, and all other relevant factors including external advice will be taken into account.

**5.9.Banks unsecured:** Accounts, deposits, certificates of deposit and senior unsecured bonds with banks and building societies, other than multilateral development banks. These investments are subject to the risk of credit loss via a bail-in should the regulator determine that the

bank is failing or likely to fail. See below for arrangements relating to operational bank accounts.

- 5.10. **Banks secured:** Covered bonds, reverse repurchase agreements and other collateralised arrangements with banks and building societies. These investments are secured on the bank's assets, which limits the potential losses in the unlikely event of insolvency, and means that they are exempt from bail-in. Where there is no investment specific credit rating, but the collateral upon which the investment is secured has a credit rating, the higher of the collateral credit rating and the counterparty credit rating will be used to determine cash and time limits. The combined secured and unsecured investments in any one bank will not exceed the cash limit for secured investments.
- 5.11. **Government:** Loans, bonds and bills issued or guaranteed by national governments, regional and local authorities and multilateral development banks. These investments are not subject to bail-in, and there is generally a lower risk of insolvency, although they are not zero risk. Investments with the UK Central Government may be made in unlimited amounts for up to 50 years.
- 5.12. **Operational bank accounts:** The Authority may incur operational exposures, for example through current accounts, collection accounts and merchant acquiring services, to any UK bank with credit ratings no lower than BBB- and with assets greater than £25 billion. These are not classed as investments, but are still subject to the risk of a bank bail-in, and balances will therefore be kept below £10m per bank. The Bank of England has stated that in the event of failure, banks with assets greater than £25 billion are more likely to be bailed-in than made insolvent, increasing the chance of the Authority maintaining operational continuity.
- 5.13. **Risk assessment and credit ratings:** Credit ratings are obtained and monitored by the Authority's treasury advisers, who will notify changes in ratings as they occur. Where an entity has its credit rating downgraded so that it fails to meet the approved investment criteria then:
- no new investments will be made,
  - any existing investments that can be recalled or sold at no cost will be, and
  - full consideration will be given to the recall or sale of all other existing investments with the affected counterparty.
- 5.14. Where a credit rating agency announces that a credit rating is on review for possible downgrade (also known as "rating watch negative" or "credit watch negative") so that it may fall below the approved rating criteria, then only investments that can be withdrawn will be made with that organisation until the outcome of the review is announced. This policy will not apply to negative outlooks, which indicate a long-term direction of travel rather than an imminent change of rating.
- 5.15. **Other information on the security of investments:** The Authority understands that credit ratings are good, but not perfect, predictors of investment default. Full regard will therefore be given to other available information on the credit quality of the organisations in which it invests, including credit default swap prices, financial statements, information on potential government support, reports in the quality financial press and analysis and advice from the Authority's treasury management adviser. No investments will be made with an organisation if there are substantive doubts about its credit quality, even though it may otherwise meet the above criteria.

- 5.16. When deteriorating financial market conditions affect the creditworthiness of all organisations, as happened in 2008 and 2011, this is not generally reflected in credit ratings, but can be seen in other market measures. In these circumstances, the Authority will restrict its investments to those organisations of higher credit quality and reduce the maximum duration of its investments to maintain the required level of security. The extent of these restrictions will be in line with prevailing financial market conditions. If these restrictions mean that insufficient commercial organisations of high credit quality are available to invest the Authority's cash balances, then the surplus will be deposited with the UK Government via the Debt Management Office or invested in government treasury bills for example, or with other local authorities. This will cause a reduction in the level of investment income earned, but will protect the principal sum invested.
- 5.17. **Investment limits:** The Authority's revenue reserves expressly available to cover investment losses are forecast to be £5 million on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019. In order that no more than 100% of available reserves will be put at risk in the case of a single default, the maximum that will be lent to any one organisation (other than the UK Government) will be £5 million. A group of banks under the same ownership will be treated as a single organisation for limit purposes.
- 5.18. **Liquidity management:** The Authority uses purpose-built cash flow forecasting software to determine the maximum period for which funds may prudently be committed. The forecast is compiled on a prudent basis to minimise the risk of the Authority being forced to borrow on unfavourable terms to meet its financial commitments. Limits on long-term investments are set by reference to the Authority's medium-term financial plan and cash flow forecast.

## 6. Investment Strategy - Non-Treasury Management Investments

- 6.1. The Authority invests its money for three broad purposes:
- because it has surplus cash as a result of its day-to-day activities, for example when income is received in advance of expenditure (known as **treasury management investments** - see section 5 of this report),
  - to support local public services by lending to or buying shares in other organisations (**service investments**), and
  - to earn investment income (known as **commercial investments** where this is the main purpose).
- 6.2. This section (section 6) is a new part of this report for 2019/20, meeting the requirements of statutory guidance issued by the government in January 2018, and focuses on the second and third of the above categories.

### 6.3. Treasury Management Investments

- 6.3.1. The Authority typically receives its income in cash (e.g. from taxes and grants) before it pays for its expenditure in cash (e.g. through payroll and invoices). It also holds reserves for future expenditure. These activities, plus the timing of borrowing decisions, lead to a cash surplus which is invested in accordance with guidance from the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy. The balance of treasury management investments is expected to fluctuate between £10m and £50m during the 2019/20 financial year.

6.3.2. **Contribution:** The contribution that these investments make to the objectives of the Authority is to support effective treasury management activities.

6.3.3. **Further details:** Full details of the Authority's policies and its plan for 2019/20 for treasury management investments are covered in the previous section, section 5 of this report

#### 6.4. Service Investments:

6.4.1. **Contribution:** The Council lends money to third parties such as its subsidiaries, local businesses, local charities, local residents and its employees to support local public services and stimulate local economic growth. These are often treated as capital expenditure and included within the Council's capital programme

6.4.2. **Security:** The main risk when making service loans is that the borrower will be unable to repay the principal lent and/or the interest due. In order to limit this risk, it will be ensured that any new loans made will remain proportionate to the size of the Authority. Balances as at 31.3.18 were as follows:

6.4.3. *Table 4: Loans for service purposes in £ millions*

Category of borrower	31.3.2018 actual		
	Balance owing	Loss allowance	Net figure in accounts
Subsidiaries	0.3	-0.3	0.0
Local businesses	4.5	0.0	4.5
Local charities	47.8	-43.5	4.3
Local residents	0.1	0.0	0.1
Employees	0.1	0.0	0.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>52.8</b>	<b>-43.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>

6.4.4. The largest balance above relates to Alexandra Palace debts (shown under local charities). There is a large amount of historic debt that a provision was created for, however this has not been written off. The loans to local business include the opportunity investment fund, and a loan to a business who operates some of Haringey's leisure facilities.

6.4.5. Accounting standards require the Authority to set aside loss allowance for loans, reflecting the likelihood of non-payment. The figures for loans in the Authority's statement of accounts from 2018/19 onwards will be shown net of this loss allowance. However, the Authority makes every reasonable effort to collect the full sum lent and has appropriate credit control arrangements in place to recover overdue repayments.

6.4.6. **Risk assessment:** The Authority assesses the risk of loss before entering into and whilst holding service loans by weighing up the service outcomes any such loan could provide against the creditworthiness of the recipient. This is done on a case by case basis, given the low number of such arrangements. This forms part of the Council's capital programme, further details of which are in the Council's annual medium term financial strategy.

**6.5. Commercial Investments: Property**

6.5.1. **Contribution:** The Council holds properties which are classified as ‘investment properties’ in the Council’s statement of accounts. These properties are all within the local area, and the revenue stream associated with these (net of the costs of maintaining the properties) forms part of the Council’s annual budget, therefore contributing to the resources available to the Council to spend on local public services.

6.5.2. The value of investment properties disclosed in the 2017/18 statement of accounts was £66.9m.

**7. Capacity, Skills, Culture and Advice**

7.1. CIPFA’s Treasury Management Code of Practice requires the Chief Financial Officer to ensure that all members tasked with treasury management responsibilities, including scrutiny of the treasury management function, receive appropriate training relevant to their needs and understand fully their roles and responsibilities.

7.2. Given the significant amounts of money involved, it is crucial members have the necessary knowledge to take treasury management decisions. Training sessions are arranged for members to keep their knowledge up to date.

7.3. The needs of the Council’s treasury management staff for training in investment management are assessed as part of the staff appraisal process, and additionally when the responsibilities of individual members of staff change. Staff regularly attend training courses, seminars and conferences provided by Arlingclose and CIPFA. Relevant staff are also encouraged to study professional qualifications from CIPFA, the Association of Corporate Treasurers and other appropriate organisations.

7.4. The Council has appointed Arlingclose Limited as treasury management advisers and receives specific advice on investment, debt and capital finance issues. The quality of this service is reviewed by the Council’s treasury management staff.

7.5. Appropriately skilled and experienced finance and legal staff members work with service departments to ensure that the risks associated with any projects they undertake, and compliance with regulation and statutory guidance are properly understood, and form a key consideration in any decision making process.

7.6. The Council’s constitution has clearly defined roles and responsibilities for treasury management responsibilities, both for members, committees, and officers.

**8. Investment Indicators**

8.1. The Authority has set the following quantitative indicators to allow elected members and the public to assess the Authority’s total risk exposure as a result of its investment decisions.

8.2. **Total risk exposure:** The first indicator shows the Authority’s total exposure to potential investment losses.

8.3. *Table 5: Total investment exposure in £ millions*

Total investment exposure	31.03.2018 Actual	31.03.2019 Forecast	31.03.2020 Forecast
Treasury management investments	45.9	33.7	15.0
Service investments: Loans	9.0	8.6	8.3
Commercial investments: Property	66.9	66.9	66.9
<b>TOTAL INVESTMENTS</b>	<b>121.8</b>	<b>109.2</b>	<b>90.2</b>

**8.4. How investments are funded:** Government guidance is that these indicators should include how investments are funded. Since the Authority does not normally associate particular assets with particular liabilities, this guidance is difficult to comply with. However, the following investments could be described as being funded by borrowing. The remainder of the Authority's investments are funded by usable reserves and income received in advance of expenditure.

8.5. *Table 6: Investments funded by borrowing in £ millions*

Investments funded by borrowing	31.03.2018 Actual	31.03.2019 Forecast	31.03.2020 Forecast
Treasury management investments	0.0	0.0	0.0
Service investments:	5.9	6.1	6.4
Commercial investments: Property	43.8	47.3	51.6
<b>TOTAL FUNDED BY BORROWING</b>	<b>49.7</b>	<b>53.4</b>	<b>58.0</b>

**8.6. Rate of return received:** This indicator shows the investment income received less the associated costs, including the cost of borrowing where appropriate, as a proportion of the sum initially invested. Note that due to the complex local government accounting

framework, not all recorded gains and losses affect the revenue account in the year they are incurred.

8.7. Table 7: Investment rate of return (net of all costs)

Investments net rate of return	2017/18 Actual	2018/19 Forecast	2019/20 Forecast
Treasury management investments	0.25%	0.70%	1.00%
Service investments:	4.17%	4.17%	4.17%
Commercial investments: Property	0.72%	4.00%	4.00%
ALL INVESTMENTS	0.80%	3.00%	3.52%

## 9. Treasury Management Indicators

9.1. The Authority measures and manages its exposures to treasury management risks using the following indicators.

9.2. **Security:** The Authority has adopted a voluntary measure of its exposure to credit risk by monitoring the value-weighted average credit rating of its investment portfolio. This is calculated by applying a score to each investment (AAA=1, AA+=2, etc.) and taking the arithmetic average, weighted by the size of each investment. Unrated investments are assigned a score based on their perceived risk.

Credit risk indicator	Target
Portfolio average credit rating	<i>Above A-, score of 7 or lower</i>

9.3. **Liquidity:** The Authority has adopted a voluntary measure of its exposure to liquidity risk by monitoring the amount of cash available to meet unexpected payments within a rolling 3 month period, without additional borrowing.

Liquidity risk indicator	Target
Total cash available within 3 months	£10m

9.4. **Interest rate exposures:** This indicator is set to control the Authority's exposure to interest rate risk. The upper limits on the one-year revenue impact of a 1% rise or fall in interest rates will be:



Interest rate risk indicator	Limit
Upper limit on one-year revenue impact of a 1% <u>rise</u> in interest rates	£1m
Upper limit on one-year revenue impact of a 1% <u>fall</u> in interest rates	£1m

9.5. The impact of a change in interest rates is calculated on the assumption that maturing loans and investments will be replaced at current rates.

9.6. **Maturity structure of borrowing:** This indicator is set to control the Authority's exposure to refinancing risk. The upper and lower limits on the maturity structure of borrowing will be:

Refinancing rate risk indicator	Upper limit	Lower limit
Under 12 months	50%*	0%
12 months and within 24 months	40%	0%
24 months and within 5 years	40%	0%
5 years and within 10 years	40%	0%
10 years and within 20 years	40%	0%
20 years and within 30 years	40%	0%
30 years and within 40 years	50%	0%
40 years and within 50 years	50%	0%
50 years and above	40%	0%

\*this has been revised from the previous year when the corresponding figure was 60%

9.7. Time periods start on the first day of each financial year. The maturity date of borrowing is the earliest date on which the lender can demand repayment.

9.8. **Total short term borrowing:** the Council has used short term borrowing (under 1 year in duration) from other local authorities extensively in recent years, as an alternative to longer term borrowing from PWLB, due to the lower interest rates, and corresponding revenue savings. Short term borrowing exposes the Council to refinancing risk: the risk that interest rates rise quickly over a short period of time, and are at significantly higher rates when loans mature and new borrowing has to be raised. With this in mind, the Authority will set a limit on the total amount of short term local authority borrowing, as a proportion of all borrowing.

Short term borrowing	Limit
Upper limit on short term borrowing from other local authorities as a percentage of total borrowing	30%

9.9. **Principal sums invested for periods longer than a year:** The purpose of this indicator is to control the Authority's exposure to the risk of incurring losses by seeking early repayment of its investments. The limits on the long-term principal sum invested to final maturities beyond the period end will be:

Price risk indicator	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
Limit on principal invested beyond year end	£10m	£10m	£10m

#### 10. Minimum Revenue Provision Policy Statement

10.1. The Council's MRP policy has been reviewed and revised to better reflect the rules set out in the prudential code and government guidance around prudent provision for repayment of borrowed capital. The revised policy, which took effect from 1 April 2016, ensures that provision for capital repayment is made over a period that is commensurate with the period in which the asset purchased provides benefits.

##### General Fund MRP policy: borrowing before 2007/08

10.2. The Council will calculate MRP on historic debt based on the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) as at 1 April 2007.

10.3. The Council will calculate the MRP charge based on 2% of that CFR, fixed at the same cash value so that the whole debt is repaid after 50 years in total.

10.4. The historic MRP policy for borrowing incurred before 2007/08 led to MRP charges that exceeded what prudence required during the period from 1 April 2007 to 31 March 2016. This resulted in a cumulative charge at 31 March 2016 that was in excess of what is considered prudent and appropriate under the current policy. To reflect the historic over-provision the Council will undertake an annual review to determine whether to make a realignment of MRP charged to the General Fund, using the policy set out above, to recognise the excess sum charged to that point.

10.5. The following conditions will apply to the annual review:

- Total MRP after applying realignment will not be less than zero in any financial year.
- The cumulative total of the MRP realignment will never exceed the amount of historical over-provision calculated to 31 March 2016.

##### General Fund MRP policy: prudential borrowing from 2007/08

10.6. For borrowing incurred on schemes described by the Government as Prudential Borrowing or Unsupported Borrowing, MRP will be calculated over the estimated remaining useful life applicable to the expenditure (usually the useful life of the asset it is financing) using the Annuity repayment method in accordance with Option 3 of the guidance.

10.7. This means that MRP will be calculated on an annuity basis (like many domestic mortgages) over the estimated life of the asset. Estimated life periods will be determined by the Section 151 Officer under delegated powers.

10.8. In accordance with the provisions in the guidance, MRP will be first charged in the financial year following the one in which the entire asset to which the charge relates, becomes fully operational.

- 10.9. Financial agreements such as loans, investments or where assets are to be acquired for future development (including where capital receipts are part of the business case), will not, at the discretion of the CFO, attract MRP. This discretion will be applied where it is reasonable to assume that the initial capital investment will be returned to the Council in full at maturity or over a defined period.

#### Concession Agreements

- 10.10. MRP in relation to concession agreements (e.g. PFI contracts) and finance leases are calculated on an asset life method using an annuity repayment profile, consistent with the method for all prudential borrowing since 2007/08. Estimated life periods will be determined under delegated powers.
- 10.11. The Section 151 Officer may approve that such debt repayment provision may be made from capital receipts or from revenue provision.

#### Finance Leases

- 10.12. For assets acquired by finance leases, including leases brought on Balance Sheet under the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) based Accounting Code of Practice, MRP will be determined as being equal to the element of the rent or charge that goes to write down the balance sheet liability.

#### Statutory capitalisations

- 10.13. For expenditure which does not create a fixed asset, but is statutorily capitalised and subject to estimated life periods that are referred to in the guidance, these estimated periods will generally be adopted by the Council. However, the Council reserves the right to determine useful life periods and prudent MRP in exceptional circumstances where the recommendations of the guidance would not be appropriate.
- 10.14. Other methods to provide for debt repayment may occasionally be used in individual cases where this is consistent with the statutory duty to be prudent, at the discretion of the Section 151 Officer.

### **11. Related Matters**

- 11.1. The CIPFA Code requires the Authority to include the following in its treasury management strategy.
- 11.2. **Financial Derivatives:** Local authorities have previously made use of financial derivatives embedded into loans and investments both to reduce interest rate risk (e.g. interest rate collars and forward deals) and to reduce costs or increase income at the expense of greater risk (e.g. LOBO loans and callable deposits). The general power of competence in Section 1 of the *Localism Act 2011* removes much of the uncertainty over local authorities' use of standalone financial derivatives (i.e. those that are not embedded into a loan or investment).

- 11.3. The Authority will only use standalone financial derivatives (such as swaps, forwards, futures and options) where they can be clearly demonstrated to reduce the overall level of the financial risks that the Authority is exposed to. Additional risks presented, such as credit exposure to derivative counterparties, will be taken into account when determining the overall level of risk. Embedded derivatives, including those present in pooled funds and forward starting transactions, will not be subject to this policy, although the risks they present will be managed in line with the overall treasury risk management strategy.
- 11.4. Financial derivative transactions may be arranged with any organisation that meets the approved investment criteria. The current value of any amount due from a derivative counterparty will count against the counterparty credit limit and the relevant foreign country limit.
- 11.5. **Housing Revenue Account:** On 1st April 2012, the Authority notionally split each of its existing long-term loans into General Fund and HRA pools. From 2012 going forwards, new long-term loans borrowed have been, and will be assigned in their entirety to one pool or the other. Interest payable and other costs/income arising from long-term loans (e.g. premiums and discounts on early redemption) will be charged/ credited to the respective revenue account. Differences between the value of the HRA loans pool and the HRA's underlying need to borrow (adjusted for HRA balance sheet resources available for investment) will result in a notional cash balance which may be positive or negative. This balance will be measured each month and interest transferred between the General Fund and HRA at the Authority's average interest rate on investments.
- 11.6. **Markets in Financial Instruments Directive:** The Authority has opted up to professional client status with its providers of financial services, including advisers, banks, brokers and fund managers, allowing it access to a greater range of services but without the greater regulatory protections afforded to individuals and small companies. Given the size and range of the Authority's treasury management activities, this is the most appropriate status.

**12. Financial Implications**

- 12.1. The budget for investment income in 2019/20 is £0.25 million, based on an average investment portfolio of £25 million at an interest rate of 1.0%. The budget for debt interest paid in 2019/20 is £17.4 million (£6.8 General Fund, £10.6m HRA), based on an average debt portfolio of £538.5 million at an average interest rate of 3.23%. If actual levels of investments and borrowing, or actual interest rates, differ from those forecast, performance against budget will be correspondingly different.

**13. Other Options Considered**

- 13.1. The CIPFA Code does not prescribe any particular treasury management strategy for local authorities to adopt. The Director of Finance (S151 Officer) having consulted the Cabinet Member for Finance, believes that the above strategy represents an appropriate balance between risk management and cost effectiveness. Some alternative strategies, with their financial and risk management implications, are listed below.

