

NOTICE OF MEETING

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Monday, 14th 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 - 20)

To receive the minutes of the OSC meeting on 19th November 2018 and the Call-In meeting held on 6th December 2018 relating to the Tangmere and Northolt blocks on Broadwater Farm.

7. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS (PAGES 21 - 50)

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

Children and Young People – 8th November 2018
Environment and Community Safety 16th October 2018
Adults and Health – 1st November 2018
Housing and Regeneration – 15th November 2018.

8. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR STRATEGIC REGENERATION

Verbal update.

9. BUDGET SCRUTINY - PRIORITY X (PAGES 51 - 64)

10. HARINGEY BREXIT PREPAREDNESS (PAGES 65 - 70)

11. CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

To follow.

12. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (PAGES 71 - 92)

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

14. FUTURE MEETINGS

28th January 2019

25th March 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, 04 January 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 2018, 7.00PM

PRESENT:

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

Cooptees: Yvonne Denny.

17. 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'.

18. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

19. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair advised that there was one new item of Urgent Business, around the revised Statement of Gambling Policy, which would be taken at Item 14. The Committee was required to consider the Statement of Gambling Policy as a Budget and Policy Framework document, as per Part 4 Section E Paragraph 2.1 of the Council's Constitution. Consideration of the report at this meeting was required in order to fit in with the wider decision making timetable for Cabinet and Full Council.

20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

21. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

22. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting on 2nd October be agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

23. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS

The Chair requested that the Panel Chairs pick up any outstanding actions arising from minutes. **(Action: Panel Chairs).**

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the following Scrutiny Panel meetings were noted:

Adults and Health – 9th September 2018

Children and Young Peoples – 6th September 2018

Environment and Community Safety – 13th September 2018

Housing and Regeneration Panel – 17th September 2018

24. LOCAL BUSINESS, EMPLOYMENT AND GROWTH

The Committee received a presentation for noting on Local Business, Employment and Growth from Steve Carr, the Assistant Director for Economic Development and Growth. The following arose from the discussion of the presentation:

- a. The Committee commented that two-thirds of businesses were in Tottenham and enquired what was being done to ensure that there were similar opportunities and support mechanisms in other parts of the Borough. In response, officers acknowledged these concerns and suggested that major inward investment in a particular location was determined by a multiplicity of factors; including the availability of large sites and existing land use.
- b. In response to a question around the activities being undertaken, officers outlined a proposal for a joint undertaking between Haringey's library service and the British Library to provide enterprise support across all of the Borough's libraries. Officers agreed to provide more details on this proposal as it progressed. **(Action: Steve Carr).**
- c. In response to a question around micro-businesses and what was being done to encourage young people and women to set up businesses, officers advised that there was an entrepreneurship bursary scheme being run in conjunction with the University of Westminster to encourage minority ethnic businesses to come forward. Similarly, there were also mentoring opportunities available.
- d. The Committee raised concerns with the fact that the economic strategy was from 2015 and therefore out of date in some respects. In particular the Committee suggested that the new strategy needed to incorporate some form of worst case scenario planning in relation to Brexit.
- e. The Committee expressed a view that the Council should be doing everything it could through its role as a landlord in attracting small businesses and providing ongoing support to them. Officers acknowledged the key role that the Council could play and the levers available to it, including as part of its ongoing regeneration programme. Officers agreed to come back to the Committee with a briefing on how the Council supported local businesses. **(Action: Steve Carr).**
- f. In relation to question around the town centre strategy and the potential for different town centres to be in competition with one another, officers advised that they were pulling together information on capacity studies for town centres.

- Officers also advised that a number of training and development sessions were being pulled together for Members on how to make town centres more resilient.
- g. The Committee enquired about the role of town centre managers in bringing in expertise and networking opportunities. The Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning agreed to bring back a paper on town centre managers to a future Committee meeting. **(Action: Helen Fisher).**
 - h. The Committee sought reassurance around what the Council could do to reduce red-tape around apprenticeships, particularly in terms of supporting the transition into a permanent role. Similarly, the Committee enquired what could be done to support pop-up businesses such as those at Blue House Yard. In response, officers advised that there were a number of pots of money available that the Council could apply for but these tended to follow GLA priorities and designated growth areas. Officers acknowledged that more work needed to be done on looking at how to connect up schemes like Blue House Yard and town centres.
 - i. The AD for Economic Development and Growth agreed to provide an update to the Committee on what the Council was doing to support apprenticeship schemes. **(Action: Steve Carr).**
 - j. The Chair emphasised the role of place making in relation to economic development and the need to build places that worked for everyone and in support of all Haringey's different communities. The Chair urged that how the Council thought about its places should be a key consideration when developing the new strategy.