Alternative	Impact on income and expenditure	Impact on risk management
Invest in a narrower range of counterparties and/or for	Interest income will be lower	Lower chance of losses from credit related defaults, but

shorter times		any such losses may be greater
Invest in a wider range of counterparties and/or for longer times	Interest income will be higher	Increased risk of losses from credit related defaults, but any such losses may be smaller
Borrow additional sums at long-term fixed interest rates	Debt interest costs will rise; this is unlikely to be offset by higher investment income	Higher investment balance leading to a higher impact in the event of a default; however long-term interest costs may be more certain
Borrow short-term or variable loans instead of long-term fixed rates	Debt interest costs will initially be lower	Increases in debt interest costs will be broadly offset by rising investment income in the medium term, but long-term costs may be less certain
Reduce level of borrowing	Saving on debt interest is likely to exceed lost investment income	Reduced investment balance leading to a lower impact in the event of a default; however long-term interest costs may be less certain

## Appendix A - Arlingclose Economic & Interest Rate Forecast December 2018

### Underlying assumptions:

- Our central interest rate forecasts are predicated on there being a transitional period following the UK's official exit from the EU.
- The MPC has a bias towards tighter monetary policy but is reluctant to push interest rate expectations too strongly. We believe that MPC members consider that: 1) tight labour markets will prompt inflationary pressure in the future, 2) ultra-low interest rates result in other economic problems, and 3) higher Bank Rate will be a more effective policy weapon if downside risks to growth crystallise.
- Both our projected outlook and the increase in the magnitude of political and economic risks facing the UK economy means we maintain the significant downside risks to our forecasts, despite the potential for slightly stronger growth next year as business investment rebounds should the EU Withdrawal Agreement be approved. The potential for severe economic outcomes has increased following the poor reception of the Withdrawal Agreement by MPs. We expect the Bank of England to hold at or reduce interest rates from current levels if Brexit risks materialise.
- The UK economic environment is relatively soft, despite seemingly strong labour market data. GDP growth recovered somewhat in the middle quarters of 2018, but more recent data suggests the economy slowed markedly in Q4. Our view is that the UK economy still faces a challenging outlook as the country exits the European Union and Eurozone economic growth softens.
- Cost pressures are easing but inflation is forecast to remain above the Bank's 2% target through most of the forecast period. Lower oil prices have reduced inflationary pressure, but the tight labour market and decline in the value of sterling means inflation may remain above target for longer than expected.
- Global economic growth is slowing. Despite slower growth, the European Central Bank is conditioning markets for the end of QE, the timing of the first rate hike (2019) and their path thereafter. More recent US data has placed pressure on the Federal Reserve to reduce the pace of monetary tightening - previous hikes and heightened expectations will, however, slow economic growth.
- Central bank actions and geopolitical risks have and will continue to produce significant volatility in financial markets, including bond markets.

### Forecast:

- The MPC has maintained expectations of a slow rise in interest rates over the forecast horizon, but recent events around Brexit have dampened interest rate expectations. Our central case is for Bank Rate to rise twice in 2019, after the UK exits the EU. The risks are weighted to the downside.
- Gilt yields have remained at low levels. We expect some upward movement from current levels based on our central case that the UK will enter a transitional period following its EU exit in March 2019. However, our projected weak economic outlook and volatility arising from both economic and political events will continue to offer borrowing opportunities.

	Dec-18	Mar-19	Jun-19	Sep-19	Dec-19	Mar-20	Jun-20	Sep-20	Dec-20	Mar-21	Jun-21	Sep-21	Dec-21	Average
<b>Official Bank Rate</b>														
Upside risk	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.17
Arlingclose Central Case	0.75	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.13
Downside risk	0.00	-0.50	-0.75	-0.75	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	-0.85
<b>3-mth money market rate</b>														
Upside risk	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.15	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.17
Arlingclose Central Case	0.90	0.95	1.10	1.30	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.27
Downside risk	-0.20	-0.45	-0.60	-0.80	-0.90	-0.90	-0.90	-0.85	-0.85	-0.85	-0.85	-0.85	-0.85	-0.76
<b>1-yr money market rate</b>														
Upside risk	0.20	0.30	0.30	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.33
Arlingclose Central Case	1.15	1.25	1.35	1.50	1.70	1.60	1.50	1.40	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.40
Downside risk	-0.35	-0.50	-0.60	-0.80	-0.90	-0.90	-0.90	-0.85	-0.85	-0.85	-0.85	-0.85	-0.85	-0.77
<b>5-yr gilt yield</b>														
Upside risk	0.25	0.30	0.30	0.35	0.35	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.37
Arlingclose Central Case	1.15	1.25	1.35	1.50	1.50	1.40	1.35	1.35	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.33
Downside risk	-0.50	-0.60	-0.65	-0.80	-0.80	-0.70	-0.65	-0.65	-0.65	-0.65	-0.65	-0.65	-0.65	-0.66
<b>10-yr gilt yield</b>														
Upside risk	0.25	0.30	0.30	0.35	0.35	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.37
Arlingclose Central Case	1.50	1.65	1.70	1.80	1.80	1.75	1.75	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
Downside risk	-0.55	-0.70	-0.70	-0.80	-0.80	-0.75	-0.75	-0.70	-0.70	-0.70	-0.70	-0.70	-0.70	-0.71
<b>20-yr gilt yield</b>														
Upside risk	0.25	0.30	0.30	0.35	0.35	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.37
Arlingclose Central Case	2.00	2.10	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.18
Downside risk	-0.60	-0.70	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.73
<b>50-yr gilt yield</b>														
Upside risk	0.25	0.30	0.30	0.35	0.35	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.37
Arlingclose Central Case	1.90	1.95	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.99
Downside risk	-0.60	-0.70	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.75	-0.73

PWLB Certainty Rate (Maturity Loans) = Gilt yield + 0.80%

PWLB Infrastructure Rate (Maturity Loans) = Gilt yield + 0.60%

This page is intentionally left blank



**Report for:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 28 January 2019

**Title:** Scrutiny of the 2019/20 Draft Budget/5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) (2019/20-2023/24) - Recommendations

**Report authorised by:** Cllr Pippa Connor, Vice Chair Overview and Scrutiny Committee and lead for Budget Scrutiny

**Lead Officer:** Robert Mack, Principal Scrutiny Officer  
Tel: 020 8489 2921 or Email: [rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk)

**Ward(s) affected:** All

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

### **1. Describe the issue under consideration**

- 1.1 This report sets out how budget proposals detailed in the draft 5 year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2019/19 – 2023/24) have been scrutinised and the draft recommendations that have been reached by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) and Scrutiny Review Panels.
- 1.2 Members of the Committee are asked to consider and agree recommendations contained within this report so that these can be considered by Cabinet on 12 February 2019, when they will also agree the final MTFS proposals that will be put to Council on 25 February.

### **2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:
  - (a) Notes the budget information and capital schemes proposals, attached at Appendices A and B, considered by Scrutiny Panels and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in December/January 2018;
  - (b) Considers the additional information, attached at Appendix C, requested during the December/January round of budget scrutiny meetings;
  - (c) Agrees final budget recommendations to be put to Cabinet on 12 February 2019, following consideration of recommendations arising out of the budget scrutiny process, set out in Appendix D.

### **3. Reasons for Decision**

- 3.1 As laid out in the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Constitution, Part 4, Section G) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is required to 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.

#### **4. Alternative Options Considered**

N/A

#### **5. Budget Scrutiny Process**

5.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Protocol lays out the process for Budget Scrutiny. This 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 above, 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 Cabinet Members 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.

#### **6. Budget Scrutiny to Date**

6.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the MTFS (2018/19 – 2022/23) planning timetable and budget scrutiny process for 2018/19 at its meeting on 19 November 2018. Following consideration by Cabinet, all four scrutiny panels have met to scrutinise the draft budget proposals that fall within their portfolio areas:

- Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel
  - o Priority 1

- Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel
  - o Priority 2
- Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel
  - o Priority 3
- Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
  - o Priority 4 and Priority 5.

6.4 In addition, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee met on 14 January to consider proposals relating to Priority X (Enabling).

6.5 Cabinet Members, senior officers and finance leads were in attendance at each meeting to present proposals and to respond to questions from members. For some of the proposed revenue savings proposals, additional information was requested during the December/January round of meetings. This information is attached at Appendix C while a list of recommendations, developed from the meetings above, is provided at Appendix D.

6.6 The Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel met on 18 January so its draft recommendations are to follow.

**7. Next Steps**

7.1 The table below sets out the remaining steps in the budget scrutiny process:

Date	Meeting	Comments
28 January 2019	Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Recommendations agreed and formally referred to Cabinet
12 February 2019	Cabinet	Cabinet will set out its response to recommendations made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
25 February 2019	Full Council	Final budget setting

**8. Contribution to Strategic Outcomes**

8.1 The budget scrutiny process has made a contribution to each of strategic outcomes relating arising from the Councils Corporate Plan 2015-18.

## 9. Statutory Officers Comments

### Finance

- 9.1 The Chief Finance Officer has been consulted on this report and acknowledges the importance of budget scrutiny in preparing and subsequently approving the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).
- 9.2 There are no specific financial implications as a result of the scrutiny process but there may be an impact on the overall Council budget if recommendations are made for change. Any such implications would be considered as part of February's Cabinet MTFS report.

### Legal

- 9.3 There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is exercising its budget scrutiny function. This is part of the constitutional arrangements for setting the Council's budget, as laid out in Part 4, Section G of the Haringey Constitution.

### Equality

- 9.4 The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act;
  - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
  - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.
- 9.5 The three parts of the duty applies to the following protected characteristics: age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy/maternity; race; religion/faith; sex and sexual orientation. In addition, marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.
- 9.6 The proposals in the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy are currently at a high level and will be developed further as service changes and policy changes are progressed. Equality impact assessments will be developed as part of this process.
- 9.7 The Committee should ensure it addresses these equality duties by considering them within its work. This should include considering and clearly stating;
- How specific savings / policy issues impact on different groups within the community, particularly those that share the nine protected characteristics;
  - Whether the impact on particular groups is fair and proportionate;

- Whether there is equality of access to services and fair representation of all groups within Haringey;
- Whether any positive opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and/or good relations between people, are being realised.

**10. Use of Appendices**

Appendices A and B – Draft 5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy Scrutiny Report and Capital Schemes proposals

Appendix C – Additional Information Requested

Appendix D – Draft List of Recommendations from Budget Scrutiny Process

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

11.1 Background papers:

- 5 year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2019/20 – 2023/24) – Cabinet 11<sup>th</sup> December 2018

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX A

- Report for:** Budget Scrutiny Panels
- Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel, 17<sup>th</sup> December 2018
  - Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel, 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018
  - Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel, 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018
  - Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 14th January 2019
  - Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel, 17<sup>th</sup> January 2019

**Item number:**

**Title:** Scrutiny of the 2019/20 Draft Budget / 5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2019/20-2023/24)

**Report authorised by:** Jon Warlow, Director of Finance and Section 151 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 2019/20 Draft Budget / 5 year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2019-20 - 2023 proposals relating to the Scrutiny Panels' remit.

### 2. Recommendations

2.1 That the Panels consider, and provide recommendations to Overview and Scrutiny Committee, on the 2019-20 Draft Budget/MTFS 2019/20 to 2023/24 and savings proposals relating to the Scrutiny Panel's remit.

### 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 Draft Budget/MTFS. 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/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 Budget (2019/20) / 5 year MTFS (2019/20 – 2023/24)**

- 5.1 The MTFS agreed by Council in February 2018 recognised a budget gap of £11m in 2019/20 that would need to be closed through further budget reductions. The proposed 2019/20 new budget reductions required to help close this gap (i.e. savings, cuts and income generation) of £7m in 2019/20 (rising to £12.8m by 2023/24) are presented for scrutiny.
- 5.2 Even with the budget reduction options set out in Appendix D being approved when the budget is finalised in February, it is presently estimated that the Council will need to have put into effect £6.5m of further budget reductions. This is after the planned utilisation of £10.5m of corporate reserves and balances in 2019/20. The current 2019/20 gap of £6.5m still needs to be addressed before the Final Budget/ MTFS is submitted to Cabinet and Council in February 2019.
- 5.3 The Council continues to have a structural funding gap in 2020/21 estimated at £18.4m - this rises to £26.4m in 2023/24. This gap will be reduced to the extent that further ongoing budget reductions are identified and put into effect in 2019/20.
- 5.4 Scrutiny panel recommendations relating to 2018/19 savings that were previously considered in December 2017/January 2018 which also form part of the 2018/19 budget setting process 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 28<sup>th</sup> January 2019 for discussion, prior to approval and referral to Cabinet for consideration in advance of the Full Council meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2019. For reference the remit of each Scrutiny Panel is as follows:

- Priority 1/People (Children) – Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel
- Priority 2 / People (Adults) – Adult and Health Scrutiny Panel
- Priority 3 / Place – Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel
- Priority 4 / Economy – Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
- Priority 5 / Housing – Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
- Priority X / Your Council– 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 Budget / 5 year MTFS by priority area.

## **6. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

6.1 The Budget Scrutiny process for 2019/20 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 draft Borough Plan sets out the Council's overarching commitment to tackling poverty and inequality and to working towards a fairer Borough.
- 7.5 The Council is also bound by the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act
  - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not
  - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.
- 7.6 The three parts of the duty applies to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status applies to the first part of the duty.
- 7.7 The Council has designed the proposals in this report with reference to the aims of the Borough Plan to reduce poverty and inequality. The Council is committed to protecting frontline services wherever we can and the budget proposals have focused as far as possible on delivering efficiencies or increasing income, rather than reduction in services.
- 7.8 As plans are developed further, each area will assess the equality impacts and potential mitigating actions in more detail. Final EQIAs will be published alongside decisions on specific proposals.
- 7.9 Any comments received will be taken into consideration and a further update will be brought to Cabinet on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2018.

## **8. Use of Appendices**

Appendix A – Key lines of enquiry for budget setting

Appendix B – 5 year Draft Budget (2019-20) / Medium Term Financial Strategy  
(2019/20 – 2023/24) - Cabinet 11<sup>th</sup> December 2018

Appendix C – 2018 (Prior Year) Overview & Scrutiny Recommendations

Appendix D – 2019 (New) Budget Proposals

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

Background papers: 2019/20 Draft Budget / 5 year MTFS (2019/20 – 2023/24) -  
Cabinet 11<sup>th</sup> December 2018

## **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 GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2019/20 AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL  
PLAN 2019/24**

**Appendix B**

	2018/19 Budget	Movement	2019/20 Projected	Movement	2020/21 Projected	Movement	2021/22 Projected	Movement	2022/23 Projected	Movement	2023/24 Projected
<b>Services</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Priority 1	54,525	4,766	59,291	(401)	58,890	(90)	58,800	0	58,800	0	58,800
Priority 2	91,809	6,319	98,128	(4,584)	93,544	(6)	93,538	39	93,577	(100)	93,477
Priority 3	27,920	(731)	27,189	(1,565)	25,624	(600)	25,024	(70)	24,954	(70)	24,884
Priority 4	4,716	(2,310)	2,406	(15)	2,391	0	2,391	0	2,391	0	2,391
Priority 5	19,833	(1,036)	18,797	(708)	18,089	(573)	17,516	0	17,516	0	17,516
Priority X	38,281	(2,795)	35,487	(2,505)	32,982	(25)	32,957	(6)	32,951	(6)	32,945
Non Service Revenue	13,026	23,521	36,548	(92)	36,456	5,532	41,988	9,416	51,404	8,041	59,445
Further Savings to be identified	0	(6,521)	(6,521)	(11,921)	(18,443)	(1,532)	(19,974)	(4,029)	(24,003)	(2,414)	(26,417)
Contribution from Reserves and Balances		(10,487)	(10,487)	10,487	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Budget Requirement</b>	<b>250,110</b>	<b>10,726</b>	<b>260,836</b>	<b>(11,304)</b>	<b>249,533</b>	<b>2,706</b>	<b>252,239</b>	<b>5,350</b>	<b>257,589</b>	<b>5,451</b>	<b>263,040</b>
<b>Funding</b>											
New Homes Bonus	(2,736)	336	(2,400)	200	(2,200)	0	(2,200)	0	(2,200)	0	(2,200)
Adult Social Care Grant	(718)	718	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revenue Support Grant	(30,202)	8,561	(21,641)	1,626	(20,015)	1,658	(18,357)	0	(18,357)	0	(18,357)
Council Tax	(101,917)	(3,826)	(105,744)	(2,658)	(108,401)	(3,253)	(111,654)	(3,350)	(115,004)	(3,451)	(118,455)
Retained Business Rates by Pool	(20,729)	(3,500)	(24,229)	0	(24,229)	(612)	(24,841)	(500)	(25,341)	(500)	(25,841)
Top up Business Rates	(56,702)	(1,310)	(58,012)	(547)	(58,559)	(1,485)	(60,044)	(1,500)	(61,544)	(1,500)	(63,044)
<b>Total Main Funding</b>	<b>(213,004)</b>	<b>979</b>	<b>(212,025)</b>	<b>(1,379)</b>	<b>(213,404)</b>	<b>(3,691)</b>	<b>(217,095)</b>	<b>(5,350)</b>	<b>(222,446)</b>	<b>(5,451)</b>	<b>(227,897)</b>
Public Health	(20,209)	532	(19,677)	0	(19,677)	0	(19,677)	0	(19,677)	0	(19,677)
Other core grants	(16,897)	(12,237)	(29,134)	12,682	(16,452)	986	(15,466)	0	(15,466)	0	(15,466)
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<b>(250,110)</b>	<b>(10,726)</b>	<b>(260,836)</b>	<b>11,304</b>	<b>(249,533)</b>	<b>(2,706)</b>	<b>(252,239)</b>	<b>(5,350)</b>	<b>(257,589)</b>	<b>(5,451)</b>	<b>(263,040)</b>

**Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations**

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
N/A	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><b>Cabinet to examine how the Council can ensure that meaningful consultation is undertaken in response to the budget setting process.</b></p>	<p>The Council is required to consult with residents and businesses on any new budget proposals.</p>
		<p><b>Cabinet should regularly monitor progress on achievement of savings, and report regularly on budget, including achievement of savings, projections; risk; and mitigation.</b></p>	<p>The budget monitoring report is on the Council’s forward plan to be considered by Cabinet on a quarterly basis.</p>
		<p><b>A) Cabinet members and priority leads as appropriate should report to their scrutiny panels, starting in October on: financial performance against budget, risks and mitigation plans, alongside regular reporting on overall priority performance.</b></p> <p><b>B) Quarterly briefings prepared for all panel chairs on priority performance, budget, risks and mitigation.</b></p>	<p>Cabinet Members and officers regularly attend scrutiny panel meetings and will continue to do so.</p>
		<p><b>Cabinet member for finance should then report to OSC on overall progress against budget, risks and mitigation.</b></p>	

## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

### Priority 1 Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
1.1	Children’s Service – service redesign and workforce	The Panel welcome the strategic approach of making investments in the service to realise future savings.	Noted
		The Panel welcome the pragmatic approach of bringing services in house, such as the Independent Reviewing Officers, allowing greater control on cost.	Noted
		<b>OSC recommend there be meaningful consultation with staff, users and communities to ensure services are delivered effectively, including where savings are required.</b>	<p>The Cabinet agrees that effective engagement with a range of stakeholders enriches and strengthens proposals for the redesign of services, and should include those directly using the services.</p> <p>An example would be the development of the draft Care Leavers’ Strategy which is based on in-depth engagement with young people and will be finalised with the further involvement of a range of stakeholders.</p>

## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
		The Panel welcome the efforts to chart and manage risk and would want to see this continue.	Noted
		<b>That the Cabinet explore methods of bringing services back-in house, where it is financially viable.</b>	When services are commissioned or re-commissioned, all possible approaches to service delivery are considered at that point, with a view to identifying the best quality and value approach that achieves the desired outcomes and improvements for children and young people.
1.2	Early Help and Targeted Response	The Panel welcome efforts to intervene earlier in supporting at-risk children, which may reduce longer term costs.	Noted
		The Panel welcome efforts to model risk and forecast potential costs by identifying potential costs of different children-related activity and estimating likely uptake.	Noted
1.3	New models of care	The Panel note there is a continuing interest in seeking partnership arrangements, and agree that should be on a pragmatic basis.	Noted



## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
		<p><b>That OSC is concerned about the viability of the new models of care savings and sought assurances from Cabinet about the potential for the savings figure to be realised.</b></p>	<p>The Council is working with partners in light of the changes to safeguarding responsibilities and in response to the recent Joint Targeted Area Inspection to develop a joined up response to children, young people and families with needs in the borough. The emerging model is being developed in partnership and will be brought to Cabinet in order to start a period of engagement with a range of stakeholders.</p> <p>The primary focus of the model is improved outcomes for children, young people and families by working at an earlier stage across a range of partners.</p>
		<p><b>That Cabinet explore possibilities for further engagement with shared services and the pooling of resources with neighbouring local authorities.</b></p>	<p>As noted above, the Council is adopting a multi-agency approach to developing its model of care. As these proposals become more detailed and if appropriate, conversations with neighbouring authorities will be undertaken to determine areas for joint working on a</p>

## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
			<p>bigger footprint.</p> <p>The Council is already working with the other NCL authorities to explore ways of jointly commissioning accommodation based and other specialist services.</p>

Any Other Comments		
<b>Panel's work programme</b>	There should be a scrutiny project by the relevant scrutiny panel into the effect of poverty and austerity on child protection, including the cost implications	N/A
	In the context of service design and delivery, the relevant panel should look at models of co-production in the next administration.	N/A

## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

### Budget Scrutiny Recommendations – Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel

#### Priority 2

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
2.1	Haringey Learning Disability Partnership	That further financial and strategic information concerning the evidence base for the Learning Disability budget proposal, especially savings for 2018/19, be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January before final budget scrutiny recommendations are made. Where possible, this information should be provided for the “mid-way” point.	Noted
2.2	Mental Health	That further financial and strategic information concerning the evidence base for the Mental Health budget proposal, especially savings for 2018/19, be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January before final budget scrutiny recommendations are made. Where possible, this information should be provided for the “mid-way” point.	Noted
2.2	Mental Health	<b>That Cabinet have oversight of the funding available for those with acute mental health needs in a community care setting, and should make representations as appropriate via joint health and care bodies and to NHS England.</b>	The Council is working with the four other boroughs and five CCGs in the NCL area to ensure a joined up response on this issue which focuses on the health, wellbeing and quality of life of people with mental health needs

## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
			<p>living in the community.</p> <p>As well as direct approaches to the Mental Health Trust and to NHS England, to ensure that all those with mental health needs continue to receive the range of support that they require whether in a hospital, forensic or community setting, the Council has also referred the issue to the JHOSC for strategic oversight.</p>
2.3	Physical Support	<p>That further financial and strategic information concerning the evidence base for the Physical Support budget proposal, especially savings for 2018/19, be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January before final budget scrutiny recommendations are made. Where possible, this information should be provided for the “mid-way” point.</p>	Noted

**Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations**

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
2.1  2.2  2.3	Haringey Learning Disability Partnership  Mental Health  Physical Support	That further information on the risks associated with each of the budget proposals be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January.	Noted
2.1  2.2  2.3	Haringey Learning Disability Partnership  Mental Health  Physical Support	<b>That Cabinet be aware that OSC have significant concerns over the viability of savings proposals to Haringey Learning Disability Partnership, mental health and physical support.</b>	<p>The savings proposals for Priority 2 have been made in cognisance of the impact of increasing demand and market pressures for adults with care and support needs. The range of interventions proposed to achieve the required savings is based on evidence drawn from other local authorities and recognise that actions around demand management, market management and operational management are needed.</p> <p>There is a range of risks associated with the delivery of all savings and a risk register has been produced and shared which seeks to set these out. The register identifies actions to mitigate the</p>

## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
			impact of these risks and to support delivery of the savings
N/A		That further information on the overspend on care packages be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January.	Noted

Any Other Comments		
<b>Panel's work programme</b>	That the panel examine the impact on clients as they go through changes in services provision in relation to the proposed changes to Haringey Learning Disability Partnership, mental health and physical support	N/A

## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

### Budget Scrutiny Recommendations – Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel

#### Priority 3

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet response
3.7	Rationalisation of Parking Visitor Permits	<p>That clarification be provided regarding the concessionary rate for parking visitor permits.</p> <p>N.B. The service has been confirmed that the concessionary rate was reduced from 75 to 65, as recommended by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in its response to Cabinet on the MTFS dated January 2017</p>	Noted
3.8	Relocation of Parking/CCTV Process and Appeals	<p>That the equalities impact assessment (EIA) in respect of the proposal to relocate parking/CCTV processes and appeals be circulated to the Panel</p> <p>N.B. The EIA will be circulated to Panel Members</p>	Noted

**Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations**

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet response
3.2	Charging for Bulky Household Waste	<p><b>Given the potential negative impact on recycling levels and a potential increase in fly tipping, that Cabinet re-examine whether the savings proposed are financially achievable in the round.</b></p>	<p>There is no negative impact on recycling as a result of the charge. If residents do not take up the bulky collection it is expected that items will either be taken to the Reuse &amp; Recycle Centre or residents will arrange alternative collections. It is possible that a minority of residents may choose to fly tip their waste, as some do now, but the new charge for collections is unlikely to encourage previously law-abiding residents to change their behaviour in this way.</p> <p>Weekly monitoring does not show any significant increase in fly-tipping since charges were introduced. Fly-tips are collected by Veolia in the same way as bulky waste and will be taken to the Biffa MRF as will items from the reuse and recycle centre. Even if items are fly-tipped rather than collected they will</p>



## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet response
			<p>still be recycled.</p> <p>In summary, there is no loss of recycling to the system nor an increase in fly-tipping since charges were introduced. We continue to monitor the take up of bulky waste collections and fly tipping around the borough closely, and are working across services and with Veolia to implement an action plan to reduce this further.</p>
3.1  3.2  3.3	<p>Green Waste Charging</p> <p>Charging for Bulky Household Waste</p> <p>Charging for Replacement Wheelie</p>	<p><b>That Cabinet note that OSC have concerns over the proposed charges for green waste and that the possibility of including a concessionary rate be explored as part of the fees and charges setting process.</b></p>	<p>This will be considered as part of the wider review of fees and charges undertaken as part of the 2019/20 MTFS process.</p>

**Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations**

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet response
	Bins		
3.1  3.2  3.3	Green Waste Charging  Charging for Bulky Household Waste  Charging for Replacement Wheelie Bins	That the Panel continue to monitor the impact of the introduction of charges for replacement bins and collection of green waste and bulky items.	N/A

## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

### Budget Scrutiny Recommendations – Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel

#### Priority 4 & 5

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendations	Cabinet response
4.1	Consultancy Spend (Tottenham Regeneration)	That further information on the Consultancy Spend for Tottenham Regeneration be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January before final budget scrutiny recommendations are made. This should include information on how the budget was spent in 2017/18 and what the budget will be used for during 2018/19.	Noted
4.1	Consultancy Spend (Tottenham Regeneration)	<b>That an in-principle target of zero be set for consultancy spend.</b>	The Council looks to only use consultants when their specialist skills and the additional capacity they bring to projects are required.
5.1	Reduction in Housing Related Support Budget	None	N/A
<b>Any Other Comments</b>			
N/A		That a full breakdown of the P4 and P5 budget, for April	Noted

### Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendations	Cabinet response
		2018 – March 2023, be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January before final budget scrutiny recommendations are made. This should include information on the capital strategy and HRA.	
N/A		That further information on the Consultancy Spend for Wood Green Regeneration be made available for consideration by OSC on 29 January before final budget scrutiny recommendations are made. This should include information on how the budget was spent in 2017/18 and what the budget will be used for during 2018/19.	Noted

## Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

### Budget Scrutiny Recommendations – Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Priority – X				
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No)	
6.1	Shared Service Centre	Further information be provided on the savings proposed within each area of the Shared Service Centre; the impact in 2019/20 on staffing posts as a result; and the capital costs.	No - This information was considered by OSC on 29 Jan	
6.1	Shared Service Centre	<b>That Cabinet note OSC concerns about the potential for significant job losses in relation to the savings proposed under Priority X. That Cabinet ensure that there is a full and proper consultation carried out with the trade unions and all effected staff.</b>	Yes	Noted. Any changes to staffing will be undertaken in accordance with Council policy, including appropriate consultation.
<b>Any Other Comments</b>				
None				

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A (ii)

Summary of priority 1 (People – Children) budget reduction proposals

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total
Title	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Reduce the number of agency staff	(196)	(61)	-	-	-	(257)
Reduce operational costs	(347)	(250)	-	-	-	(597)
Reduce the costs of placements	(746)	(90)	(90)	-	-	(926)
Safeguarding and Social Care and Early intervention and preventing demand	(290)	-	-	-	-	(290)
Increase income generation	(23)	-	-	-	-	(23)
<b>People (Children) Totals</b>	<b>(1,602)</b>	<b>(401)</b>	<b>(90)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(2,093)</b>

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PC1

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Reduce the number of agency staff		
<b>Priority:</b>	P1	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Director of Children's Services</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Children in Need of Support and Protection and Children in Care, Quality Assurance, Early Help	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	

<b>Description of Option:</b>
Total savings for this proposal to reduce agency spend on social work staff are £257,000.
The proposal is to reduce the number of social work agency staff through the following actions:
<p>a) Retaining social work staff is key to reducing spend on agency staff. One way of doing this is to ensure that social workers have a varied learning and development programme that helps them maintain and develop their skills and that this is supported by clearly mapped out career progression opportunities. This proposal therefore includes the creation of 14 senior practitioner roles which will replace ordinary social worker posts and help with the retention of social workers who are looking for more senior roles with additional responsibilities. <b>Full year savings will be £35,000.</b></p> <p>b) Growing our own social workers through the recruitment of newly qualified social workers is the second proposal. Newly qualified social workers looking for their first post are easier to recruit than more experienced social workers. In Haringey the support for this cohort is well established and headed by experienced staff members skilled in this area of work. Expanding this model will deliver savings, improve consistency of support and relationships for families and allow the organisation to “grow our own” talent. The proposal is to recruit at least ten newly qualified social workers each year and as they become more experienced and can take on a full case load of children we will release at least ten agency workers. <b>Full year savings will be £101,000.</b></p> <p>c) Launching a digital recruitment strategy that clearly communicates the Haringey offer and is effective in attracting experienced social workers is key to reducing our agency staffing numbers. We also plan to review the Recruitment and Retention offer to ensure it continues to be effective and is targeted at the correct teams. The new offer will provide a more attractive offer to the hardest to recruit services. This could mean reducing the offer to those that are not difficult to recruit to, should evidence support this. <b>Full year savings will be £121,000.</b></p>

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	196,000	61,000			



## Priority One – Budget Reductions

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>
Children will be able to build strong relationships with social workers as instability in a workforce can mean that children have many different social workers.
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>
Improved career progression opportunities for staff.
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
Meet statutory duties to ensure children are protected from harm and supported to maximise their life chances. Improves the skill and experience levels in the social care workforce which means statutory requirements should be more effectively met.

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Unable to recruit to full cohorts	H	M	Continuous recruitment campaigns with full support from management and recruitment partner
Turnover of staff increases	H	L	Turnover is reducing and key actions are being taken to ensure Haringey is a good place for social workers to develop and practice
Recruitment offer fails to attract experienced workers to key teams	H	M	The Recruitment and Retention offer will be kept under review and there is monthly monitoring of recruitment and retention and action will be taken to address any arising issues.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PC2

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Reduce operational costs		
<b>Priority:</b>	People	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Director of Children's Services</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Children in Need of Support and Protection and Children in Care, Quality Assurance, Early Help	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	

<b>Description of Option:</b>
<p>This proposal sets out a number of proposed actions to reduce operational costs by £654K. These include</p> <p>a) Review our approach to managing less complex children in need cases and those families needing immigration advice and support. This approach will involve de-designating vacant social worker posts where support to families can be delivered by family support workers in teams where child protection issues are not the main reason for support. Any assessments and visits will continue to be delivered by social workers as statutorily required. <b>Full year savings will be £26,000.</b></p> <p>b) Reduce staffing costs where work has now been incorporated into central teams and a post is vacant. Full year savings will be <b>£43,000.</b></p> <p>c) Reduce management costs where the posts are no longer needed as they have been vacant for some time and the operational management has changed. <b>Full year savings will be £30,000.</b></p> <p>d) Reduce the costs of more complex cases in social care teams through the redesign and development of the early help teams. <b>Full year savings will be £250,000.</b></p> <p>e) Reduce the costs of running the Children's Centres through reducing the management costs. <b>Full year savings will be £248,000.</b></p> <p>f) Introduce a new more flexible model of delivering support to gypsy and traveller children and families. This will include working closely with other services across the council and ensuring family support workers have specialist skills and can commission flexible advisory support when it is needed. <b>Full year savings will be £57,000.</b></p>

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	347,000	250,000			

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>
Children and families will continue to receive the right help at the right time. Proposals above reflect best practice in other local authorities where safeguarding issues are dealt with through the MASH and in Safeguarding and Support teams. The proposals are low risk, and the impact to families is likely to be positive. For most families ongoing social care support is seldom required as families are able to care for their children appropriately. If there are issues of significant harm, child protection there is a pathway to stepping cases back up for a social work intervention.
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>
As significant number of the above proposals relate to already vacant posts there will be minimal impact on staff. Where staff are affected by changes they will be consulted on the proposed changes.
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
These options have no impact on the council meeting statutory duties to ensure children are protected from harm and supported to maximise their life chances. Social Workers must continue to complete an initial assessment of the family and their needs in accordance with s17 of the children's act 1989 and this will be done in the assessment service.

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Capacity across the services could be reduced as vacant posts are deleted	M	L	Capacity will be monitored through performance measures and case loads and action will be taken if issues emerge
Commissioned services do not adequately meet the needs of communities	H	L	Contract management will ensure performance is closely monitored and feedback and complaints will inform this

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PC3
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Reduce the cost of placements		
<b>Priority:</b>	People	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Director of Children's Services</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Safeguarding and support, Looked after children, Young Adults Service, Special Education Needs and Disabilities	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	

<b>Description of Option:</b>
Total savings for this proposal to reduce the costs of placements is £926,000.
The proposals include:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Increasing the recruitment and retention of in-house foster carers and reducing the use of independent foster carers. <b>Savings for this proposal total £270,000 over a number of years.</b></li> <li>b) Commission respite care following the agreed closure of Haslemere. <b>Full year savings will be £145,000.</b></li> <li>c) Enhance the brokerage teams to improve negotiation of packages and management of direct payments. <b>Full year savings will be £75,000.</b></li> <li>d) Timely adaptation of properties for children with disabilities. <b>Full year savings will be £175,000.</b></li> <li>e) Ensure that children with Special Education Needs and Disabilities placed in out-of-borough schools are receiving independent travel training to encourage independence where appropriate. <b>Full year savings will be £125,000.</b></li> <li>f) Commission a range of supported housing services for young care leavers. <b>Full year savings will be £136,000.</b></li> </ul>

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	746,000	90,000	90,000		

## Priority One – Budget Reductions

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>
A wider range of placements will be in place to ensure that children receive the right support at the right time.
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>
Local providers will have opportunities to develop services to provide placements for young people.
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
The council has a duty to ensure there are sufficient placements for children who need to be cared for and these proposals support this requirement.

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Unable to recruit sufficient foster carers and the loss of in-house carers due to retirement is greater than our ability to recruit	H	M	A strong recruitment campaign is in place and performance and numbers of carers are monitored monthly to address any issues that arise quickly
The care market is not developed enough and cannot respond to specifications to deliver placements	H	M	Work is in train to work with and support providers to develop their range of services

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PC4
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Safeguarding and Social Care and Early intervention preventing demand</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Director of Children's Services</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Children in Need of Support and Protection and Children in Care, Looked After Children, Early Help</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	

<b>Description of Option:</b>
Total savings for this proposal are £290,000.
Haringey has 71 children per 10,000 (2017/18) who are looked after compared to 65.7 for statistical neighbours and 58 for inner London. This proposal aims to provide a programme of support for children at risk of entering into care and prevent young adolescents at risk from a range of issues such as crime, gangs and violence, sexual exploitation, exclusion and unemployment from achieving poor outcomes. These actions include:
<b>d) Developing an effective edge of care service which means children and families will be safely supported to avoid entering care. This will include reviewing our family reunification approach where children in care and those are admitted into care under a section 20 arrangement and are then supported to safely return home. Full year savings will be £150,000.</b>
<b>e) Developing a vulnerable adolescents service which will identify vulnerable young adolescents and ensure they receive the right help at the right time to prevent poor outcomes for them and ensure they do not need more expensive social care services. Full year savings will be £140,000.</b>

**1. Financial benefits summary**

<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	290,000	0			

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>
<p>The range, nature and causes of adolescent risk differ than those faced by younger children and there is increasing recognition that the system developed to protect children from harm is not well placed to meet the needs of adolescents. Young people who enter care at an older age tend to experience a number of placement moves; have poorer outcomes relating to education; are more likely to struggle when leaving care and are disproportionately more likely to go missing and be vulnerable to exploitation.</p> <p>The poor outcomes for young people who enter care and the need to reduce pressures on the placements budget provides a clear rationale for investing in the right interventions and approaches to prevent young people from entering care, whenever it is safe to do so.</p>
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>
<p>These models are evidencing varying levels of savings to the Council as well as more widely to the health and police.</p>
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
<p>The Council will continue to meet its statutory duties to protect children and young people from harm. The new approach will support young people where there is high degree of family conflict, experience of early trauma such as historic/current domestic abuse, parental substance misuse, parental mental health issues and young people have multiple vulnerabilities such as being excluded, at risk of offending, criminal and sexual exploitation, going missing and NEET.</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Suitability of referrals to the services	M	M	Close working across various teams will be required to ensure that the right young people are referred to the service and that thresholds for the service are clear and clearly implemented
Adolescents or parents refuse to engage in the offer	H	M	Ensure staff have the skills to work effectively with parents and adolescents
Failure to meet the minimum threshold	M	M	These savings are based on a modest number of young people meeting the thresholds for service and work will begin in advance of the service launching to identify those that are suitable

## Business Planning / MTF5 Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PC5
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Increase income generation		
<b>Priority:</b>	People	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Director of Children's Services
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Early Help	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	

<b>Description of Option:</b>
Total savings for this proposal are £23,000.
This proposal is to increase income and contributions to services through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Providing Educational Psychology Services to schools</li> <li>b) Providing Advisory Teacher Services and training to schools</li> </ul>

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20 £000s	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>					
<b>New net additional savings</b>	23	0			

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>
Schools will be able to request and buy additional support for children when they need it.
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
Educational Psychology staff will continue to deliver statutory services to children.

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Inability to recruit sufficient Education Psychology staff	H	M	Working with recruitment partner to ensure proactive recruitment to vacant roles



Priority Two – Budget Reductions

Summary of budget reduction proposals for Adults Services

		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2023/24
Ref	Title	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
PA1	Charging for Managed Accounts	120	0	0	0	0	120
PA2	Fast tracking financial assessments	140	0	0	0	0	140
PA3	Capitalisation of CAS	177	0	0	0	0	177
PA4	Housing Related support	600	0	0	0	0	600
PA5	In-House Negotiator	116	344	0	0	0	460
PA6	Transfer of High Cost Day Opps	0	525	15	0	0	540
PA7	Public Health (Sexual Health)	267	0	0	0	0	267
PA8	Investment of drug and alcohol savings in preventative services for adults and families, targeting health inequalities	400	0	0	100	100	600
PA9	Further savings to be delivered by Adults Services	180	180	180	180	0	720
	<b>People (Adults) Totals</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>1,049</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3,624</b>

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA1
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Charging for Managed Accounts</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>John Everson</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Adults</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Farzad Fazilat</b>

### Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

### Charging Administration Fee

- 1. Appointeeship** - Currently the Council does not charge for administration of Appointeeship clients, unlike Deputyship where there is an administration fee for managing client funds and assets. The full set of Deputyship charges are set out by the Court of Protection. There is no national policy governing charges for Appointeeship. Policy and charges are therefore subject to local Council decisions. Subject to review and potentially Cabinet approval, the Council may decide to charge an administration fee comparable to that levied for Deputyship, the additional income based on 200 new clients could equate to approximately £70k in additional annual income.
- 2. Self-funders** - A number of residents meet the full costs of their care and therefore arrange their own packages of care, without recourse to the local authority. However, some residents who meet the full costs of their care look to the Council to organise the setting up of their care packages – a function for which the Council does not currently charge. Other authorities do charge for this service. As an income-generating opportunity, the Council is proposing to charge for arranging packages of care for self-funders. Given only a minority of disabled and older residents in need of packages of care are self-funders, the income generating potential is limited and a maximum of £50k additional income has been calculated.

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
New net additional savings (year on year)	120				

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>1. Appointeeship – Those clients for whom the Council acts as Appointee would be impacted by this change as they would incur a management fee. This is in line with other administrative tasks carried out by the Council on behalf of users and would mirror the approach for Court of Protection clients, ensuring that the Council covers its administrative costs. Administrative costs would only be levied where there were sufficient funds in place to warrant this. Close communication with clients and families will be needed to ensure introduction of charges does not have an adverse impact on vulnerable clients.</p> <p>2. Self-funders - There will be a financial impact on those adults who fund their own care and who choose to have their care managed by the council. Currently this management service is free. Those who do not want to pay this fee would have the choice to manage their own care provision which may result in taking up poor quality services or placing stress on the individual.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>The Council is currently able to charge for Court of Protection clients based on legislative guidance. There is no such guidance for charging fees in relation to appointeeship although their situations are in effect similar.</p> <p>There would be additional administrative time required to manage the charging of this service.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>The Council is already meeting its statutory responsibility to appointeeship clients. As the number of clients increase, however, the council recognises the administrative costs of managing client accounts is increasing and that there is a need to off-set this increasing cost.</p> <p>The statutory requirement to provide care and support under the Care Act 2014 legislation is not affected by the proposal to charge self-funders.</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There may be objections from clients and users about the proposal to charge for managing appointeeship accounts. The fact there is no specific statutory guidance around charging appointeeship clients may pose a barrier.			Legal and financial advice prior to implementation and develop breakdown of which clients will be subject to charging.
Self-Funders not managing their care effectively			All people in receipt of Adult Social Care receive a review. Any issues would be identified at this stage or if the service user or carer contacted the service.