25. PERFORMANCE UPDATE - Q2

Clerk's note – The Chair advised that the agenda would be amended so that the performance report would be taken before the Budget Scrutiny Timetable report. The minutes follow the order in which items were taken at the meeting, rather than the order they were published on the agenda.

The Committee received a performance report which set out performance against the outcomes and strategic priorities in the Corporate Plan 2015-18. Updates reflected the latest data available as at September 2018. The report was introduced by Charlotte Pomery, AD for Commissioning. The Chair suggested that Panel Chairs could pick up items specific to their area outside of the meeting. The following arose from the discussion of the presentation:

- a. The new Borough Plan was being developed and as part of that process there would be a new performance framework developed.
- b. The Committee raised concerns with the target for the number of affordable homes built and suggested that the vast majority related to shared ownership.
- c. The Committee also expressed concern with the number of young people supported into apprenticeships. The Committee commented that the reasons for underperformance seemed to suggest the young people were at fault and should instead reflect why the Council were unable to support them. In response, officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that the definitions were set in 2015 but would be revised as part of the new Borough Plan.

- d. The AD for Commissioning agreed to come back to the Committee with what constituted an acceptable level of litter. **(Action: Charlotte Pomery)**.
- e. The Committee expressed concerns that the performance figures seemed to suggest that 20% of Council tenants lived in non-decent homes. The AD for Commissioning agreed to come back to the Committee with further details on this. **(Action: Charlotte Pomery)**.
- f. In response to a question about how the numbers for rough sleepers were compiled, officers advised that surveys were undertaken of the number of people sleeping rough on a designated day. There was a count day scheduled for 28th November.
- g. The Committee sought reassurance about how joined up services were, in relation to rough sleepers, on a pan-London basis. In response, officers advised that Haringey worked closely with Islington and the Police in and around Finsbury Park. In addition, Finsbury Park and Stroud Green was the first place chosen to host a 'floating hub' from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. This involved a two-week focused piece of work around rough sleepers. Officers commented that rough sleepers often had complex needs and that a significant number also had No Recourse to Public Funds, which made interventions more difficult.
- h. The Committee sought further information about the age of the first interaction of young people with the youth justice system and the reasons for this. The AD for Commissioning agreed to share the information from the recent Haringey Stat meeting around serious youth violence. **(Action: Charlotte Pomery)**.
- i. The AD Commissioning advised that there was a Member briefing on rough sleeping scheduled for 19th December.
- j. The Committee sought reassurance around a reduction in the numbers of Temporary Accommodation available. In response, officers acknowledged that there were significant numbers of residents housed in Temporary Accommodation but commented that HfH had undertaken a significant piece of work to reduce homelessness, offer housing advice and intervene sooner. The Homelessness Reduction Act came into force in April with a focus on prevention and a requirement that the local authority work with people for 56 days before making a decision on homelessness.
- k. The AD for Commissioning agreed to come back with details on the response rate for the Residents Survey. **(Action: Charlotte Pomery)**.
- l. The Chair raised concerns that the Committee had not been receiving quarterly performance briefings.
- m. The Chair of the Adults and Health Panel raised concerns with ongoing cuts to the CCG and the need for coordination between the CCG and Council on savings within Adults and Health. The Panel Chair agreed to pick this up during her Panel meeting. **(Action: Cllr Connor)**.
- n. The Chair of the Adults and Health Panel requested that some of the key risks identified in the report be provided to the Panels as part of the Budget Scrutiny process with a cost attachment. Officers suggested that this could be better set out through the formal quarterly briefings for OSC Members. **(Action: Charlotte Pomery)**.

RESOLVED

That the Committee noted the progress made against the delivery of the priorities and targets of the Corporate Plan.