## Priority Two – Budget Reductions

Capacity of staff to deliver			A full appraisal will need to be carried out to ensure the application of charging does not incur additional costs.

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA2
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Fast Tracking Financial Assessments</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>John Everson</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Adults</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Farzad Fazilat</b>

### Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

This proposal aims to speed up the process of financial assessment so that charging starts as soon after the start of services as possible. The aim would be to carry out any necessary financial assessment before services are brokered and put in place, except in an emergency. The saving lies largely in reducing levels of debt and the costs of recovering overpayments rather than any additional costs to the user of this approach.

The Financial Assessment Process currently starts after a service has been agreed. The delay in assessment results in direct loss of income for the council. The direct loss of income for 2017-18 was £140k. We are changing the process to bring the assessment upstream and complete the calculation and determine client contribution before the service starts to avoid loss of income to the council.

It is worth noting that there are additional non-cashable savings which are deemed to be significant: the avoidance of the costs of lengthy recovery of unpaid contributions and a reduction in queries from providers and families which take up resources within the social care adult services, payments and Brokerage service. The fast tracking of financial assessments will ensure that all assessments are carried out before care packages and funding are agreed and will avoid loss of income as outlined above.

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings (year on year)</b>	<b>140</b>				

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Service users will be aware of the outcome of the financial assessment sooner and thereby be able to understand any charges they will be required to meet, including deciding to make plans to manage their own care.</p> <p>Users will be aware sooner of the costs of services which have been put in place, with greater clarity about the client's contribution to the cost of care for people who receive care.</p> <p>Users may feel they are being charged more or that charging is playing a part in their assessment – this is not the case.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>There would be an additional requirement for two Financial Assessment Officers to manage the fast tracking of Financial Assessments. The process needs to be fully integrated with the front of the service. This process would need to be fully reviewed prior to implementation to test the capacity of the team to deliver and the cost effectiveness of the approach.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>The statutory requirement to provide care and support under the Care Act 2014 legislation is not affected by this proposal.</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Risk that users and carers will disengage with the financial assessment process if carried out near the needs assessment, adding further delay	M	M	Ensure financial assessment is introduced sensitively, demonstrating the benefits to the users of compliance
Capacity of staff to deliver	M	M	<p>Currently the staffing arrangement and process of the referral from Social Care front of the service to the Financial Assessment service does not lend itself to efficient way of working. Financial Assessment Officers need to be working closely with the front of the service to provide Fast Track assessments and provide timely advice to service users.</p> <p>We require two financial Assessment Officers at PO1 grade at the cost of £86k. This is invest to save.</p> <p>This would be reviewed after 24 months.</p>

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA3
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Community Alarms Service</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>John Everson</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Adults Social Care</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Jeni Plummer</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

Haringey's Community Alarms Service provides personal alarms, with a monitoring and response service, and a limited range of other assistive technology to residents. CAS clients include council social care clients, along with self-funders and HfH properties, such as sheltered accommodation. The cost of delivering the service to CAS clients is offset by contributions from clients who would not be eligible for council-funded care.

Because installation of a CAS solution can be considered the provision or adaptation of fixed assets for the benefit of our residents, there is scope within financial regulations to capitalise the majority of the operating and equipment costs of the CAS.

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings (year on year)</b>	<b>177</b>				

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>N/A</p> <p>Customers would not be impacted by this change to the way the service is funded.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>This results in one post being deleted, however this proposal is already in operation with no negative impacts experienced. All parties involved have been notified.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>Subject to agreement that capitalisation of proposed CAS costs is in line with financial regulations, there are no changes to the Council's ability to meet statutory requirements.</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
N/A			



**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA4
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Optimising transformational element of the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Charlotte Pomery</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Adults</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Gill Taylor</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

In essence, ASC is funding housing advice and support which can be funded through the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant whilst we transform these services and create longer term, more sustainable funding routes over the next 3 years.

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings (year on year)</b>	<b>600</b>				

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Services to users and carers will be positively affected by this proposal as it is based on a transformational approach which will create more sustainable routes to funding going forward.</p> <p>Users and carers will continue to benefit from a range of housing related support to better meet their needs to live independently in the community.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Positive impact of continuation of housing related support, and a recognition of its continued value.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>The statutory requirement to provide care and support under the Care Act 2014 legislation is not affected by this proposal. The Council's duties under the Homelessness Reduction Act are not affected by these proposals.</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There is a risk that routes to sustainable funding for services which can meet need are not identified.	M	M	Focus on transformational activity and doing something different.
Risk of reduced take up of HRS services during any transitional period.	M	M	Continue to make the case for vulnerable residents to be supported in a myriad ways to maintain their tenancies.

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA5
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Care Negotiation activity of Adults Care Packages		
<b>Priority:</b>	People	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	John Everson
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Adults Social Care	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Farzad Fazilat

### Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

An interim care negotiator was recruited in March 18 to work with providers of residential care, semi-independent care and supported living settings across Adult Social Care. The care negotiator used their knowledge of the market and a care fund calculator approach to renegotiate care costs down with providers in relation to overcharging in relation to actual service user needs.

The table below shows that there are potentially savings of £8,858 per week, which could equate to £460,662 annually. It is recommended that 2 care negotiators are recruited on 1 year FTC at P04 with an on cost figure of up to £114k

<b>Financial benefits analysis</b>					
<b>Saving / Cost</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings / costs shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
A. Gross saving	230	230			
B. Revenue implementation cost (One Off Pressure)	-114	0			
C. Ongoing revenue cost	0	0			
<b>D. Net Saving (A+B+C)</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
E. Saving(s) already included in MTFs 2018/23					
<b>F. New net additional saving (D minus E)</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Priority Two – Budget Reductions

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
N/A  Customers will not be directly impacted, staff have managed impact to ensure seamless transition. Proposal is currently in operation.
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff - improved confidence in engaging with users and their families regarding placements.</li> <li>• Members - improved satisfaction of service users and their families and partner organisations; Improved reputation of Haringey Council.</li> <li>• Provider - enhanced relationship with Brokerage team to ensure strengths based needs are at the centre of negotiations.</li> </ul>
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
The Council will continue to meet its statutory requirements under the Care Act 2014 and the Children and Families Act 2014, both of which place emphasis on needs assessment, outcomes identification and support planning.  Improved knowledge of negotiating care costs with providers supports early help, prevention and wellbeing, promoting independence and supports families to make informed decisions about the care and support needs.

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
N/A			

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PA6
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Day Opportunities – transfer of high cost out of borough placements into borough</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>John Everson</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Adults Social Care</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>James Cuthbert</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

The Council has three ex-day centre premises that, with certain adaptations, could be leased to a local provider to support 15-20 of these high cost service users at reduced cost, and closer to their existing support networks.

This could yield £540,000 in savings in full year 2020/21, depending on:

- Which service users move to the new service
- The outcome of the procurement exercise
- The capacity of the service to support a higher number of service users by using the leased premises as a 'hub' to support more service users.

There will be a capital outlay requirement of approximately £177k and a £10-15k social work resource requirement to manage (on a 3-4 month basis), the transition/support planning process of moving service users from out of borough back into area.

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings (year on year)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>525</b>			

## Priority Two – Budget Reductions

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
Service users and families accessing out of area placements at high cost will be supported to access the new service in borough and involved in the co-design process to ensure the new service meets need. There may be negative perceptions about the change from families which will need a robust co-production process to overcome.
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
Enabling service users in out of area arrangements to take up services in borough may have impacts on the viability of the out of area services. However, the impact of this would not be significant as there is a plural market in third sector and private sector day opportunities services, and the leasing of an in-borough day centre premises to a provider will further diversify our in-borough market to supplement any capacity loss out of area.
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
None of the day centres will be suitable for the designated service user group	M	M	Feasibility and works to be conducted.
Savings will be lower than anticipated because the procurement process fails to identify more cost-effective alternatives	M	M	Full market engagement exercise required.
Savings will be lower than anticipated because the Council is unable to support high-cost service users to access in-borough arrangements	M	M	Extensive programme of engagement required, with input from SW resource.

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA7
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Sexual health projection.		
<b>Priority:</b>	People	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Akeem Ogunyemi
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	All	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Sarah Hart

**Description of Option:**

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

Proposal

Sexual Health has the largest allocation within the public health budget and is a high-risk budget in terms of variation, as it is primarily comprised of demand-led services. The council is legally bound to provide open access sexual health services. Many residents use services outside of Haringey. The proposal is to offer up savings based on the efficiencies already achieved and for this to form the baseline budget 2019-20. Beyond this growth in the need for a service will be absorbed by channel shift from high cost services to self-testing.

Background

Spiralling demand and high unit price led public health to develop a local step change program and be part of a London wide re-commissioning program. In 2017, public health reshaped its provision and went to tender for a local young people's service, BME outreach service, healthy living pharmacies and GP services, plus a shared North Central London services. Channel shift to these services created MTFs savings. Further savings are likely to come in 2018 from new on line testing services and a fairer tariff in clinics outside of NCL.

Growth – there is some uncertainty in knowing what the growth in demand has been because the channel shift and the old systems of demand capture are very different. 3.5% growth has been factored in which counter balance 15%-30% channel shift to less expensive routes of service delivery.

Savings summary:

There will be a net recurrent saving of £267k from 2019/20 onwards

**1. Financial benefits summary**

2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Savings	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>					
Existing Budget	5,450	5,183	5,183	5,163	5,163
Proposed net expenditure after savings	5,183	5,183	5,183	5,163	5,163
<b>Savings</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
New net additional savings (year on year)	0	0	0	0	0

**Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits**

**What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?**

**Priority Two – Budget Reductions**

*List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)*

**Customers-** savings are the result of a transformation program that has been a gradual 'step change', moving at the pace of residents adapting to using different types of sexual health services – i.e. pharmacies, young people's service, to on line kits. Ongoing savings are coming from Commissioners having re negotiated a new tariff for out of area providers.

**What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?**

*List both positive and negative impacts.*

We are not expecting any further changes to services.

**How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?**

The savings outlined in this template are a result of a better than anticipated shift away from acute GUM services. This is a result of a transformation that has already been planned in sexual health services in Haringey, and has been through relevant governance and consultation, which have outlined the benefits and risks.

**Risks and Mitigation**

*What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?*

Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Sexual health services are demand-led	H	M	Regular review and profiling of activity. Communications about new cost-effective ways of accessing services (e.g. home testing kits)



## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PA8
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Drug and alcohol savings with contribution to preventative services for adults and families, targeting health inequalities</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>People</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Sarah Hart/Will Maimaris</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Drugs and alcohol services</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Sarah Hart</b>

### Description of Option:

Investment of drug and alcohol savings in preventative services for adults and families, targeting health inequalities

Retendering of the three core substance misuse adult contracts has created savings, available from January 2019. Savings come from a market price adjustment on the recovery service. Also through taking the employment services out of the contract, now funded until 2020 by the Department of Work and Pensions Individual Placement Support pilot. The cabinet report on the re-tendering process stated in the finance comments that proposals would be developed on how these savings would be used for investment in areas to improve health and wellbeing. We propose that we split the savings between cashable savings and investments in preventative services that reduce health inequalities and have a medium term return on investment for the council.

Table 1 shows that there will be a recurrent net saving related to reduced commissioning costs across the three years of £400k. The remaining funding will be held back for investment in schemes which prevent ill health in adults and families and have a specific focus on health inequalities. For these services, business cases will be developed for consideration, with a need to show returns on investment by 2021-22 to the council.

	Year 1 2019-20	Year 2 2020-21	Year 3 2021-22	Year 4 2022-3	Year 3 2021-22
Direct savings from reduced commissioning costs	£400k (recurrent)	£0	£0	£0	£450k
Invest	£200k (recurrent) including £142k in year 1 only for existing planned investment in targeted lifestyle services for adults	£0	£0	£0	£250k
ROI return from adults or children's social care budgets	£0	£0	To be included in the business case aim for recurrent £100k net saving	To be included in the business case aim for £100k recurrent net saving	To be included in the business case £100k net saving

Table 1 the savings achieved from the investment in reduction of use of high cost services.

Haringey public health now have a strong track record in identifying ROI programs and producing savings, not from limiting access but shifting demand e.g. alcohol hospital liaison services, enhanced home detox and the sexual health transformation.

Public health have scoped a number of potential areas for ROI. By May 2019 public health could rank these in terms of ROI and provide a business case. Below are some of the areas we would like to explore – many of which have a focus on families, – we would look to also scope plans which specifically reduce demand on adult social care.

- **Program of Individual Placement Support (IPS).** The national IPS trials in substance misuse and mental health will show if there is sufficient ROI from IPS. The savings will come in employment spring boarding more residents successfully through a Council funded program, this could be substance misuse treatment or homeless services.
- **Pause.** This is a national program that tackles vulnerable women having multiple pregnancies, which end in repeated social care interventions. Intermediate savings would come from a reduction care proceeding.
- **Program for children of dependent parents.** If Haringey is not successful in the innovation fund bid then we could fund the project with the savings. The ROI is potentially rapid on this project in terms of children's social care costs and a future return on adult substance misuse budgets

Public health would work with finance to create a business case for any investment by May 2019 with a clear outline of where savings would be realised (adults vs childrens)

**Why would the Council agree to invest to save rather than disinvestment?** This option has two advantages for the Council, firstly being able to demonstrate investment in innovative prevention programs. Secondly, by exploring a small investment in years 1 and 2 public health deliver can potentially deliver savings in high cost social care budgets that will create a permanent shift in spend.

Funding for substance misuse services comes from the ring fenced public health grant, a return for which has to be provided to Public Health England (PHE) annually. Whilst recognising localism, there is significant scrutiny by PHE on substance misuse spend and wider public health spend and performance so any disinvestment would be questioned.

#### Summary of net savings:

**Year 1: 2019/20 - £400k net recurrent savings from commissioning costs**

**Year 3: 2021/22 – Additional £100k recurrent savings from return on investments – e.g. reductions in looked after children, reduction in adult social care costs.**

**Year 4: 2022/23 – Additional £100k recurrent savings from return on investment**

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Existing Budget	4,300	0	0	0	0
Proposed net expenditure after savings	3,900	0	0	0	0
<b>Savings</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
New net additional savings (year on year)	<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

#### Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

**What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?**

*List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant*

**Priority Two – Budget Reductions**

*Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)*

Commissioning savings have already been realised with the expectation that outcomes will not be negatively impacted.

The impact of new investments would be scoped and evaluated including an EqlA but would be targeted at reducing health inequalities

Potential positive contributions to the following borough plan outcomes:

Outcome 5: Happy childhood: all children across the borough will be happy and healthy as they grow up, feeling safe and secure in their family and in our community

Outcome 8: All adults are able to live healthy and fulfilling lives, with dignity, staying active and connected in their communities

a) Healthy life expectancy will increase across the borough, improving outcomes for all communities

c) Adults will feel physically and mentally healthy and well

d) Adults with multiple and complex needs will be supported to achieve improved outcomes through a coordinated partnership approach

**What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?**

Commissioning savings have already been realised with the expectation that outcomes will not be negatively impacted. This has already been through cabinet in October 2018.

The impact of new investments would be scoped and evaluated and we would engage with partners on any proposals.

**How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?**

Provision of drugs and alcohol support services are a condition of the Council's Public Health Grant. These will be continue to be delivered.

**Risks and Mitigation**

*What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?*

Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Commissioning savings	I	I	There will be a robust service user led process to ensure that the changes in delivery do not impact negatively on service users. The Commissioner will monitor the implementation of the new contract on a monthly basis. The service user network will help to support and service users through the transition to the new service
Return on Investment	TBD	TBD	

**Summary of Priority 3 (Place) budget reduction**

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total
Title	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction	Budget Reduction
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO	-	400	-	-	-	400
Review and Extension of CPZ coverage	500	-	-	-	-	500
Waste, CS & Enforcement: Efficiency Savings on Veolia Contract	100	-	-	-	-	100
Increase in Moving Traffic Enforcement	260	40	-	-	-	300
Healthmatic Toilets	30	-	-	-	-	30
Extending parking enforcement	350	-	-	-	-	350
Litter Enforcement	-	100	-	-	-	100
Soft FM Efficiency	25	25	50	-	-	100
Leisure centre concessions	-	-	50	70	70	190
London Construction Programme Revenue	200	-	-	-	-	200
Flexible Police Resourcing	200	-	-	-	-	200
Waste Service Programme	-	500	-	-	-	500
Parking Transformation Programme	-	500	500	-	-	1,000
<b>Place Totals</b>	<b>1,665</b>	<b>1,565</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>3,970</b>

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL1
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Lynn Sellar</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Community Safety &amp; Enforcement</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Lynn Sellar</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

**Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation is a Mandatory Function. Owners of eligible properties have to pay a fee of £208 per habitable unit to licence with the local authority.**

**As of April 2018 the definition of a Mandatory HMO has changed and now includes properties regardless of the number of storeys. This will expand the number of properties within our borough which will require licensing as previously they would have fallen outside this definition. This scheme became operational as of 1<sup>st</sup> October 2018.**

**Licensing of Mandatory HMO accommodation is a statutory function within Housing Act 2004.**

**The licensing of smaller HMO accommodation is a discretionary power that Haringey has adopted the use of. Additional HMO licensing exists within 5 wards of Tottenham and will end in May 2019.**

**Plans to extend Additional HMO Licensing across the borough and introduce selective licensing is proposed in 29 hot spots. The aim is to have both schemes in place by the end of 2019-20. These schemes have a 5 year lifetime and can be renewed at the end of this period.**

**HMO Licensing includes the inspection of property to ensure that it meets all legal standards. The aim of licensing is to improve living conditions for those tenants residing within this property type and to reduce the impact that this type of property can have on the local community.**

Where it is a legal requirement of the property owner to licence, the onus is on the landlord or managing agent to ensure they fulfil their legal obligation. The aim of HMO Licensing in Haringey is to ensure that this property type is safe and well maintained for the tenants living within it. The property will be inspected for standards based on risk. Any property failing to meet standards will be prosecuted as per the legislation pertaining to this. Properties which are found to have failed to licence will be enforced against.

Additional fee income will be used to cover the costs of related services.

**Mitigation to avoid negative consequences of the HMO licensing scheme**

Through Migration Impact Funding (MIF) we are seeking to recruit 3 housing needs advisors who will sit within the Housing Improvement Team (HIT) and work alongside HMO Licensing officers and well as Homes for Haringey housing needs advisors. The aim of their role is to provide early intervention in cases where there may be displacement following our interventions or cases of tenants being negatively affected by their living conditions. Advisors will ensure that tenants understand their responsibilities as well as those of the landlord. This intervention aims to reduce landlords' use of section 21 eviction powers to evict tenants.

2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>		400			

### Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

#### What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

*List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)*

#### POSITIVE IMPACTS

Positive impact for tenants who reside in poorly maintained /managed HMO accommodation.

Properties found to be in use without a licence can have Rent Re-Payment Orders (RRO) placed on them if prosecuted and found guilty. The tenant can take his or her own RRO claim. Tenants are also protected from sec 21 housing evictions.

Those living in the local community should be positively impacted if they live in an area where this property type is not managed effectively. Licence conditions last for 5 year period, so landlords remain responsible for this duration.

Licensing produces a register of licence holders who have to be fit and proper persons. This allows tenants and Haringey officers to have direct contact details of the person they need to contact if things are failing.

Landlords and letting agents can advertise their properties as being licensed with the council, as a means of showing they meet standards and are compliant, good landlords in our borough.

#### NEGATIVE IMPACTS

### Priority Three – Budget Reductions

Landlords have to pay a licence fee, although this is not burdensome with the average cost equating to £4 per week based on a 5 room HMO. That is 80p per week per tenant.

Some landlords have claimed to pass this cost on to tenants so tenants are concerned their rents will rise.

**Mitigation/management – Landlords can claim this expense back from Inland revenue.**

Landlord has to meet conditions and have works done to the property to meet statutory requirement.

**Mitigation/management – Licensing conditions only ask for what is already a legal requirement for HMO accommodation. If they do not have these elements already then they have always been non-compliant.**

**What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?**

*List both positive and negative impacts.*

**Positive Impact.**

Makes identifying responsible owners of property easier for staff as there is a register of their contact details.

Provides a database of known HMO accommodation for the borough

Greater joining up of resources and service delivery.

**Negative Impacts.**

Increase in workload for officers in Housing improvement Team and other services.

**How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?**

**Licensing is a statutory function which supports the other statutory functions around enforcement response, fly tipping, noise and anti-social behaviour.**

**Properties are often identified through licensing that do not have planning permission, or which are failing to declare habitable units to Council Tax.**

**Licensing and early intervention will assist with the Homelessness Reduction Act and the impact of identifying non-compliance within HMO accommodation and the impact this can have on evictions etc.**

### Risks and Mitigation

*What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?*

Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Extension to Licensing will not be agreed by cabinet	H	L	New Cabinet administration fully advised on its advantages.