26. 2019/20 BUDGET SCRUTINY TIMETABLE

The Committee received a report for noting which set out the timetable for review and agreement of budget/MTFS proposals for 2019/20 – 2023/24. The report was introduced by Jon Warlow, Director of Finance. The Director of Finance advised that he would circulate an amended timetable following the meeting as he had spotted a couple of errors in the version included in the agenda pack. **(Action: Jon Warlow)**.

The Committee raised concerns with a lack of detail on savings proposals during last year's budget scrutiny process and requested that the information provided to the Panels and the Committee include information around risk modelling and the impact of proposed savings on service delivery. **(Action: Jon Warlow)**.

27. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE RESOURCES AND INSOURCING

The Committee received a short verbal update from the Cabinet Member for Finance, followed by a question and answer session. The following key points arose during the discussion:

- a. In response to a question, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that it was early days for the new administration but characterised Haringey as being 'open for business'. The Committee was advised that there was more work to be done to ensure that the Capital Strategy was delivered so that the Council could invest in its high streets and its open spaces. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that there was a balance to be had when setting fees and charges to ensure that it did not deter businesses investing in the borough.
- b. In response to a question around the political direction of the new administration, the Cabinet Member advised that they were looking to adopt an invest to save outlook where it was feasible. In doing so, they were hoping to invest in service areas that may have been overlooked in recent years, given the financial challenges faced by local government.
- c. In response to a query around the impact of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme, officers advised that Council Tax had been frozen for nine years and this obviously had an impact on income levels. Haringey was now roughly in the middle of all London Boroughs for its Council Tax rates. Given a political desire to invest in services, the Cabinet Member suggested that he was not in favour of reducing Council Tax to levels such as those in Wandsworth.
- d. In response to a question, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that it was probably not feasible to improve all services across the Council, certainly in the short term. In the longer term, perhaps services could be improved by bringing a number of them back in-house.
- e. In respect of demands on services from a growing population, the Cabinet Member stated that there had been a fall in demand for reception school places which suggested that the population had plateaued in the immediate term. In terms of additional demands on services stemming from redevelopment, it was acknowledged that the Council was working to increase school places and GP services in high development areas. The Committee considered that the impact

- of Brexit was unknown and that this could have a significant impact on the population.
- f. In response to a question, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that a significant number of budget cuts in previous years were around Priority 2, particularly as it was the largest budget area. The Cabinet Member suggested that that the cash savings in the upcoming budget may not be as large, but that demand growth in this area had continued and that this would have a significant impact on the deliverability of future savings. Work was ongoing with officers to ensure that a balanced budget was set and implemented.
 - g. The Committee sought reassurance that the budget setting process was being undertaken in conjunction with CCG colleagues, to ensure that there was a joined up approach to adult social care and in recognition that savings in one budget area could have a significant impact on the other. The Cabinet Member acknowledged the need to identify demand pressures across different budget areas and to ensure that there was a joined-up budget setting process. **(Action: Cllr Berryman).**
 - h. In response to a question, the Committee was advised that a full EQIA would be undertaken in relation to each saving put forward as part of the MTFS.
 - i. In response to a request for clarification, the Committee was advised that the Council Tax devolution pilot involved a percentage of local income that was retained, to provide an incentive for the growth of the local tax base. Officers advised that under the existing pilot, the local section was around 33%. Next year's percentage was due to be set soon. The local percentage retained was pooled across London to offset the fact that some London Boroughs had significantly higher numbers of business premises.
 - j. In response to a query around what other options were being pursued beyond budget cuts, the Cabinet Member advised that he was trying to ensure minimal impact on services. The Cabinet Member advised that he was looking at income generation as well as invest to save opportunities to help balance the budget.