## Priority Three – Budget Reductions

Landlords fail to license upfront, consequence is fee income will be stunted	H	M	<p>Offer early bird, discount incentive to landlords who licence early.</p> <p>Prosecutions early on against those who have failed to licence to show that it is not an option to be tolerated.</p>
Fail to recruit adequately trained officers to carry out HMO Licensing Function.	H	M	Re-examine delivery structure, look at alternative means of employment type/background, re-negotiate starting salaries to reflect competitive market in this area.

DRAFT



**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL2
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Review and extension of CPZ coverage		
<b>Priority:</b>	Place	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Ann Cunningham
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Operations	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Ann Cunningham

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

**This is an invest to save bid.**

At present approximately 80% of the borough is subject to parking controls. Those controls not only ensure road safety and the free flow of traffic, but support the delivery of Borough Plan objectives as well as the Transport Strategy objectives. The parking account also delivers an annual surplus of approximately £10m, which is ring-fenced for spending on transport-related services.

There is an increasing demand for parking controls as residents struggle to park near their home, with many areas waiting years for measures to be implemented. Additional pressures arise this year due to the opening of the new Spurs Stadium.

This increased demand exceeds what we can deliver annually through current funding levels. In addition, our incremental approach generates further displacement, resulting in new pressures arising in other roads, and new demands for interventions.

We therefore propose an accelerated programme this year to 'catch up', which will allow us to deliver to resident and Member expectations, make appropriate provision for running costs, dealing with current budget gaps, while generating a surplus. This will require an additional £495k capital, with revenue generated next year. This business case sets out the proposed programme, and expected income levels.

**CPZ – Background Statistics**

- Full existing CPZ coverage - 741 streets
- 8 New Schemes – 99 streets (13% increased coverage)
- 12 Review Schemes – incl. disabled bays and waiting and loading bays
- Reactive Maintenance – Lines and Signs to enable enforcement

**Model Assumptions – revenue costs from Year 2**

**For illustration purposes the business case presents a straight line model that averages out the expected income evenly over a 10 year period. It is likely that enforcement contraventions are at their highest in earlier years, with an expected increase in compliance in later years.**

**The business case sets out the total capital cost of £795k, the required capital funding is £495k, the service will fund £300k from its existing parking plan capital budget.**

The revenue costs (year 3 onwards) required to sustain the operation is £500k per year that will be funded from the projected income (Permits and PCN) of £1m per year, giving a net projected income over expenditure of £500k.

The business case model illustrates a payback period of 2 years - income over expenditure £73k. Subsequent years (year 3 onwards) income over expenditure of £500k.

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>	500				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>This will ensure that the Council meets its obligations in terms of enforcing the parking restrictions and will make roads safer for all.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>This proposal will offer a more robust parking enforcement offer, supporting Businesses and residents.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>This growth in enforcement will help the Council meet its statutory obligations in terms of managing the road network. It will support the delivery of P3 and transport strategy objectives.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There are difficulties in recruiting Civil Enforcement officers at present.	H	L	We will work with Recruitment to make the offer look attractive and encouraged interest in working with us. We will also start the recruitment process early allowing for any delays in attracting suitable candidates.

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PL3
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Waste, CS & Enforcement: Efficiency Savings on Veolia Contract		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Stephen McDonnell</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Waste</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Ian Kershaw</b>

### Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

These are efficiency savings secured in recent contract negotiations with Veolia. They will be delivered with no impact on services or performance. National legislation has meant the contractor is unable to meet recycling targets. This efficiency has been negotiated with the contractor. The contractor will make payments to offset the shortfall in targets and increased disposal costs.

*There is no further impact on Council objectives.*

Recycling collection is part of the wider integrated waste management contract with Veolia. The overall contract value is approximately £17m. Waste collection (including fortnightly residual and weekly recycling and food waste amounts to approximately £7m of that cost.

Although these savings are associated with the recycling rate they will not be impacted by other measures. They reflect the contractor's inability to meet the recycling targets set at the outset of the contract. The contract still retains financial penalties for failure to meet recycling targets. If the contractor improves performance by lower disposal costs. If performance falls there will be increased penalties.

There are no specific existing savings associated with the recycling collection however there are savings associated with the wider waste contract largely around charged services.

Net New Savings - £100k in first year

### 1. Financial benefits summary

2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	2019/20 £000s	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>	100				

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
None
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
None
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
<b>No impact.</b>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>	
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
These savings are dependent on the current contractual arrangement with Veolia. Change of supplier would likely lose these savings.	Ensure any new contract or delivery takes account of these savings in baseline costs.
Savings will cease entirely at the end of our contract with Veolia in 2024/25.	

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PL4
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Increase in Moving Traffic Enforcement</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Ann Cunningham</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Parking and Traffic Enforcement</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Ann Cunningham</b>

### Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

The parking and traffic enforcement service enforces moving traffic contraventions at a number of locations. This project proposes the relocation of some existing unattended cameras to locations requiring enforcement, as well as introducing additional cameras at a new location.

It has been identified that the junction of Wood Green High Rd / Station N22 would benefit from the implementation of a yellow box junction, to aid vehicular movement as well as reducing road casualties. This will require the installation of 3 CCTV cameras, due to the layout of the junction, as well as the yellow box markings.

It is estimated through surveys previously undertaken that in the region of 5,800 PCNs would be issued at the proposed new locations, generating in the region of £300k in fines. This additional income will need to be ring fenced to fund transport related services, for instance contributing to concessionary travel costs.

**One off Growth Required:** £40k Capital 2019/20

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>	260	40			

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Those proposals will aid road safety and support the delivery of corporate priorities and Transport strategy objectives.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Fewer casualties and improved flow of traffic</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p><b>Yes. It supports our road network management and road safety obligations.</b></p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Surveys undertaken a while ago indicated levels of contraventions and driver behaviour may have changed.	H	L	Monitoring and evaluation
Resource levels and demands may influence delivery timescales.	H	L	Scheduling of works.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL5
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Waste, CS &amp; Enforcement: Removal of Healthmatic Public Toilets</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Stephen McDonnell</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Waste</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Ian Kershaw</b>

**Description of Option:**

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

Removal of two automated WCs (one near Finsbury Park, one on Wood Green High Road) and direction of customers to alternatives local facilities.

The toilets are poorly used, unattractive and there are alternative facilities of a higher standard nearby.

Removal may be perceived by some as an improved look to the streetscene. Others may see withdrawal as a loss.

Pavements will need 'making good' and utilities capping after removal which would require a one-off capital outlay.

In 2017 the Wood Green facility was visited 1185 times and the Finsbury Park facility 4603 times. This equates to approximately £5 per use. For the Finsbury Park facility, peaks occurred when major events were taking place in the park, when numerous other toilets are also available and supplied at the expense of the event provider.

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	30				

## Priority Three – Budget Reductions

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Most customers will likely perceive this as an improvement on the streetscene. Some customers may need signing/directing to alternative provision.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Most customers will likely perceive this as an improvement on the streetscene. Some customers may need signing/directing to alternative provision.</p> <p>No discussions have taken place with other stakeholders. The Wood Green BID should be consulted on the withdrawal of the Wood Green High Road automated convenience.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>No impact on statutory requirements.</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Some customers may see this as a withdrawal of a service particularly for those more vulnerable/elderly	L	L	Signposting to alternative provision and promotion of community toilet scheme



**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL6
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Extending parking enforcement		
<b>Priority:</b>	Place	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Ann Cunningham
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Parking and Traffic Enforcement	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Ann Cunningham

**Description of Option:**

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

**This is an invest to save bid.**

The parking enforcement operation consists of two enforcement streams; on-street and car parks, and CCTV enforcement. This involves an establishment of 60 on-street CEOs and 13 CCTV operators plus management structures.

Changes to regulations in 2014 significantly reduced the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions by CCTV cameras. This enforcement reverted to the on-street operations, without resources increasing.

Over the past two years year we also rolled out 8 new CPZs, without increasing enforcement capacity. We now need to increase staff numbers to provide an adequate enforcement service and deal with the growing demand in North Tottenham.

See also proposal PL2 – Review and Extension of CPZ coverage

This will involve a one off capital allocation for handheld devices and other essential equipment. Any additional income will need to be ring fenced to fund transport related services, for instance contributing to concessionary travel costs.

One off Growth Required: £450k Revenue in 2019/20; £40k Capital in 2019/20.

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	-350				

**Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits**

<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>This will ensure that the Council meets its obligations in terms of enforcing the parking restrictions and will make roads safer for all.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>This proposal will offer a more robust parking enforcement offer, supporting Businesses and residents.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p><b>This growth in enforcement will help the Council meet its statutory obligations in terms of managing the road network. It will support the delivery of P3 and transport strategy objectives.</b></p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There are difficulties in recruiting Civil Enforcement officers at present.	H	L	We will work with Recruitment to make the offer look attractive and encouraged interest in working with us. We will also start the recruitment process early allowing for any delays in attracting suitable candidates.

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: PL7
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Litter Enforcement		
<b>Priority:</b>	Place	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Stephen McDonnell
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Community Safety	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Sarah Tullett

### Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

We need to have effective enforcement strategies to help keep the borough clean and safe. This proposal is to consider the option for in-house service provision based on the pilot we ran with an external contractor, Kingdom, from November 2016 to September 2017.

The proposal is dependent on a £300K growth bid to generate fines (FPNs) which have been estimated at around £400K. This calculation is based on a model which assumes a mixture of FPNs being issued for street litter and fly tipping. Also to act as a deterrent it is proposed that the FPN level increase from £80 to £180.

### 1. Financial benefits summary

2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>		100			

### Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

#### What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

*List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)*

Perception of how safe a neighbourhood is can be negatively affected by low level anti-social behaviour such as fly tipping and littering. It also has a negative impact on the economic growth and regeneration of an area.

Litter enforcement will assist in the delivery of a cleaner borough that residents would be proud to live in and work in.

Some customers will welcome increased enforcement while others may perceive it negatively.

#### What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?

*List both positive and negative impacts.*

A high profile litter enforcement team will play a key role, alongside education, in behaviour change - raising the profile of littering as an anti-social behaviour and increasing the perception of risk to those who drop litter.

## Priority Three – Budget Reductions

Increase in fines and noticeable enforcement presence should have a deterrent effect.
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
No direct impact however an effective enforcement service is necessary to help us meet our responsibilities under the Environmental Protection Act and other legislation.

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Additional back office costs in relation to legal services and debt management	M	M	To ensure that all associated cost are taken in to consideration as part of a fuller options appraisal
High staff turnover	M	H	Working terms and conditions and sufficiently generous remuneration should encourage staff retention
A self-funding service would be dependent on targeting specific offences notably dropping cigarette butts. This may seem trivial to some.	M	M	Clear communication about the value we place on clean public places and the harm that can be generated from smoking as well as the greater tendency for litter to proliferate where some litter types are tolerated.
A self-funding service is dependent on residents and visitors breaching rules. A successful service may drive behaviour change undermining its ability to fund itself.	L	H	Clear specification of the service, including the prospect that a truly successful service must be measured by outcomes in terms of street cleanliness.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL8
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Corporate Contracts: Soft FM Efficiency Savings</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Stephen McDonnell</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Corporate Contracts</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Darren Butterfield</b>

**Description of Option:**

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

New Haringey commissioning officer will work with Amey Account manager and required internal and external parties to carry out a review and Re-commission of the soft FM services, and services delivered through Amey contract (e.g. efficiencies in postage, front of house, security, cleaning etc).

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	25	25	50		

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
--

<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>There should be no negative impact on customers, efficiently on savings and processes to be achieved should have a positive impact.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>The review of the various soft services will be carried out and various partners, stakeholders, staff , unions etc will be involved throughout the process.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p><b>No impact on Statutory requirements.</b></p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
No current risk identified at the moment.			

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL9
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Review of Leisure Centre Concessions</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Place/People</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Stephen McDonnell</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Leisure Centres</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Andrea Keeble</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

The Council's contract with Fusion for the management of the three leisure centres includes a council-designed concessionary pricing scheme. The council retain control of the charges that can be levied by Fusion as part of the concessionary scheme. Generally they are only put up by CPI inflation each year.

The current schemes permits free access to residents over 65 Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm.

In addition those residents who are Under 16, Over 60, Students, those on various DWP Benefits, and Haringey Carers receive the first level of Advantage + discount.

Those residents on Income Support / Universal Credit / Housing Benefit / Council Tax Benefit, Income based Job Seekers or Working Tax Credit receive a higher level of Advantage discount.

The level of discount depends on the activity but a couple of key activities such as a casual swim or a casual gym session the pricing is as follows:-

<b>Item</b>	<b>Standard Price</b>	<b>Advantage +</b>	<b>Advantage</b>
<b>Indoor Casual Swim</b>	£4.95	£2.35	£1.70
<b>Casual Gym</b>	£8.00	£5.65	£2.85

Since 2008 leisure centre activity pricing has been based on people's ability to pay. Those that are able to pay the full commercial rate are asked to do so, and others that need support in accessing the leisure facilities receive a subsidised rate. The leisure centre subsidy is an average annual sum of £435,000.

Further work needs to be carried out to research, design and quantify the impact of any changes to the concessionary pricing system, but a key outcome will be to simplify a future scheme.

## Priority Three – Budget Reductions

1. Financial benefits summary					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>			50	70	70

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Reviewing the system of concessionary pricing in the leisure centres would ensure it is still fit for purpose. A reviewed system would ensure that target groups are helped to access the leisure centre where price is a barrier.</p> <p>A reviewed system would ensure that users who can afford to pay are asked to pay.</p> <p>A reviewed system could respond to the increase in the state pension age and recoup fees from a cohort of users who may well be able to pay.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to simplify the system for all users.</p> <p>However, in some instances, a change in pricing could reduce people's use of leisure centres.</p> <p>There are strong links to the People priority of the Borough Plan.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>The success of this proposal will require a renegotiation of the management contract.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p><b>No statutory implications</b></p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
People dropping out of exercise impacting their long term health.	M	M	Retain a concessionary scheme that targets those most in need of support. Engage with leisure centre users from the outset



**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL10
--------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>LCP Revenue</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Barry Phelps</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>LCP</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Barry Phelps</b>

**Description of Option:**

The London Construction Programme (LCP) is a virtual organisation managed by the Head of Procurement in Haringey. The LCP provide a suite of pan London construction related frameworks that are accessible by Public Sector organisations.

Towards the end of 2018/19 the LCP will establish a new pan London Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) in partnership with Construction line. The DPS will be for the provision of construction related professional services and minor works.

The DPS will generate revenue through a subscription. There are currently 43 LCP members. It is anticipated at least 50% of the current LCP membership will access the DPS. Subscriptions range between £15k and £25k per member depending upon how many DPS categories they access. Assuming 50% of LCP members subscribe at the mid-point, this will generate £440k of revenue per annum effective 2019/20.

Taking into account additional operational costs associated with the DPS and other resources in Strategic Procurement, it is anticipated there will be an annual surplus of £200k.

Existing Budget	<b>-100</b>				
Proposed net expenditure after savings	<b>-300</b>				
<b>Savings</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
New net additional savings (year on year)	200				

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
N/A  Customers will not be directly impacted.
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
DPS will increase SME interaction and enhance localism throughout London
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
Provides a compliant route to market for procurement activity in this sector

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Demand for service changes unexpectedly	M	L	At present, research has shown that there isn't another organisation that provides access to a professional services DPS platform which covers the categories we are proposing. Quick mobilisation of the team will enable access to the market against only a small number of competitors.
Lack of appetite amongst LCP members for professional services DPS platform	H	L	Pre-market engagement has indicated this is a low risk with 80% of LCP members interested. Increase in the marketing strategy through the existing LCP MW 2014 framework agreement. Due to the natural correlation between the MW 2014 framework and the proposed DPS platform it would be more effective to re-energising the client base.
Reputational risk if the project is not considered a success within Haringey and amongst the existing LCP client base	H	L	Haringey have learned from several DPS implementations, adequate resource, project governance, realistic project timescales and detailed scoping are key activities to ensure a successful implementation. It is proposed to use the newly established DPS team to project manage the implementation of the DPS alongside the LCP.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL11
--------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Flexible Police resources		
<b>Priority:</b>	Place	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Eubert Malcolm
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Community Safety	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Eubert Malcolm

**Description of Option:**

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

This proposal is to cease funding for the police partnership team.

The police partnership team consists of 1 sergeant and 5 PCs.

The funding for the team enables the tasking of police officers along with the wider partnership i.e. trading standards, CCTV, ASB enforcement to hotspots in the borough.

The current contract runs up to March 2019.

**1. Financial benefits summary**

2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Savings	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>					
<b>New net additional savings</b>	200				

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>The main negative impact will be on Priority 3 - A clean, well maintained and safe borough where people are proud to live and work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced capacity to task officers to tackle ASB and criminality</li> <li>• Reduced capacity to work in partnership to tackle localised issues i.e. targeted joint enforcement activity, unauthorised occupation on council owned land and estates</li> </ul>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Removing this funding will reduce the ability to have sustainable impact on issues that blight the borough.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>This is no statutory duty to have these police officers working with the local authority</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Reduced capacity to deal with localised ASB concerns	H	M	Concerns will be passed to local SNT's
Reputational damage from the community following increased criminality	H	M	Concerns will be passed to local SNT's
Reputational damage with police colleagues from reducing the team	M	M	To discuss with the Borough commander before withdrawal

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: PL12
--------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Waste Services Transformation</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Stephen McDonnell</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Community Safety</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Ian Kershaw</b>

**Description of Option:**

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

This savings proposal has been developed following independent advice from waste consultants Eunomia. Eunomia reviewed the viability and risks associated with a set of potential waste savings and assessed that on their own, each proposal had risks for deliverability and interdependencies with other services.

An alternative approach as proposed by this submission, is to review all the waste and street cleansing services together as a new Transformation Programme. This will form a revised programme of work which will deliver greater savings from 2020/21 onwards.

Over the next four months a detailed programme of work will be developed to inform viable models of waste collection and street cleansing that could deliver significant savings from 2020/21. By providing a robust review of our collection systems, the project should also deliver increased recycling, minimise the impact on disposal costs and reduce fly-tipping.

A figure of £500,000 in savings from 2020/21 has been put forward as this revised MTFs option. This is derived from assessments made by Eunomia but will be informed by the detailed audit, mapping and modelling and ultimately Member decisions about new delivery models.

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	0	500			

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i>
Waste collection is a universal service delivered to all homes in the borough, and so any changes are highly susceptible to negative impacts on satisfaction. Furthermore, the design of waste collection is key to recycling which impacts both cost and sustainability.
Street cleansing is experienced by all residents and changes can impact satisfaction.
To mitigate adverse effects any changes should be supported by small scale trials to make explicit the benefits and allow mitigation of any adverse effects.
<b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b> <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i>
As above. A full EqIA and consultation will be needed before full scale changes are implemented.
<b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b>
Waste collection is a statutory function.

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Impact on recycling rate	M	M	Full service review will aim to minimise impact on recycling rate and some options may be available to increase it. This will be assessed as part of all the options developed for members.
Impact on waste disposal costs	M	M	Full service review will aim to minimise impact on waste disposal costs, and this will be assessed as part of all the options developed for members.
Impact on street cleanliness	M	M	Full service review will aim to minimise impact on street cleanliness, and align resources better to achieve the same outcomes across the borough.
Impact on resident satisfaction with the above services, and more widely, of the Council	M	M	All service changes will be subject to resident consultation and will need to be supported by an effective communications campaign.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref:  
PL13

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Parking Transformation Programme</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Stephen McDonnell</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Parking</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>David Murray / Ann Cunningham</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

The Parking Transformation Programme will deliver significant improvements to this service over the coming three years. A number of work streams are being developed, including the financial appraisals.

**Proposed Savings**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Revenue Expenditure</b>	<b>Income</b>	<b>Net Savings</b>	<b>2020-2021</b>	<b>2021-2022</b>	<b>Total</b>
CPZ Review and Expansion Phase 3	£500,000	(£1,000,000)	(£500,000)	(£500,000)		(£500,000)
Pricing and Permits - Diesel Surcharge	£0	(£500,000)	(£500,000)		(£500,000)	(£500,000)
<b>Total</b>	<b>£500,000</b>	<b>(£1,500,000)</b>	<b>(£1,000,000)</b>	<b>(£500,000)</b>	<b>(£500,000)</b>	<b>(£1,000,000)</b>

**CPZ Review and Expansion – phase 3**

This will continue the CPZ rollout programme taking the borough to 100% coverage. Demand for CPZs is high and those controls support the delivery of transport and air quality strategies, as the delivery of new Borough Plan priorities.

**Pricing and Permits - Diesel Surcharge**

The Council adopted a parking permit charging policy based on CO2 emissions a number of years ago, encouraging the use of more fuel efficient vehicles. Many boroughs are now extended their charging models to tackle emissions from Diesel vehicles. It is proposed that Haringey also does so, which will complement a range of other measures to improve air quality across the borough.

Any additional income will need to be ring fenced to fund transport related services, for instance contributing to concessionary travel costs.

## Priority Three – Budget Reductions

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>	0	500	500		

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>CPZs improve road conditions making them safe, improve air quality by reducing congestion and as such there no negative impacts.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Parking provisions will be made for Businesses.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>The Council has a statutory duty to manage the road network.</p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
The CPZ programme is subject to consultation and the community may reject proposals.	H	L	Consultation will be undertaken
The introduction of a Diesel surcharge is subject to consultation and the community may not support its introduction	H	M	Consultation will be undertaken



Priority Four – Budget Reductions

Summary of Budget Reduction Proposals – Economy/Regeneration

Economy				All Years	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Ref	Title	Category	Description	Net Saving (All)	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings
				£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
EC1	Carbon Management	Other	Saving £60k from the Carbon Management Service’s base budget, replacing this with an income of the same amount from Planning Service. The Carbon Management Service will increase its support to the Planning Service through advice and technical specification on planning applications and issues related to carbon reduction, energy and sustainability.	(60)	(60)	-	-	-	-
EC2	Reduction in consultancy budget	Other	Saving £75k from central budget typically allocated to cover large contracts and project delivery requirements. As some Tottenham Regeneration activities shift from a focus on initial strategies and feasibility work to delivery stage, there is increasing scope to explore funding these types of contracts from other sources, including but not limited to capitalisation of costs, utilising both internal and external funding sources.	(75)	(75)	-	-	-	-
EC3	Deletion of senior post	Efficiency Saving	The Strategic Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development was re-designated as Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, and along with this, it was proposed to delete the Director of Regeneration post.	(225)	(225)	-	-	-	-
EC4	Tackling uncrystallised debt	Income Generation	This proposal comprises an opportunity to achieve new income potential by starting a process of tackling the uncrystallised debt in the commercial portfolio	(50)	(50)	-	-	-	-
EC5	Outdoor media advertising	Income Generation	Proposal to generate new income from outdoor media, utilising the council’s landholdings by identifying sites suitable for outdoor installations. It is estimated that net income in 2019/20 would be at least £100k, and increasing significantly over future years.	(15)	-	(15)	-	-	-
<b>Economy Totals</b>				<b>(425)</b>	<b>(410)</b>	<b>(15)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: EC1
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Sustainability Planning Advice Income – Carbon Management and Planning Service</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Economy</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Joe Baker / Emma Williamson</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Carbon Management and Planning</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Joe Baker</b>

### Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

To make a saving of £60,000 from the Carbon Management Service base budget, and to replace this saving with income from the Planning Service for the same amount (secured through a Service Level Agreement). This income from the Planning Service would be secured through Planning Performance Agreement Fees. The Carbon Management Service would then continue, and increase, its support the Planning Service through advice and technical specification on planning applications and issues related to carbon reduction, energy and sustainability. The level of support and the timeframes will need to be set out in the agreed Service Level Agreement between the two services.

The Carbon Management Service already undertakes this work for the planning service to ensure that the policies around Carbon Reduction, Local Energy Production, and Sustainability are secured in the planning process. This SLA and budget adjustment would better reflect the arrangement, and allow for it to mature and improve on a stable footing, while reducing the demand placed on the Council's base revenue budget by the Carbon Management team.

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)</b>	312,500				
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Existing Budget	£313	£253	£253	£253	£253
Proposed net expenditure after savings	£253	£253	£253	£253	£253
<b>Savings</b>	<b>£60</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>
New net additional savings (year on year)	£60				

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>There should be no impact on the services offered, but fees collected from the Planning Service may have to increase.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Planning fees (pre-application advice) may have to increase.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>Carbon reduction and sustainability is a statutory requirement and its process has been embedded through the planning service through the SEA Directive, and the NPPF. Though supporting the Carbon Management Service in this manner it will ensure that this statutory function can continue.</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Planning fees reduce in volume.			To continue to promote that borough as a place to do business in.
Environmental Standard are not required			To monitor national, regional and local policies.

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: EC2
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Reduction in Consultancy Budget		
<b>Priority:</b>	Economy	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Peter O'Brien
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	Regeneration	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	David Lee

### Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

Regeneration are proposing to save £75k in our central budget (V30001), from an allocation of £250k in 2017/18 for GL code 24005 (Fees – Consultants).

This budget line has typically been allocated to cover large contracts and project delivery requirements.

As some Tottenham Regeneration activities shift from a focus on initial strategies and feasibility work to delivery stage, there is increasing scope to explore funding these types of contracts from other sources, including but not limited to capitalisation of costs, utilising both internal and external funding sources. It is therefore not proposed that the work undertaken in this area would change, but that funding for this work would be sought from other sources.

We do not expect that this will impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes, nor will this affect statutory requirements as the work that Regeneration undertakes is not statutory. There is a risk that some exploratory/feasibility work may take longer to commence, or will not happen in a given financial year, if alternative funding sources cannot be identified.

### 1. Financial benefits summary

2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	2019/20 £000s	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>	75				

## Priority Four – Budget Reductions

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>As above, the most significant risk is that some feasibility, technical or commercial work may take longer to commence and there will be a reduction in operational flexibility. This may require managing expectations around how much feasibility work can be undertaken in a given year, which may impact on the council's housing and development aspirations.</p> <p>The Regeneration Department will work to try and identify alternative sources of funding to seek to mitigate this risk.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>There is minimal impact on relevant stakeholders, as above; however if cumulative savings pressures were to increase substantially this could impact on the Regeneration Team's ability to continue to match fund its significant external investment secured to date. It is believed that the £75k savings can be offset through capitalising costs and, where this is not possible, that an internal review of subsidiary budgets can offset this reduction in the central budget.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p><b>This £75k makes a contribution of 0.7% of the £11m savings expected in 2019/20.</b></p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
There is a risk that, as Regeneration budgets shrink, it is unable to meet match funding requirements for external funding secured.	H	L	Budget holders with responsibility for externally funded projects to ensure that adequate match funding remains in place.
Risk that cumulative savings proposals impact on the Regeneration Team's ability to deliver the ambitious change laid out in the Tottenham and Wood Green SRFs.	M	L	The Regeneration Team is continuing to explore further capitalising costs and will continue to leverage in external funding sources in order to deliver large-scale change.

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: EC3
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Deletion of Senior post</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Economy</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Helen Fisher</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>HRP</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

**Background**

Following consultation with Corporate Leadership Group, it was decided that a senior management restructure was required to establish and clarify the role of strategic leadership, required to effectively deliver the Council's priorities in light of recent changes. The restructure would involve:

- achieving a flatter, more coherent structure and improve reporting lines;
- work towards a more joined up, corporate way of working;
- to create stability in the senior management structure;
- to establish a more coherent approach to commissioning;
- focus on the need to develop our approach to partnership working;
- to create a Corporate Board structure in place of SLT;
- the need to ensure that the senior leadership of the council is as cost-effective as possible whilst delivering strong leadership.

The proposal included deletion of a number of posts as well as creating, and re-designating a number of other roles.

**Proposal**

The Strategic Director of Regeneration, Planning & Development was re-designated as Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning, and along with this, it was proposed to delete the Director of Regeneration post. It has been agreed that the restructure of the senior level within Housing, Regeneration & Planning will take place at a later date as part of a second phase of the above restructure. The Director of Regeneration is currently acting up into the role of Director of Housing, Regeneration & Planning due to a vacancy. Whilst the detailed decision on the deletion of the post can be determined at a later date, there is a saving currently due to the vacancy and it is proposed that this saving could be realised immediately.

## Priority Four – Budget Reductions

1. Financial benefits summary					
2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Existing Budget	£425				
Proposed net expenditure after savings	£200				
<b>Savings</b>	<b>£225</b>				
New net additional savings (year on year)	£225				

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>N/A</p> <p>Customers will not be directly impacted, staff have managed impact to ensure seamless transition. Proposal is currently in operation.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>This results in one post being deleted, however this proposal is already in operation with negative impacts experienced. All parties involved have been notified.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>

Risks and Mitigation			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
Delay in implementation	L	M	

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: EC4
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Strategic Property Unit – New Income Proposal</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Economy/Your Council</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Steve Carr</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Housing, Regeneration &amp; Planning</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Bill Ogden</b>

### Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

This proposal comprises an opportunity to achieve new income potential by starting a process of **tackling the uncrystallised debt** in the commercial portfolio:

1. **Existing Proposal:** There is a level of uncrystallised debt in the commercial portfolio, which is estimated at circa £225k per annum. This has arisen from a backlog of outstanding rent reviews as well as tenants holding over under expired leases, where lease renewals still have to be negotiated. The existing professional staff in the Strategic Property team does not have the capacity to address this and it is proposed to secure an additional agency resource to tackle this backlog. The proposed cost of an agency surveyor through Hays is circa £75k per annum. We estimate this would achieve a net increased income to the Council during 2019/20 of £150k per annum. **Update:** An agency surveyor commenced at the end of June and has already made encouraging progress in inspecting units, initiating rental negotiations and achieving two rental settlements.
2. **Additional Proposal:** It is estimated that there is further potential to release more income, estimated at £225k per annum, from retrospective and ongoing rent reviews and lease renewals, which is beyond the capacity of existing professional staff to handle. It is proposed to recruit a second agency resource through Hays to undertake this work at a cost of circa £75k per annum to commence in September 2018. We estimate this would achieve a net increased income to the Council during 2019/20 of £150k per annum
3. In Summary, we estimate that in 2019/20 a **total gross new income of £450k** per annum could be achieved from rent review/lease renewal settlements given an outlay of £150k, giving a net new income flow of £300k per annum.
4. We would thus offer up £300,000 income to be set against the ongoing budget deficit of the SPU team that has arisen from the carrying cost of the supernumerary posts, which were deleted in anticipation of the HDV.
5. Note – this exercise cannot be scaled-up without further resource allocation to the property function.



## Priority Four – Budget Reductions

<b>2. Financial benefits analysis</b>					
<b>Saving / Cost</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings / costs shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
A. Gross saving	-450				
B. Revenue implementation cost (One Off Pressure)					
C. Ongoing revenue cost	150				
<b>D. Net Saving (A+B+C)</b>	-300	0	0	0	0
E. Saving(s) already included in MTFS 2018/23	-250				
<b>F. New net additional saving (D minus E)</b>	-50	0	0	0	0

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Rent reviews and lease renewals can give rise to issues of tenant affordability, which can be addressed through good communication and dialogue with tenants, and in some cases agreement of stepped rents or payment plans.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>As above</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>The Council is under an obligation to ensure it achieves best value from the commercial portfolio</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact H/M/L</b>	<b>Probability H/M/L</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Tenant affordability	M	M	Good communication and dialogue with tenants, with agreement of stepped rents and payment plans if appropriate

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: EC5
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Strategic Property Unit – New Income Proposal</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>P4/PX</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Steve Carr</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Housing, Regeneration &amp; Planning</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Bill Ogden</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

This proposal comprises an opportunity to achieve new income potential from the introduction of outdoor media, beginning with regularisation of existing media/advertising on our estate:

6. There is significant income potential to be achieved from Outdoor Media advertising across the Council's commercial estate, including development sites and highway land. At present there is only one lease of an advertising billboard in the commercial portfolio. The income potential from Outdoor Media is well proven and many London Boroughs are achieving valuable income from this. It is therefore proposed initially to instruct a specialist consultant to undertake an assessment of the Council's landholdings to identify suitable sites for Outdoor Media installations and in doing so to identify existing illegal advertising on Council property where action can be taken to regularise. The initial Stage 1 assessment is estimated at a cost of £15k. Thereafter, subject to planning consent and Member agreement, it is estimated that net income in 2019/20 would be not less than £100k, increasing significantly over future years. It is not possible at this stage to accurately forecast future income flows until an initial assessment has been completed, but it is not unusual for Boroughs to achieve many times this per annum depending on their location and appetite of advertisers.
7. In Summary, we estimate that in 2019/20 a total gross new income of £115k could be achieved from Outdoor Media given an outlay of £15k, giving a net new income flow of £100k per annum.
8. We would thus offer up £100,000 income to be set against the ongoing budget deficit of the SPU team that has arisen from the carrying cost of the supernumerary posts which were deleted in anticipation of the HDV.
9. Note – this exercise cannot be scaled-up without further resource allocation to the property function. We will address this wider issue of income generation and cost cover in the Commercial Property Review exercise that is intended to go to Corporate Board in September and will influence the restructure programme of the Housing, Regeneration and Planning Directorate.

## Priority Four – Budget Reductions

<b>2. Financial benefits analysis</b>					
<b>Saving / Cost</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings / costs shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
A. Gross saving	-450				
B. Revenue implementation cost (One Off Pressure)					
C. Ongoing revenue cost	150				
<b>D. Net Saving (A+B+C)</b>	-300	0	0	0	0
E. Saving(s) already included in MTFs 2018/23	-250				
<b>F. New net additional saving (D minus E)</b>	-50	0	0	0	0

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Any cases of illegal advertising on Council land would be subject to action to regularise either through formal agreements or in some cases removal</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Suggested early discussion with Cabinet Member on Outdoor Media proposals to secure support and agree guidelines</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>Outdoor Media companies would be responsible for securing appropriate planning and building regulation consents as appropriate</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact H/M/L</b>	<b>Probability H/M/L</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Outdoor Media installations require planning consent	M	M	Discussion with Planners at early stage. Seek alternative sites
Outdoor Media content not compliant with council policy	M	L	Ensure that licences and Heads of terms incorporate council policy and are reviewed by Comms and Procurement teams
Outdoor Media proposals may be politically sensitive	M	M	Early discussion with Cabinet Member and agree guidelines for advertising content

Priority Five – Budget Reductions

Summary of Budget Reduction Proposals - Housing

Housing				All Years	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Ref	Title	Category	Description	Net Saving (All)	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings	Net Savings
				£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
HO1	Temporary accommodation reduction plan	Other	Reduce TA costs, as detailed in the TA Reduction Plan. Proposals include initiatives to prevent homelessness, improve economic position of those in TA, and help support those in TA to move on. Revenue costs covered by the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant. Plan also includes proposals to increase supply of low cost TA through new purchase, repair and management joint venture partnership, and capital investment in new Community Benefit Society. Please note that due to the additional costs incurred due to unforeseen works at BWF, it may not be possible to meet the projected savings.	(2,201)	(920)	(708)	(573)	-	-
HO2	Explore opportunities to capitalise development team costs	Other	Proposal to charge salaries of staff within housing development and enabling team to the Housing Revenue Account, as their work is now focused on bringing forward sites for direct housing development. Approximately 40% of salaries are currently funded by the HRA, and it's proposed to increase this to 100%.	(150)	(150)	-	-	-	-
<b>Housing Totals</b>				<b>(2,351)</b>	<b>(1,070)</b>	<b>(708)</b>	<b>(573)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: HO1
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Housing</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Alan Benson</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>		<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Alan Benson</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

**Background**

The Council has a statutory duty to provide temporary accommodation (TA) to households who have been accepted as Statutorily Homeless until they can be discharged, usually through an offer of settled accommodation.

Haringey has just under 3,000 households in such accommodation including around 2,600 placed in private sector accommodation. The costs of these properties is, in most cases, significantly in excess of the Local Housing Allowance (the maximum amount of Housing Benefit which can be claimed in the private rented sector) and so the council is required to subsidise these properties to ensure that they are affordable to these households. The current budget for this in the MTFs is £7.1 million per annum.

**Proposals**

The proposals to reduce this cost are contained in the Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan. These proposals include initiatives to prevent homelessness, to improve the economic position of those who are in temporary accommodation and to help people move on – with the revenue costs of these covered by the Flexible Homelessness Support Grant. They also include proposals to increase the supply of lower-cost temporary accommodation through a new Purchase Repair & Management Joint Venture Partnership and capital investment in a new Community Benefit Society.

*However please note that due to the additional costs incurred due to unforeseen works at BWF, it may not be possible to meet the projected savings. Other options are currently being scoped in order to ensure savings are met.*

## Priority Five – Budget Reductions

<b>1. Financial benefits summary</b>					
<b>2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)</b>					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Existing Budget	£7,100	£6,180	£5,472	£4,899	£4,899
Proposed net expenditure after savings	£6,180	£5,472	£4,899	£4,899	£4,899
<b>Savings</b>	<b>£920</b>	<b>£708</b>	<b>£573</b>	<b>£0</b>	<b>£0</b>

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>Improved temporary accommodation offer for homeless households, with properties meeting agreed minimum standards at an LHA rent. The quality of service will also improve, as housing services will be provided by a housing association or Homes for Haringey, rather than by the often unreliable arrangements put in place by private landlords.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>Reduced reliance on private landlords.  Depending on exact arrangements, Homes for Haringey may provide housing management services to more homes.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>
<p>The Council has a statutory duty to provide temporary accommodation (TA) to households who have been accepted as Statutorily Homeless until they can be discharged, usually through an offer of settled accommodation. This will allow us to achieve this duty for less money and provide better quality accommodation.</p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Probability</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
	H/M/L	H/M/L	
See attached detailed Risk Register for the Housing Delivery Companies programme.			

## Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

Ref: HO2
-------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Capitalisation of Development team salary costs</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Economy</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Dan Hawthorn</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>HRP</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Alan Benson</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

**Background**

One of the Council's key priorities is to deliver new council housing on council-owned land as part of the target to provide 1,000 new Council homes by 2022. A Development & Enabling team exists within the Housing Strategy & Commissioning team to work up proposals for – and then deliver – new homes on medium-sized council-owned land, the majority of which is currently held in the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). Because the nature of this team's work is changing and it will now be working to bring forward sites for direct housing development, it is proposed that the salaries of a number of staff in the development team are now charged to the HRA in full:

**Proposals**

In order to facilitate required general fund savings it is proposed to charge the salaries of key development team staff fully to the HRA.

2 x Senior Housing Project Managers and 1x Housing Project Manager.

Approximately 40% of these salaries are currently funded by the HRA and it is proposed to increase this to 100% and offer the balance as a saving to the General Fund.

Current Housing Strategy & Commissioning General Fund budget - £914,300

Existing MTFs Savings - none

Net New Savings - £150k

2018/19 Service Budget (£'000)					
<b>Savings</b>	<b>2019/20</b>	<b>2020/21</b>	<b>2021/22</b>	<b>2022/23</b>	<b>2023/24</b>
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>	<b>£000s</b>
Existing Budget	914	764	764	764	764
Proposed net expenditure after savings	764	764	764	764	764
<b>Savings</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
New net additional savings (year on year)	150	0	0	0	0

## Priority Five – Budget Reductions

<b>Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits</b>
<p><b>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p>
<p>N/A</p> <p>Customers will not be impacted.</p>
<p><b>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?</b>  <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p>
<p>The proposal is to increase the level of salaries charged to the HRA. This will reduced the amount of HRA funding for other requirements, but the cost is not considered significant and leads to the provision of additional housing to be let in future.</p>
<p><b>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</b></p>

<b>Risks and Mitigation</b>			
<i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i>			
Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
HRA will not be able to fund other requirements/projects.	L	L	The level of funding required from the HRA relative to the total value of the account is very low, and leads to the provision of additional housing to be let in future.



Summary of PX (Your Council) budget reductions

		2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Total
Ref	Title	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions	Budget Reductions
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
YC1	Out of home advertising income generation	(129)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(6)	(151)
YC2	Remove ward budgets	(190)	-	-	-	-	(190)
	<b>Your Council Totals</b>	<b>(319)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>(6)</b>	<b>(341)</b>

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref: YC01
--------------

<b>Title of Option:</b>	<b>Out of home advertising income generation</b>		
<b>Priority:</b>	<b>Your Council</b>	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Joanna Sumner</b>
<b>Affected Service(s):</b>	<b>Strategy &amp; Communications</b>	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	<b>Lesley Gordon/Eleri Salter</b>

**Description of Option:**

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

*[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]*

Haringey Council currently has a street furnishing advertising contract with JCDecaux. The contract in its current form has run for over 20 years and includes 29 static single poster council information panels (CIPs) which offer Haringey the opportunity to place its communication messages on the boards at no cost. The CIP split across the borough is: Wood Green (19), Seven Sisters (8) and Bounds Green (2).

The current contract terminates at the end of September 2018. We are currently in the process of procuring a new solution working alongside Highways, Planning, Procurement and Legal. The introduction of a new contract and solution will give the council a new income stream and the opportunity to update the current static CIPs to digital CIPs to maximise income generation while also having the opportunity to display council messages.

Moving into a digital display environment would not only ensure that Haringey's communication messages can be updated quickly, it also means there are no printing costs.

The aim is to work with one selected outdoor advertising company. The chosen provider would work closely with the Planning and Highways to ensure that any new street furnishings would be sympathetic to the surroundings, future borough plans and opportunities.