The following key points arose during a question and answer session with the Cabinet Member for Insourcing:

- a. In reference to the earlier question about Haringey being open for business, the Cabinet Member emphasised the need for businesses to be socially responsible. The Cabinet Member advised that the Council would be working through the supply chain to ensure that the London Living Wage was paid and that all staff had the right of representation by a trade union. The Cabinet Member advised that the administration would be looking to maintain a 100% occupancy rate for its industrial estates and would also be seeking to develop additional ground space at these sites.
- b. In response to a question, The Cabinet Member advised that the administration was heading towards a default position of bringing services back in house, where this was practicable. The Cabinet Member cautioned that any decision to do so would have to overcome obstacles around best value. The Committee was advised that the Council was developing a close working relationship with APSE to provide expertise and consultancy work, at a much cheaper rate than an equivalent private sector firm. Officers would be working with APSE to go through the contracts one-by-one, starting with the Amey contract and then the

- highways contract. Members would have the opportunity to feed into this process directly, through APSE.
- c. In relation to a further question around the timescales for the Amey contract, the Committee was advised that a report from APSE was expected in late January and that it could take six months from the date of that decision. The Cabinet Member elucidated that the Contract still had two years left to run but that there was a 6 month notice period within the contract.
 - d. In reference to the Veolia contract, the Cabinet Member advised that he thought there could be a number of advantages in bringing the Veolia contract back in-house, but cautioned that there would likely be a significant financial penalty to pay as a result. The Cabinet Member outlined that any decision to bring the contract back in-house would require political support from Members. It was suggested that the cost of the financial penalty could well be offset by the profits generated from the contract being outsourced.
 - e. In response to a question, the Cabinet Member advised that he had discussions with colleagues in other boroughs, including Islington and Enfield about how they had approached direct delivery of services.
 - f. In reference to a question about savings within Corporate Services, the Cabinet Member advised that the main savings were attached to the 'Front Office Back Office' programme. These savings related to changing the way the Council delivered services through technological improvements and efficiencies. It was estimated that these savings would be recognised over a three and a half year period.
 - g. In reference to a question around engagement with Cabinet colleagues, the Committee noted that Cabinet had set up an insourcing sub-group made up of officers and Cabinet Members which was taking a strategic look at insourcing. The Cabinet Member advised that he had also met with individual Cabinet colleagues separately.
 - h. The Chair feedback to the Cabinet Member on some of the points raised in relation to his portfolio as part of the Scrutiny Café event. In summary, the points raised were around; the need to retain key workers, the need to offer inner London weighting as an employer and the need to understand the reasons for staff churn. In response the Cabinet Member acknowledged these concerns and suggested that in principle he was in favour of anything that improved the terms and conditions for Council staff. The Director of Transformation and Resources agreed to feedback figures on the staff churn rate to the Committee **(Action: Richard Grice)**.
 - i. In response to a question, the Cabinet Member advised that his perception of staff wellbeing was one of gradual improvement. It was hoped that this would be improved further as the insourcing programme progressed.
 - j. In response to concerns about what was being done to reassure EU nationals working in the borough, officers advised that senior staff had been holding a number of drop-in sessions with staff to identify issues and answer questions. One of the issues that came to light was around identifying who was an EU national, as there had been no need to hold this information up until now. The Council was also looking at whether it could support staff in applying for settled immigration status or citizenship. One idea being explored was around offering a travel loan style scheme in order to help with costs of applying for settled status/citizenship.

28. REVIEW ON FIRE SAFETY IN HIGH RISE BLOCKS

The Committee received a progress report on the Scrutiny Review into Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks and was asked to consider potential interim findings and recommendations. The report was introduced by Rob Mack, Principal Scrutiny Officer. The Committee was advised that Tower Hamlets and Islington had undertaken similar reviews and made recommendations in a number of areas that the Committee may want to consider:

- a. An ageing building control workforce and the need for more staff in this area.
- b. The retrofitting of sprinklers.
- c. Leaseholder fitting of fire doors.
- d. Fire safety and how best to support vulnerable residents.
- e. Publishing fire safety assessments for high risk buildings.
- f. How best to communicate with residents, especially over the 'stay put' policy.
- g. Processes for advancing recommendations from residents.
- h. HMO's and the fire safety risks involved.

The Committee agreed to undertake some further evidence gathering work in December. The Committee would also consider the recommendations of the Hackitt Report when they came out in January. Officers would send round dates for further evidence gathering sessions outside of the meeting. **(Action: Rob Mack).**

RESOLVED

- I. That the report on progress and evidence received to date be noted; and
- II. That the Committee considered potential interim findings and recommendations.

29. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Committee considered a report which sought approval of the work plans for 2018-20 for the Committee and the Panels. The report was introduced by Rob Mack, Principal Scrutiny Officer. The Committee noted that there were minor amendments to be made to the published document.