Haringey will receive a percentage return from advertising revenue generated by the advertising company. Haringey would ensure that a percentage of the display would be reserved for council communications.

We will aim to:

- Upgrade all current street furnishings to digital panels and identify and implement (subject to planning permission) new digital sites to ensure that messages can be either targeted or more evenly spread throughout the Borough.
- Agree a percentage of advertising revenue returns to Haringey (to the strategy & communications function).
- Agree a percentage of time to display council messages.
- Ensure Business Rates are paid by the advertising company
- Ensure the chosen provider implement and maintain all locations.

Based on the procurement timescales we expect the new contract to be in place by October 2018.

The projections below are based on the current 29 sites in place and will increase if further assets are added. It should be noted that income projections could increase as we will also receive 10%

## Priority X – Budget Reductions

of any sales over and above projected income.

### 1. Financial benefits summary

2018/19 Service Budget (£000s)					
Savings	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
<i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i>	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>	175	5	5	6	6

### Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

#### What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

*List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)*

The income generation clearly allows us to work towards a situation where the communication function reduces its actual cost to the organisation.

The digital aspect of these sites means that the council will be able to use them more flexibly for our own campaigns.

There is a need to develop an organisation-wide protocol setting out our approach to income generation from sponsorship and advertising

#### What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?

*List both positive and negative impacts.*

There is some impact on highways and planning services which has been discussed with them throughout the ITT process. Procurement colleagues have also been heavily involved.

As well as generating income this contract will allow us to utilise infrastructure and technology to make positive change, as well as delivering ambitious green initiatives.

#### How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

N/A

### Risks and Mitigation

#### What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?

Risk	Impact H/M/L	Probability H/M/L	Mitigation
This is a fairly low risk option but there will be a planning process to be navigated.	L	L	Highways and planning colleagues have been involved throughout this process.
No Cabinet Approval	H	L	This proposal has been discussed with the CEX and Leader in detail.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Shared Service Centre

Priority	X
Current Service Area	Shared Service Centre
<b>Proposal:</b>	
	6.3

<b>Impact on Residents</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
No impact on residents	N/A
<b>Current budget Savings/Invest</b>	<b>Employees Change in employees</b>
£000	336
Total	Total
3,250	0
9,025	

BENEFITS CASE						
Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA)	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Benefits Estimated (Savings)	0	250	1500	1500	1500	
Reduced benefits due to lead-on time (if applicable)						
Additional Cost Estimated						
<b>Net Impact Cost/(Savings)</b>	0	250	1500	1500	1500	0
<b>Cumulative Cost/(Savings)</b>	0	250	1750	3250	3250	3250
Additional Cost Estimated						
<p><b>Detailed description:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Carry out a high-level options review (November 2016)</li> <li>ii. Carry out a detailed options appraisal including cost and benefit analysis (April 2017)</li> <li>iii. Members agree new Service Delivery Model (June 2017)</li> <li>iv. Complete Transition to New Service Delivery Model (April 2018)</li> </ul> <p>Benchmark and industry standard savings for shared services have been used to establish likely savings.</p>						



**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

<b>Priority</b>	X	<b>Impact on Residents</b>	
<b>Current Service Area</b>	All	No impact on residents	Outcomes N/A
<b>Proposal:</b>		<b>Current budget</b>	N/A
		<b>Savings/invest</b>	N/A
		<b>Total</b>	<b>Employees</b>
		<b>£000</b>	<b>Change in employees</b>
		<b>1,000</b>	<b>Total</b>
		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Proposed:</b>	6.3
------------------	-----

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

**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.



## Closure of internal print room

Priority	X
Current Service Area	Communications

Impact on Residents	Outcomes
No impact on residents	N/A

**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.

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

**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.



**APPENDIX B**

**PRIORITY 1**

CAPITAL SCHEME NO.	CAPITAL SCHEME DESCRIPTION	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Overall Total
		£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
<b>115</b>	Fortismere Secondary School Development	400	10,050	10,050	5,400	10,000	<b>35,900</b>
		<p>This proposal is to remodel parts of Fortismere Secondary School. This will in turn free-up land on the site to enable the construction of housing on the site. The budget assumption is that the scheme will be self-financing through the sale of the housing built on the site. A full business case will be presented prior to the scheme proceeding.</p>					
<b>118</b>	Education Estates	5,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	<b>9,000</b>
		<p>An extensive condition survey of the Children's Services estate has identified a range of urgent works that are required in schools. This budget allocation is to fund those works. A full business case is being prepared that will outline the investment required and is likely to be considered as part of the 2020/21 budget round.</p>					

**PRIORITY 2**

CAPITAL SCHEME NO.	CAPITAL SCHEME DESCRIPTION	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Overall Total
		£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
<b>211</b>	Community Alarm Service	177	177	177	177	177	<b>885</b>
		This scheme is correctly account for the capital costs of the service. It relates to the cost of the installation of the alarms					
<b>213</b>	Canning Crescent Assisted Living	500	4,200	1,750	250		<b>6,700</b>
		Cabinet at its meeting of the 9th October 2018 decided to purchase Canning Crescent. The intention is to return to Cabinet with a fully costed business case that converts the building into 21 supported housing units as well a provision for the relocation of the Clarendon Recovery College.					
<b>214</b>	Osborne Grove Nursing Home	500	1,500	6,000	2,250	500	<b>10,750</b>
		The budget detailed here provides for the redevelopment of the OGNH. A further report and business case will presented to Cabinet once the feasibility study has been concluded.					

CAPITAL SCHEME NO.	CAPITAL SCHEME DESCRIPTION	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Overall Total
		£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
<b>215</b>	Hornsey Town Hall Supported Living	250	1,750				<b>2,000</b>
		The council has the opportunity to purchase the affordable housing units in the development. The creation of the units is a requirement of the planning permission. The council intends to use the units for supported living.					

<b>216</b>	Homelessness Hub	100					<b>100</b>
		Cabinet at its meeting of the 11th September 2018 agreed to enter into a lease of 332-334 High Road, Tottenham. This was to create an co-located housing assessment centre and hub for single homeless people and those at risk of homelessness.					

**PRIORITY 3**

CAPITAL SCHEME NO.	CAPITAL SCHEME DESCRIPTION	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Overall Total
		£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
322	Finsbury Park	600	600	600	600	600	3,000
		<p>The park regularly undertakes capital works that are funded through the ring-fenced revenue account. This expenditure is being recognised in the Council's capital programme.</p>					
323	Parking Strategy	1,000	1,000				2,000
		<p>The funding allocated here is to support a revised parking strategy. There will be a full business case completed that will show the scheme is self-financing prior to any substantial expenditure being incurred.</p>					
325	Parks Vehicles	720					720
		<p>Budgetary provision has been made to replace a number of parks vehicles. A business case will be prepared which will show the scheme to be self-financing prior to any purchase decision.</p>					

**PRIORITY 4**

CAPITAL SCHEME NO.	CAPITAL SCHEME DESCRIPTION	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Overall Total
		£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
480	Wood Green Regen (2)	2,997	4,632	5,901	12,141	13,610	39,279
		The budget allocated is to support the regeneration of Wood Green. At various stages of the regeneration process authority will be sought from Cabinet for investments to be made to further the regeneration of the area.					
481	Strategic Investment Pot	1,750	1,400	2,650	0	0	5,800
		This budget is funded by external grant and will be used to support the Productive Valley Fund, STEA and a broadband project.					
482	Strategic Property	19,635	680	1,275	250		21,840
		Budgetary provision has been made for a number of strategic property acquisitions and for investment in the Council's commercial property portfolio. Each decision will be the subject of a full business case that demonstrates that it is self-financing.					

**PRIORITY 5**

CAPITAL SCHEME NO.	CAPITAL SCHEME DESCRIPTION	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Overall Total
		£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
<b>512</b>	Wholly Owned Company	5,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	<b>37,000</b>
		<p>Cabinet at its meeting of the 17th July 2018 agreed to establish a wholly owned company for the delivery of housing. The budgetary provision above is reflective of that decision. Each individual investment decision will be subject to a full business case that demonstrates that it is at least self-financing.</p>					
<b>513</b>	54 Muswell Hill Flats	712					<b>712</b>
		<p>This is the estimated cost of fitting out 6 flats at this address for disposal as shared ownership.</p>					

**PRIORITY X**

CAPITAL SCHEME NO.	CAPITAL SCHEME DESCRIPTION	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	Overall Total
		£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
<b>607</b>	Financial Management System Replacement	0	350	2,000	650	0	<b>3,000</b>
		This is budgetary provision for the replacement of the Council's main accounting system. A full business case will be prepared to demonstrate that the scheme is self-financing					
<b>622</b>	FOBO Programme	500	500	500	0	0	<b>1,500</b>
		The front office back office programme (FOBO) is a transformation project that aims to significantly improve the Council's processes and procedures resulting in savings and an improved customer experience.					

This page is intentionally left blank



**Appendix C****Additional Information****Priority 1**

PC2: Further details of the proposed budget reductions arising from the rationalisation of the management of Children's Centres:

<b>Post affected</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>Affected number of Employees</b>	<b>Number of Posts Created</b>	<b>FTE</b>	<b>Grade</b>	
Management	√	PO 4/6	3	3	√	PO5 (1)/ 7 (2)	
Nursery Practitioner	√	SO 1	11	11	√	PO1(1) / Scale 6 (10)	
Total			14	Total			14

**1. 2017/18 Priority 4 Budget breakdown**

Priority 4 budget consists 6 main budget areas. The total net budget is in the region of £11.9m.

<b>Priority 4</b>	<b>Budget £000's</b>	<b>Description of budgets</b>
Planning	1,674	Salaries, Stationery, Income, Services include: Planning Enforcement, Business Support, Development Control, Building Control, Planning Policy and Local Land Charges.
Regeneration	4,600	Salaries, Consultancy, Income Services include: Wood Green Investment, Regeneration Projects, Wood Green High Street
Economic Regeneration	1,549	This budget is all grant funded. Economic Regen, Employment Programmes, HEST, Nth London CEIP LSCC-Lond. Stan.Camb., Fashion Technology Academy, Tottenham Employment, Apprenticeships/RTW National College
Housing and Growth	1,131	Salaries, Legal Fees Services include Regeneration and Strategy and HDV
Carbon Management	237	Salaries, Income. Services include: WoodGreen Neighbourhood, CPU – Energy Carbon Management, Decentralised Energy, Solar PV
Strategic Property	175	Services include- various Council Buildings
Enabling Culture	2,613	Services include: Museums, Archives, Bernie Grant Centre, Alexandra Palace
<b>Total for Priority 4</b>	<b>11,979</b>	

**2. Draft Priority 4 Capital Budget 2018/19- 2022/23**

A number of Capital projects receive funding from

- GLA
- TFL
- Third Party Developer

Some funding will be carried over from 2017/18 and hence is it difficult at this stage to say precisely how much external funding contributes to the projects listed in the table below:

<b>SCHEME NAME</b>	<b>18/19 Budget</b>	<b>19/20 Budget</b>	<b>20/21 Budget</b>	<b>21/22 Budget</b>	<b>22/23 Budget</b>	<b>Total MTFS Cost</b>
	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>	<b>£'000</b>
Tottenham Hale Green Space	4,344	4,990	5,946	900	2,680	<b>18,860</b>
Tottenham Hale Streets	14,670	9,017	7,683	5,097	1,363	<b>37,829</b>
Tottenham Regeneration Fund	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Opportunity Investment Fund	10	0	0	0	0	<b>10</b>
Growth on the High Road	(84)	0	0	0	0	<b>(84)</b>

Tottenham High Rd & Bruce Grove Stn	444	0	0	0	0	<b>444</b>
North Tott Heritage Initiative	557	0	0	0	0	<b>557</b>
Heritage building improvements	500	0	0	0	0	<b>500</b>
HRW business acquisition	10,218	5,847	26,993	9,352	10,496	<b>62,907</b>
Northumberland Park	400	1,500	400	435	0	<b>2,735</b>
White Hart Lane Public Realm (LIP)	3,639	500	0	0	0	<b>4,139</b>
Site Acq (Tott & Wood Green)	10,146	10,000	8,867	0	0	<b>29,013</b>
Wards Corner CPO	8,950	8,950	0	0	0	<b>17,900</b>
Wood Green Regeneration	127	100	0	0	0	<b>227</b>
Wood Green Station Road	155	120	0	0	0	<b>275</b>
Vacant possession Civic Centre	3,268	72	0	0	0	<b>3,341</b>
Marsh Lane	2,227	821	6,823	4,200	266	<b>14,337</b>
Hornsey Town Hall	170	90	86	0	0	<b>346</b>
Alexandra Palace - Heritage	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Alexandra Palace - Maintenance	400	400	400	400	400	<b>2,000</b>
Winkfield Road	145	0	0	0	0	<b>145</b>
Alexandra Palace -West Yard	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Low Carbon Zones	28	15	0	0	0	<b>43</b>
Techno Park	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Green Lanes	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Western Road Recycling	(0)	0	0	0	0	<b>(0)</b>
Tott Hale Gyratory	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Bruce Castle	94	0	0	0	0	<b>94</b>
District Energy Network (DEN)	1,072	800	0	0	0	<b>1,872</b>
Redevelopment of Waltheof Gardens	(0)	0	0	0	0	<b>(0)</b>
Contribution to Community Events & Public Space (THFC)	1,000	0	0	0	0	<b>1,000</b>
Keston Road (Maya Angelou Contact Centre)	289	0	0	0	0	<b>289</b>
Re-provision of schools in North Tottenham area	500	4,000	20,000	12,000	600	<b>37,100</b>
New corporate headquarters within Wood Green	250	950	2,400	6,000	8,400	<b>18,000</b>
New Wood Green Library/Customer Services.	655	0	0	0	0	<b>655</b>
JLAC Match Fund	0	500	500	0	0	<b>1,000</b>
Bruce Grove Public Realm	2,800	500	0	0	0	<b>3,300</b>
Tottenham High Road Strategy	800	0	0	0	0	<b>800</b>
Tottenham Green Public Realm Scheme Phase 2	600	0	0	0	0	<b>600</b>
HDV Acquisitions & Receipts	1,639	5,163	0	12,082	28,657	<b>47,540</b>
SDP Acquisitions & Receipts	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
P4 Other	(24)	0	0	0	0	<b>(24)</b>
	<b>69,990</b>	<b>54,336</b>	<b>80,099</b>	<b>50,466</b>	<b>52,861</b>	<b>307,750</b>

### 3. 2017/18 General Fund Housing Budget Breakdown

<b>General Fund - Housing</b>	<b>2017/18 Budget</b>	Description
Housing Demand	10,904	
Arms Length services	4,253	Pays for Home for Haringey management, and Hearthstone project
Indirect Temporary Accommodation Housing services	812	Legal fees, Home Connections web database, Temporary Accommodation Storage costs
Direct Temporary Accommodation Housing services	5,836	Fees for Private Sector Leases, Housing Association Leases, B&B's & Annexes, preventative Assured Shorthold Tenancies
Temporary Accommodation Lodges	3	Income from Broadwater Lodge and others as they become operational
Housing Commissioning	9,633	
Housing Commissioned Services	535	Housing Strategy & Commissioning Team
Housing Investments & Sites	164	Development & Enabling Team
Housing Related Support (Housing Related Support) Programme	8,934	Housing Related Support Team and Commissioning Budget (c£4.6m to be transferred to Adult Social Care following implementation of Housing Related Support Review)
<b>Private Sector Housing</b>	<b>730</b>	
Private Sector Housing Team	980	HMO Licensing and Private Sector Housing investigation, inspections and enforcement. Includes a target of -81k for mandatory HMO Licensing
Tottenham HMO's	-250	Income from licensing fees Tottenham Additional HMO Licensing Scheme

#### 4. Draft General Fund Housing Capital Budget 2018/19 -2022/23

SCHEME NAME	18/19 Budget	19/20 Budget	20/21 Budget	21/22 Budget	22/23 Budget	Total MTFS Cost
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
CPO - Empty Homes	525	525	525	525	525	2,625
Temporary Accommodation Acquisition Programme	25,000	25,000	4,409	0	0	54,409
P5 Other	157	0	0	0	0	157
	<b>25,682</b>	<b>25,525</b>	<b>4,934</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>57,191</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

## APPENDIX D

### Overview and Scrutiny Committee

#### Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

<b>Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel - Priority 1</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No)</b>
PC2	Children in Need of Support and Protection and Children in Care, Quality Assurance, Early Help	Further details of the proposed budget reductions arising from the rationalisation of the management of Children's Centres	None at this stage	N
Capital	Fortismere School	Further details of the proposal, including the amount of funding that would be required next year.	None at this stage	N
<b>Comments:</b>				
The Panel stated that they had a high level of confidence that the proposals within the MTFS would be deliverable. They also appeared to be achievable and realistic. They also welcomed the transparent and collaborative approach and the income generation that was proposed.				
<b>Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel - Priority 3</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No)</b>
PL1	Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO	The Panel sought assurances from Cabinet that the additional HMO licensing scheme would		Y

		be tenant focused and that the Council would monitor its impact on tenants, such as eviction rates and homelessness.		
PL1	Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO	The Panel requested further information how the Council would meet the stated income targets for the HMO licensing scheme, including a breakdown of the financial profiling used.		Y
PL11	Flexible Police resources		The Panel recommended that Cabinet reconsider the proposed saving in relation to flexible police resources. In particular, consideration should be given to whether this would have a disproportionate impact on the east of the borough, which had a higher number of victims of crime. Cabinet should also consider whether this proposal was reflective of the fairness agenda. The Panel felt that this saving proposal was contrary to the priorities identified in the new Borough Plan around tackling crime. Fear of crime was one of the main issues identified by residents as part of the consultation in response to the new Borough Plan.	Y



<b>Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel - Priorities 4 &amp; 5</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No)</b>
EC2	Reduction in consultancy budget.	More details on how much is spent on consultants altogether, including through capital costs.	That consideration be given to further reducing consultancy costs and that senior managers should always examine whether functions can be carried out another way rather than through consultants.	Y
EC4	Tackling uncrystallised debt	A progress update to be provided to the Panel in future (the proposal involves tackling a backlog of outstanding rent reviews and lease renewals).		N
EC5	Outdoor media advertising	<p>More details on the cost of the consultancy work that has been carried out on this proposal.</p> <p>Information on how much other boroughs had been able to raise through similar outdoor advertising initiatives. The consultants have been carrying out a benchmarking study on</p>	<p>That consideration be given to whether it would be possible to obtain some advertising revenue in 2019/20. (Income is currently projected from 2020/21 onwards)</p> <p>That consideration be given to avoiding excessive street clutter when implementing the scheme.</p>	Y

		this with findings expected to be available in January.		
HO1	Temporary Accommodation reduction plan	More information to be brought to the Panel at the March meeting about the different funding models available for increasing the supply of Temporary Accommodation.		N
Capital Scheme 513	Muswell Hill Flats	N/A	That the flats should be used for social rent and not shared ownership as currently proposed.	Y
N/A	N/A (General query)	More details on the overall Housing, Regeneration & Planning staffing budget.		N
N/A	N/A (General query)	More details on the current void rate and rental income from properties in the commercial portfolio.		N
<b>Comments</b>				
The Panel noted that they were not able to fully scrutinise the Capital section of the budget as Members felt that the information that they received did not contain sufficient detail.				

N.B. Adults and Health Panel (Priority 2) to follow.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Report for:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 28 January 2019

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

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

**Lead Officer:** Rob Mack, Principal Scrutiny Support Officer  
Tel: 020 8489 2921, E-mail: [rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk)

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

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

**1. Describe the issue under consideration**

1.1 This report seeks approval of the work plans for 2018-20 for the Committee and its Panels.

**2. Recommendations**

2.1 To note the work programmes for the main Committee and Scrutiny Panels at Appendix A and agree any amendments, as appropriate.

**3. Reasons for decision**

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

**4. Background**

4.1 An updated copy of the work plan for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is attached as Appendix "A". The current work plans for all of the other scrutiny panels are also attached.

4.2 Responses to all of the issues raised in the survey and feedback from the Scrutiny Café have been drafted and shared with all of those who attended the Café. The responses are also on the Council's website:  
<https://www.haringey.gov.uk/local-democracy/how-decisions-are-made/overview-and-scrutiny/scrutiny-consultation>

*Overview and Scrutiny Committee*

4.3 After reported previously, an additional Committee meeting has been arranged for Monday 29 April. This is to assist the Committee in completing its work plan and, in addition, to provide an opportunity to approve final reports of reviews undertaken by the Committee and its panels.

- 4.4 The meeting will also receive a report on the further development of overview and scrutiny, which has been moved back from the Committee meeting on 25 March. In order to inform this, a “Scrutiny Stocktake” will be arranged with Scrutiny chairs and officers involved in scrutiny. This will be facilitated by Ann Reeder, who recently assisted with mentoring of Chairs. The intention is that those attending will give their feedback on their experience of scrutiny to date in the new Council and consider how ways of working might refreshed and capacity developed further
- 4.5 The Committee will be meeting on 25 January to consider interim recommendations for its review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks. A draft final report will be submitted to the Committee meeting on 25 March. It will now be possible for work to begin on the Committee’s review on Local Business, Employment and Growth. However, work on the scope and terms of reference requires completion before evidence gathering can commence.

#### *Forward Plan*

- 4.6 Since the implementation of the Local Government Act and the introduction of the Council’s Forward Plan, scrutiny members have found the Plan to be a useful tool in planning the overview and scrutiny work programme. The Forward Plan is updated each month but sets out key decisions for a 3-month period.
- 4.7 To ensure the information provided to the Committee is up to date, a copy of the most recent Forward Plan can be viewed via the link below:

<http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RP=110&RD=0&J=1>

- 4.8 The Committee may want to consider the Forward Plan and discuss whether any of these items require further investigation or monitoring via scrutiny.

### **5. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

- 5.1 The contribution of scrutiny to the corporate priorities will be considered routinely as part of the OSC’s work.

### **6. Statutory Officers comments**

#### **Finance and Procurement**

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

#### **Legal**

- 6.2 There are no immediate legal implications arising from the report.
- 6.3 In accordance with the Council’s Constitution, the approval of the future scrutiny work programme falls within the remit of the OSC.

6.4 Under Section 21 (6) of the Local Government Act 2000, an OSC has the power to appoint one or more sub-committees to discharge any of its functions. In accordance with the Constitution, the appointment of Scrutiny Panels (to assist the scrutiny function) falls within the remit of the OSC.

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

### **Equality**

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

- Tackle discrimination and victimisation of persons that share the characteristics protected under S4 of the Act. These include the characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (formerly gender) and sexual orientation;
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

6.7 The Committee should ensure that it addresses these duties by considering them within its work plan and those of its panels, as well as individual pieces of work. This should include considering and clearly stating;

- How policy issues impact on different groups within the community, particularly those that share the nine protected characteristics;
- Whether the impact on particular groups is fair and proportionate;
- Whether there is equality of access to services and fair representation of all groups within Haringey;
- Whether any positive opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and/or good relations between people, are being realised.

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

## **7. Use of Appendices**

Appendix A; Work Plans for the Committee and the scrutiny panels.

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

N/A



## Overview and Scrutiny Committee

### Draft Work Plan 2018-20

**1. Scrutiny review projects;** These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.

Project	Comments	Priority
Review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks	This review was begun in 2017/18 and now needs to be completed. It has focussed on how the Council has satisfied itself that its buildings and high-rise buildings in the Borough are safe from fire and action identified and taken to date in response to the Grenfell Tower fire.	1.
Local Business, Employment and Growth	Review to focus in depth on a specific aspect of this.	2.
Communicating with the Council	Review to consider how to improve communication between residents and Council services	3.
Working with the voluntary and community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working together with local voluntary/community sector, strengthening their capacity and working with them to attract external investment in the borough;</li> </ul>	4.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building on examples of good co-operation and joint working between Council services and volunteers, such as within parks, which could be replicated more widely;</li> <li>• Involving and supporting voluntary organisations to bid for services.</li> </ul>	
Child Poverty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues in schools highlight food poverty, poor housing and increasing mental health needs.</li> </ul>	

<p>2. <b>“One-off” Items;</b> These will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Committee. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.</p>		
<b>Date</b>	<b>Potential Items</b>	<b>Lead Officer/Witnesses</b>
<b>4 June 2018</b>	Terms of Reference	Scrutiny Support Officer
	Work Plan	Scrutiny Support Officer
<b>23 July 2018</b>	Leader’s Update on Council Priorities	Leader and Chief Executive
	Q1 Performance report	Performance Manager
	2017/18 Provisional Outturn report	Head of Finance Operations

	Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panel Work Programme	Scrutiny Support Officer
	Review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks – Update	Scrutiny Support Officer
<b>2 October 2018</b>	Budget Monitoring – Q1	Chief Finance Officer
	Review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks - Update	Scrutiny Support Officer
	Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panel Work Programme	Scrutiny Support Officer
<b>19 November 2018</b>	Budget Monitoring – Q2	Chief Finance Officer
	Budget setting process; To set out the budget scrutiny process and context for the remainder of the year	Chief Finance Officer
	Cabinet Member Questions; 1. Finance 2. Corporate Services and Insourcing	Cabinet Member - Finance Chief Finance Officer Cabinet Member – Corporate Services and Insourcing

	Performance update – Q2; To monitor performance against priority targets	Performance Manager
	Local Business, Employment and Growth	Assistant Director, Economic Development and Growth
	Review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks	Scrutiny Support Officer
	Work Plan	Scrutiny Support Officer
<b>14 January 2019</b>	Priority X Budget Scrutiny (Deputy Chair in the Chair); To undertake scrutiny of the “enabling” priority.	Chief Finance Officer/Principal Accountant, Financial Planning
	Brexit – Implications for Borough	Head of Policy and Cabinet Support
	Consultation and Engagement	Assistant Director for Strategy and Communications
	Cabinet Member Questions - Strategic Regeneration	Cabinet Member for Strategic Regeneration and officers
<b>28 January 2019</b>	Budget Scrutiny; Panel feedback and recommendations. To consider panel’s draft	

	recommendations and agree input into Cabinet's final budget proposal discussions (Deputy Chair in the Chair)	Deputy Chair (in the Chair)
	Treasury Management Statement	Head of Pensions
	Cabinet Member Questions - Civic Services	Cabinet Member for Civic Services and officers
<b>25 March 2019</b>	Borough Plan	Head of Policy and Cabinet Support
	Cabinet Member Questions – Communities, Safety and Engagement (Voluntary Sector/Equalities issues)	Cabinet Member – Communities, Safety and Engagement
	Budget Monitoring – Q3	Chief Finance Officer
	Performance update – Q3	Performance Manager
	Complaints Annual Report	Assistant Director (Corporate Governance)

	Review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks – Interim Report	Principal Scrutiny Support Officer
	Brexit – Implications for Borough	Head of Policy and Cabinet Support
<b>29 April 2018</b>	Cabinet Member Questions – Finance	Cabinet Member - Finance
	Scrutiny Function	Principal Scrutiny Support Officer
	FOBO	Director of Customers, Transformation and Resources
	Draft Scrutiny Review reports	Scrutiny Panel Chairs
<b>2019-20</b>		
<b>Meeting 1</b>	Leader’s Update on Council Priorities	Leader and Chief Executive
	Q1 Performance report	Performance Manager

	2017/18 Provisional Outturn report	Head of Finance Operations
	Terms of Reference and Memberships	Scrutiny Support Officer
	Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panel Work Programme	Scrutiny Support Officer
<b>Meeting 2</b>	Cabinet Member Questions – Corporate Services and Insourcing	Cabinet Member - Corporate Services and Insourcing
	Insourcing	Director of Customers, Transformation and Resources
	Consultation and Engagement	Director of Customers, Transformation and Resources
	OSC Annual Report 2018-19	Scrutiny Support Officer
<b>Meeting 3</b>	Budget Monitoring – Q1	Chief Finance Officer
	Cabinet Member Questions – Civic Services	Cabinet Member for Civic Services and officers

<b>Meeting 4</b>	Performance Report – Q2	Performance Manager
	Cabinet Member Questions - Finance	Cabinet Member - Finance Chief Finance Officer
<b>Meeting 5 (Budget Scrutiny)</b>	Budget Scrutiny; Panel feedback and recommendations. To consider panel’s draft recommendations and agree input into Cabinet’s final budget proposal discussions (Deputy Chair in the Chair)	Deputy Chair (in the Chair)
	Treasury Management Statement	Head of Pensions
<b>Meeting 6</b>	Race Equality	Head of Policy and Cabinet Support
	Cabinet Member Questions – Communities, Safety and Engagement (Voluntary Sector/Equalities issues)	Cabinet Member – Communities, Safety and Engagement
	Budget Monitoring – Q3	Cabinet Member - Finance Chief Finance Officer



	Performance update – Q3	Performance Manager
--	-------------------------	---------------------

This page is intentionally left blank

## Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel

### Draft Work Plan 2018-19

<p><b>1. Scrutiny review projects;</b> These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.</p>	
Project	Comments
Care Home Commissioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim report published March 2018.</li> <li>• Further evidence session held October 2018.</li> <li>• To be completed.</li> </ul>
Day Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review to run from November 2018 to March 2019.</li> <li>• Draft objective of review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To review Haringey’s Day Opportunities provision and what services are currently offered in order to learn from the past to improve care in the future for residents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Draft sub-headings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Looking at services from a residents’ perspective, what has happened to service users and their carers since the day care closure?</li> <li>○ Has the move from day centre based care to community settings made overall financial savings?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Where are our residents currently being cared for?</li> <li>○ What is the evidence from external witnesses?</li> </ul>
--	---

<p>2. <b>“One-off” Items;</b> These will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Panel. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.</p>	
Date	Potential Items
<b>4 September 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Terms of Reference</li> <li>● Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member</li> <li>● Performance Update</li> <li>● Cabinet Member Questions; Adults and Health</li> <li>● Community Well-Being Framework</li> </ul>
<b>4 October 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Care Homes Review – Evidence Session</li> </ul>
<b>1 November 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Haringey Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2017-18</li> <li>● Financial Monitoring; To receive an update on the financial performance relating to Corporate Plan Priority 2.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suicide Prevention</li> </ul>
<b>13 December 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Scrutiny</li> </ul>
<b>29 January 2019</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions; Adults and Health</li> <li>• Mental Health</li> </ul>
<b>4 March 2019</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical Activity for Older People – update</li> <li>• General Practice - NCL strategy (see JHOSC - 30<sup>th</sup> Nov)</li> </ul>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel

### Work Plan 2018 - 20

**1. Scrutiny review projects;** These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.

Project	Comments	Priority
Special Educational Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEND children are growing in numbers. They can often find difficulty in accessing services due to stretched Council budgets or lack of clarity on how parents can access services;</li> <li>• Families can find it a struggle to obtain a formal diagnosis for their children, which is often a prerequisite in getting extra support at school and/or at home;</li> <li>• Some groups of SEND children have an increased risk of exclusion from school and there can also be poor outcomes in the classroom, which can have a detrimental impact on families struggling to cope;</li> <li>• Early intervention, including diagnosis, is key in order to put relevant support measures in place so that children with SEND can have fulfilling lives with good educational outcomes.</li> </ul> <p>The review will examine and review the role and the effectiveness of the current service children with Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) issues and autism receive. It will aim to establish;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looking in particular at their interaction with the Council and schools, what are the experiences of parents with SEMH and autistic children in trying to access support for their children?</li> <li>• What are the waiting times for parents requesting an assessment, obtaining a diagnosis and</li> </ul>	1.

	<p>receiving the extra support required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the outcomes of children with SEMH and autism in relation to their diagnoses?</li> <li>• As local authorities move away from statements to Education Health and Care (EHC) plans, what are the challenges parents face in obtaining EHC plans? How many children currently have a statement or EHC plan and how many apply for it? What are the rejection rates of children trying to obtain an EHC plan and what are the reasons?</li> </ul>	
<p>Alternative Provision</p>	<p>The review will look at Alternative Provision (AP) services provided to students who no longer attend mainstream education for reasons such as exclusion, behavioural issues, school refusal, short/long term illnesses as well as any other reasons. The main areas of focus will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the reasons why children in Haringey enter AP?</li> <li>• Once entering alternative provision, what are their outcomes and attainment levels when compared to mainstream schools?</li> <li>• How many children going through the AP route later enter the youth justice system?</li> <li>• How many children enter alternative provision as a result of SEND needs and how many have a statement or a EHCP plan?</li> <li>• The demographics of children entering AP including ethnicity, gender, areas of the borough where children in AP are drawn from and levels of children receiving free school meals prior to entering AP;</li> <li>• What are the challenges schools and local authorities face and what can we do better to meet the needs of children so as to avoid AP altogether?</li> <li>• Are the outcomes from AP providers uniform within Haringey?</li> <li>• How cost effective is AP.</li> </ul>	

2. **“One-off” Items; These** will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Panel. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.



Date	Potential Items
<b>6 September 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terms of Reference</li> <li>• Service Overview and Performance Update</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions; Children and Families and Communities (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within their portfolios).</li> <li>• Work Planning; To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for this year.</li> </ul>
<b>8 November 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families.</li> <li>• New Safeguarding Arrangements.</li> <li>• Financial Monitoring; To receive an update on the financial performance relating to Corporate Plan Priority 1.</li> <li>• Joint Targeted Area Action Plan – Update.</li> </ul>
<b>18 December 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Scrutiny</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Communities</li> </ul>

<p><b>4 February 2019</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational Attainment Performance; To report on educational attainment and performance for different groups, including children with SENDs. Data on performance broken down into different groups, including children with SENDs, as well as ethnicity, age, household income etc. To include reference to any under achieving groups.</li> <li>• School Exclusions; To consider an overview of current action to address school exclusions and, in particular, the outcome of the detailed analysis of fixed term exclusions.</li> <li>• Chair of LSCB &amp; Annual Report.</li> <li>• Review on Support to Children from Refugee Families (N.B. including NRPF): Update on Implementation of Recommendations</li> </ul>
<p><b>7 March 2019</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families</li> <li>• Apprenticeship Levy</li> <li>• Review on Child Friendly Haringey: Update on Implementation of Recommendations</li> <li>• Services to Schools</li> <li>• Joint Targeted Area Action Plan – Update</li> </ul>
<p><b>2019 - 2020</b></p>	

<b>Meeting 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terms of Reference</li> <li>• Work Planning; To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for year.</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Communities</li> <li>• Youth Services</li> <li>• Review on Restorative Justice: Update on Implementation of Recommendations</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families</li> <li>• Chair of LSCB &amp; Annual Report/New Safeguarding Arrangements</li> <li>• Mental health services for teenagers and young people (CAMHS)</li> <li>• Financial Monitoring; To receive an update on the financial performance relating to Corporate Plan Priority 1.</li> </ul>
<b>Budget Meeting</b>	Budget scrutiny
<b>Meeting 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Communities</li> <li>• Educational Attainment Performance; To report on educational attainment and performance for different groups, including children with SENDs. Data on performance broken down into different groups, including children with SENDs, as well as ethnicity, age, household income etc. To include reference to any under achieving groups.</li> </ul>

<b>Meeting 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families</li><li>• Play and leisure</li><li>• Unregistered schools</li><li>• Home schooling and safeguarding</li></ul>

## Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel - Work Plan 2018-19

**1. Scrutiny review projects;** These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.

Project	Comments	Priority
Crime, Disorder and Anti-Social Behaviour	<p>Examining the role and effectiveness of the Council and partners in working together to tackle this issue. Some of the key stakeholders involved will include, Police, Enforcement Response/Noise Team, Licensing Team, ASB Team and Homes for Haringey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish evidence base for Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour. Where are the hotspots?</li> <li>• Is the Multi-agency response working? Do other Boroughs utilise this more effectively.</li> <li>• Police non-emergency 101 number call answering answer times.</li> <li>• Is CCTV coverage adequate and in the correct locations.</li> <li>• Ducketts common: Key hotspot for ASB and drug dealing.</li> </ul>	
Reducing the amount of plastic/developing a plastic free policy.	<p>Examining the Council’s recycling performance around plastic waste and seeing what more could be done to reduce the use of plastics. What could the Council do to lead by example in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine the Council’s current position in relation to plastic waste and what other boroughs are doing around this issue. In order to do this, the Panel will look at the Council’s current recycling policy in relation to different types of plastic.</li> <li>• Examine how the Council could reduce plastic waste and increase its recycling performance, looking at innovative ideas from across the sector.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine how the Council could interact with the young people within our borough to positively change behaviour. What could be done to assist schools to reduce the amount of plastic waste? Is there scope for the Council to develop a plastic free pledge for schools to sign up to?</li> <li>• Examine the how the Council can develop a plastic-free policy and what other measures the Council could undertake to lead by example.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Potential Items</b>
13 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions; Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel's terms of reference that are within that portfolio).</li> <li>• Membership &amp; Terms of Reference.</li> <li>• Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member.</li> <li>• Service Overview and Waste, recycling and street cleansing data.</li> <li>• Work Programme: To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for this year.</li> <li>• Review of Fear of Crime: Update on implementation of recommendations.</li> <li>• Knife Crime and MOPAC performance Overview.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police Priorities in Haringey. Will include an update on Stop and Search and Lethal Firearm Discharges as</li> </ul>

<p>16<sup>th</sup> October 2018</p>	<p>requested by the Panel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Monitoring: To receive an update on the financial performance relating to Corporate Plan Priority 3.</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Q&amp;A – Environment: To question the Cabinet Member for Environment on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio.</li> <li>• Waste, recycling and street cleansing data</li> <li>• Work Plan update – The Panel to agree its work plan for OSC to formally approve on 19<sup>th</sup> November.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Budget Scrutiny</b></p> <p>18<sup>th</sup> December 2018</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Scrutiny.</li> <li>• Air Quality.</li> <li>• 18 month follow-up on the recommendations to the Scrutiny Review on Cycling.</li> <li>• Green flags.</li> <li>• Work Programme and scoping document for Scrutiny Review into plastic waste.</li> </ul>
<p>7<sup>th</sup> February 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Flags in parks – An update on the red and amber ratings awarded in parks.</li> <li>• Community Safety Partnership; to invite comments from the Panel on current performance issues and priorities for the borough’s Community Safety Partnership. To include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ New Community Safety Strategy</li> <li>○ Crime Performance Statistics - Update on performance in respect of the MOPAC priority areas plus</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ commentary on emerging issues; and</li> <li>○ Statistics on hate crime.</li> <li>● Update around the Gangs Matrix.</li> <li>● Reducing Criminalisation of Children.</li> <li>● Cabinet Member Q&amp;A –Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).</li> </ul>
11 <sup>th</sup> March 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Veolia Performance.</li> <li>● Green Waste charges</li> <li>● Update on the Planned and Reactive maintenance programme (Highways).</li> <li>● Parks Review – 6-9 month follow-up.</li> <li>● Fly-tipping, bulky waste collection recycling centres.</li> <li>● Cabinet Member Q&amp;A – Environment: To question the Cabinet Member for Environment on current issues and plans arising from her portfolio.</li> </ul>



<b>Meeting 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership &amp; Terms of Reference.</li> <li>• Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member.</li> <li>• Service Overview and Waste, recycling and street cleansing data.</li> <li>• Work Programme</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions; Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Q&amp;A – Environment: To question the Cabinet Member for Environment on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio.</li> <li>• Financial Monitoring: To receive an update on the Q1 financial performance relating to Corporate Plan Priority 3.</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Q&amp;A –Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).</li> <li>• Community Safety Partnership; To invite comments from the Panel on current performance issues and priorities for the borough’s Community Safety Partnership. To include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Crime Performance Statistics - Update on performance in respect of the MOPAC priority areas plus commentary on emerging issues; and</li> <li>▪ Statistics on hate crime.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SNT Policing model and the impact of the merging of Haringey and Enfield SNTs.</li> </ul>

<b>Meeting 4 (Budget Scrutiny)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Budget Scrutiny</li></ul>
<b>Meeting 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cabinet Member Q&amp;A - Environment; To question the Cabinet Member for Communities on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio.</li><li>• Waste, recycling and street cleansing data</li><li>• Performance update – Q3</li><li>• Budget Monitoring Q3</li></ul>

## Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel - Draft Work Plan 2018-19

**1. Scrutiny review projects;** These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.

Projects	Comments
Wards Corner	Scoping document prepared and site visit carried out. Evidence sessions expected Feb 2019.
CIL/S106	To take place in 2019/20.
Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP)	To take place in 2019/20.
High Road West	To take place in 2019/20.

Date	Potential Items
<b>17 September 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terms of Reference</li> <li>• Service Overview and Performance Update</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Housing and Estate Renewal; and</li> <li>○ Strategic Regeneration</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Planning; To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for this year.</li> </ul>
<b>15 November 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Monitoring; To receive an update on the financial performance relating to Corporate Plan Priorities 4 &amp; 5.</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions - Strategic Regeneration</li> <li>• Wood Green/Tottenham landowner forums</li> <li>• GLA Grant Allocation</li> </ul>
<b>17 December 2018</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Scrutiny</li> </ul>
<b>15 January 2019</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Housing and Estate Renewal</li> <li>• Additional scrutiny on capital budget</li> <li>• Community Infrastructure Levy overview</li> </ul>
<b>14 February 2019</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions - Strategic Regeneration</li> <li>• Update on Broadwater Farm</li> <li>• Wood Green/Tottenham landowner forums</li> </ul>
<b>14 March 2019</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions - Housing and Estate Renewal</li> <li>• Review on Social Housing: Update on Implementation of Recommendations</li> </ul>