RESOLVED

- I. That the work plans for the Committee and panels for 2018-20, including the scopes and terms of references for the reviews on the Wards Corner Regeneration and Day Opportunities, be approved; and
- II. That further reports on progress with the work plans be submitted to each future meeting of the Committee.

30. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

The Committee received a report which set out the draft revised Statement of Gambling Policy. The report was introduced by the Lead Licensing Officer, Daliah

Barrett. The Committee was advised that there was a requirement to review the Council's Statement of Gambling Policy every three years. The current policy was adopted in January 2016 and was therefore due for review. The report sought comments from the Committee on the draft policy that was currently under public consultation. The following arose in discussion of the report:

- a. In response to a question around ASB and whether the Council could rescind a licence, officers advised that there was a formal process in place to review a licence if there was evidence that a premises was not upholding the objectives of the Gambling Act 2005. The Lead Licencing Officer advised that the operators tended to be very proactive in reporting ASB, as it was detrimental to their business. The Committee was advised that there was a very active Bet Watch scheme in place in Tottenham.
- b. The Committee enquired whether there was any way of asking for voluntary contributions from the betting operators to tackle ASB. In response, officers advised that there was no provision in the Act to allow the authority to ask for voluntary contributions. The betting industry did make voluntary contributions to GamCare schemes.
- c. In response to a question, the Committee was advised that the Gambling Act did not allow the authority to take demand into consideration nor the number of existing premises in a particular location. Unlike the Licensing Act 2003, the Gambling Act 2005 did not allow ASB as a material consideration.
- d. In response to a question about the number of licensing reviews undertaken, officers advised that, so far, they had never had to get to the stage of reviewing a licence. Instead, all problems had been resolved through mediation between officers and individual premises. In response to a follow up question, officers advised that there had been cases in other local authorities where licences had been revoked for issues such as drug dealing taking place on the premises.
- e. In response to a question around problem gamblers, the Committee were advised that the industry used a self-exclusion process.
- f. The Committee sought information around the impact of betting shops on homelessness. The Lead Licensing Officer agreed to raise the issue with the Association of Betting Shops and get back to OSC. **(Action Daliah Barrett)**.
- g. Officers agreed to circulate a previous Scrutiny Review undertaken around the clustering of Betting Shops to the Committee. **(Action Rob Mack)**.

RESOLVED

The Committee reviewed the draft Statement of Gambling Policy and provided comments on the policy for recommendation onto the Cabinet and then Full Council for adoption.

31. FUTURE MEETINGS

14 January 2018
28 January 2018
25 March 2018

Action List

Date of Meeting	Action	Owner	Status
19 th November	Panel Chairs to pick up outstanding actions from Panel Minutes.	Panel Chairs	Ongoing
19 th November	Further information requested around scheme with British Library.	Steve Carr	Ongoing
19 th November	Briefing requested on how the Council supported local businesses.	Steve Carr	Ongoing
19 th November	A paper on town centre managers requested a future Committee meeting.	Helen Fisher	Ongoing
19 th November	Briefing requested around how the Council supported local apprenticeship schemes.	Steve Carr	Ongoing
19 th November	Further information requested around what was an acceptable level of litter.	Charlotte Pomery	Ongoing
19 th November	Further information requested on the fact that 20% of Council tenants seemingly lived in non-decent homes.	Charlotte Pomery	Ongoing
19 th November	Send round the information from the Haringey Stat meeting on youth violence.	Charlotte Pomery	Ongoing
19 th November	Come back with details on the response rate for the Residents Survey.	Charlotte Pomery	Ongoing
19 th November	Panel to pick up need for coordination between the CCG and Council on savings.	Cllr Connor / Cllr Berryman	Ongoing
19 th November	Formal quarterly performance briefings for OSC Members to pick up key risks and likely cost impact.	Charlotte Pomery	Ongoing
19 th November	Updated budget scrutiny timetable to be circulated.	Jon Warlow	Complete.
19 th November	Budget documents to include information around risk modelling and the impact of proposed savings on service delivery.	Jon Warlow	Complete.
19 th November	Feedback figures on the staff churn rate.	Richard Grice	Complete.
19 th November	Dates for further fire safety evidence gathering sessions to be circulated.	Rob Mack	Complete.
19 th November	Feedback requested on link between homelessness and betting shop proliferation	Daliah Barrett	Complete.
19 th November	Circulate review on clustering of betting shops.	Rob Mack	
2 nd 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	Cllr Demir	Ongoing
2 nd October	Adults and Health Panel would monitor the development of a co-design approach as part of its work programme.	Cllr Connor	Ongoing
2 nd October	Additional information session around financial outturn process to be set up.	Cllr Das Neves	Ongoing
2 nd October	Quarter 2 Budget Monitoring report to include information around the feasibility of savings and risks of non-delivery.	Jon Warlow	Ongoing

2 nd October	Head of Organisational resilience agreed to brief Councillors on the role of Members in an emergency incident.	Andrew Meek	Outstanding
----------------------------	--	-------------	-------------

CHAIR: Councillor Lucia das Neves

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

8. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

A deputation had been received from the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association, in relation to item 9 of the Agenda – Broadwater Farm.

Mr Jacob Secker, Secretary for the Broadwater Farm Resident's Association, was invited by the Leader to put forward his deputation to Cabinet.

Mr Secker was speaking as the representative of the Association, and Tangmere block resident with right of return, and introduced fellow deputation party members, Archbishop Frimpong who was a previous tenant at Tangmere with right of return, and Alan Goodall who was a resident at Northolt block.

Mr Secker began his representation by reiterating that the Association was demanding a ballot under Greater London Authority (GLA) rules for Tangmere and Northolt residents. He contended that this ballot should be on the question of whether the estate blocks should be strengthened or demolished and rebuilt. The Association felt that without the ballot, there could be no guarantee that the Council would abide by its commitment to re-provide the same number of Council homes at Council rent.

Mr Secker had observed in the consultation forms, a clearly stated commitment to residents of an equal number of Council homes at Council rent with more family sized accommodation for Northolt Block. However, Mr Secker argued this commitment for provision of an equal number of homes was not included in the report presented to Cabinet. The report advised at paragraph 6.61 that 'any' Council homes demolished would be re-provided, and the deputation felt that the term 'any' could be open to interpretation and called for the report be amended. There was a need make clear that the number of homes demolished would be equally re-provided otherwise this would make the consultation null and void.

With regard to Northolt, Mr Secker claimed that residents had been informed, in the consultation documentation, that when they were moved into a new home, if they did not like it then they would be allowed to request a move to another home. This commitment was also not included in the report and Mr Secker argued that if this commitment was also not adhered to, then the consultation would be deemed invalid.

Mr Secker continued to reiterate the importance of the ballot as the deputation party felt without this process there was no guarantee for residents that promises about re-provision of homes at Council rents would not be kept to.

Mr Secker conceded that, in the context of tower block safety across London, the safety issues with the blocks at Broadwater Farm was a relatively serious safety issue. He re-iterated that GLA rules stipulated that where there were reasonable alternative solutions to demolition, then there had to be a ballot. Mr Secker noted the Council's own surveyors stated the blocks could be strengthened, demonstrating there was a reasonable alternative to demolition, in his view, cheaper than the demolition, therefore, meeting the requirements of a ballot.

Mr Secker concluded his deputation by asserting that the reason the Council were not balloting residents was because there was not the intention to stick to its promises made during consultation with residents.

Following the deputation, the Leader invited Cabinet Members to ask questions.

Cllr Adje thanked the deputation and disputed their view that the report was not clear on equal numbers of re- provided Council homes. He referred to the report which stated at paragraph 6.61 – *'The Council was committed to replacing any Council homes which were demolished with new Council homes on the estate'*. Mr Secker reiterated that the use of the word *'any'* was ambiguous and could mean any number of homes instead of the equal number of Council homes to those that were demolished.

The Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal responded to the deputation and stressed that the fundamental concern of the Council was for the safety of the residents at Tangmere and Northolt and they had always been the priority. The Cabinet Member made the following points:

- Disputed Mr Secker's claim that the safety concerns were 'relative' and advised they were serious, especially in the aftermath of Grenfell. It was not appropriate to discuss level of concern that should be attributed to the safety of the blocks but accept the seriousness and duty to safeguard tenants and leaseholders in the two blocks.
- There were current mitigations in place to ensure the tenants were safe at Tangmere and Northolt but these were not long term sustainable solutions and the Council therefore needed to make a decision about how to resolve the serious structural issues at the two blocks. Other blocks on Broadwater Farm had been assessed and were being strengthened but this was not considered a reasonable option for Tangmere or Northolt.
- In June 2018, Cabinet considered the options available to it, decided that rebuilding the blocks would be the most suitable option, and consulted tenants with this preferred option put forward. There had been a significant response from residents, with 90% of those replying from Tangmere agreeing with the proposal and 80% of those replying from Northolt agreeing with the proposal.
- The report before Cabinet at this meeting recommended agreeing to demolish the Tangmere and Northolt blocks.
- An earlier Cabinet report made clear the Council's guarantee to rebuild the same number of social rent tenancies following the demolition of the two blocks.

- The wording of the report would be changed so that ‘any’ at paragraph 6.61 became ‘all’ so that there was no doubt that all homes demolished, as part of this decision, would be replaced with the same number of Council rented tenancies, on the same terms. Every resident is guaranteed his or her right of return to the estate **when** the blocks were rebuilt.
- In terms of the funding, the Council had provisionally allocated part of the GLA Building Council Homes for Londoners funding allocation from the Mayor to rebuild the blocks. Due to the safety issues of the block, there was an urgent need to rehouse residents of Tangmere before the Cadent deadline. To complete a compliant ballot would have taken time, which was not available given the safety issue concerns. The Council were in discussion with the GLA for the application of an exemption and continue to work with them.
- Irrespective of any exemption granted by the GLA, and based on Council policy, there was always a commitment to holding a ballot as part of the engagement undertaken on the next phase of work, which would be developing proposals for the new homes on the estate. This ballot would be of residents across the whole Broadwater Farm estate, including those former tenants of Tangmere and Northolt who have relocated as a result of the issues discovered.

The Cabinet Member further confirmed that all of the existing social rented Council homes on the Broadwater Farm estate would be replaced.

The Leader thanked the deputation party at which point Archbishop Frimpong responded to note that he had full confidence in the Cabinet to keep their commitments. Cabinet continued to consider the Cabinet report on Broadwater Farm.

9. BROADWATER FARM

Following the deputation, the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal formally introduced the report on Broadwater Farm. The Cabinet Member informed the meeting that once the structural issues became known, substantial work had been done across the estate to ensure the safety of residents. The nine medium rise blocks had had their individual gas supplies removed with heating and hot water provided initially by temporary oil fired boilers.

The Cabinet Member continued to outline that all these blocks would be connected to a modern district energy network by summer 2019, at a cost of £13m. In addition, strengthening and refurbishment works were being designed for the medium-rise blocks on Broadwater Farm. Kenley Tower, which passed the required safety tests, would also receive upgrade works, including new heating and hot water systems and associated works.

The Cabinet Member reminded the meeting of the purpose of the attached report, arising from the fact that two of the blocks on Broadwater Farm – Tangmere and Northolt - had failed the lower of the safety tests for buildings of their type. In June

Cabinet had taken a number of difficult decisions about the future of these two blocks. At that meeting Cabinet had considered the options available to address the structural issues affecting Tangmere and Northolt. All the options would have required residents to be rehoused from the two blocks so there had been no option for the residents to remain in their homes.

The rehousing of Tangmere residents had been more urgent due to the deadline for gas to be removed from all the blocks on Broadwater Farm. The process of rehousing Northolt residents has not started as this block did not have piped gas.

At its meeting in June Cabinet assessed that the strengthening works required to make the blocks safe were prohibitively expensive and did not represent value for money when compared to the other options. Consideration was also given to the type of building in question and its likely life span even if strengthening works were carried out.

Having considered the options in June, Cabinet decided that its preferred option was to demolish Tangmere and Northolt and then to build new, high quality replacement Council homes on Broadwater Farm. Consequently, residents had been consulted on this preferred option, and the results of the consultation for both blocks was that a very clear majority of residents agreed with the Council's proposal. This was 90% of residents in Tangmere and 80% of residents in Northolt in favour of this preferred option.

The Cabinet Member further informed Cabinet of the need to approve a rehousing policy setting out its commitment to the residents of these two blocks. This included a guaranteed right to return for Tangmere and Northolt tenants to the new homes when they were built. If Cabinet agreed the recommendations in the attached report, more detailed work would start on the proposals for the new homes and this would be done in consultation with residents of the estate.

The Cabinet Member acknowledged the decision to demolish Tangmere and Northolt was not an easy decision given some residents had been living in their homes for a number of years. However, it was clear that a large majority of those residents consulted at the two blocks supported the decision.

The Cabinet Member further put forward an amendment to the Rehousing and Payments Policy to ensure the wording of the policy properly reflected the Council's aims, following feedback from tenants. This amendment was to make clear that all tenants who move out of Tangmere or Northolt under the Policy or the Tangmere Priority Rehousing Scheme will be eligible for a second transfer with Band A priority following their first move out of the block. This would be regardless of whether their first move was through choice based lettings or through a direct offer, and this second move can be made at any time until either the tenant was offered one of the new replacement homes on the estate or s/he decides s/he does not wish to return.

The Cabinet Member sought agreement from Cabinet colleagues for an additional recommendation to delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and

planning to amend the Rehousing and Payments Policy to allow all tenants to have second moves as set out above.

Following questions from Cllrs Berryman & Brabazon, the following information was noted:

- That paragraph 6.61 would be amended by replacing the word, '*any*' with '*all*'.
- The Cabinet Member and officers had advised the BWF residents Association, a few months ago, of the Council's application to the GLA for an exemption from the requirement to ballot.
- In reference to a ballot noted at paragraph 6.62 and whether this was the same (GLA) ballot that had been mentioned by the deputation, the Cabinet Member confirmed it was a different ballot. Due to the health and safety concerns, the situation in Tangmere and Northolt was pressing and there was not enough time to work with residents to prepare a redevelopment plan, and ballot residents on it, before taking a decision about whether to demolish the blocks. When the Council had such a plan for the rebuild, it was the intention to ballot the whole estate.

Following questions from Cllr Barnes, the following was noted:

- As soon as the Cabinet became aware of the serious structural risks posed by Tangmere and Northolt, they had acted swiftly and decisively to ensure the safety of its tenants. The Cabinet Member emphasised that Cabinet were not aware of any pre-existing concerns about the structural integrity of the tower blocks from the 1970s. If it was suggested that the Council knew of these structural issues then this was a fundamentally different question to the report in consideration, and would need to be explored. The Cabinet Member had no reason to believe that the Council knew of these structural issues from the 1970's.
- If future proposed plans were rejected in a ballot, the Cabinet Member advised that the Council would need to consider what to do next at that stage but it was clear that proposals could only be progressed when a ballot was successful.
- The remaining properties at Broadwater Farm were due to have refurbishment works and would also be connected to the new district heating network. The Cabinet Member acknowledged that it would be a challenging time for residents in the next few years. However, there was a need to make sure the work was carried out to bring the homes back up to standard. Officers further clarified that the medium-rise blocks were due to have strengthening works completed and this provided the opportunity to complete long overdue internal improvement works.
- It was further clarified that the future ballot would be a ballot of the whole estate and would entail prior conversations with residents living on the whole estate (including those who had moved out of Tangmere and Northolt because of the problems). Therefore it was not prudent, at this stage, to

speculate on a potential outcome to the ballot but have full discussions with residents beforehand.

The Leader highlighted the additional recommendation put forward by the Cabinet Member for Housing & estate renewal at paragraph 9 above,

RESOLVED

1. To note and considers the outcome of the consultation carried out with Council tenants living in Tangmere pursuant to section 105 of the Housing Act 1985, and the non-statutory consultation with the Council leaseholders of Tangmere, as summarised in section 6.20 – 6.26 of this report and set out in detail in appendix 1.
2. Having regard to the results of this consultation, to agree that Tangmere should be demolished and authorises the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to serve the initial demolition notice on the secure tenants of Tangmere and to decide the timing of any final demolition notice that needs to be served.
3. To note and considers the outcome of the consultation carried out with Council tenants living in Northolt pursuant to section 105 of the Housing Act 1985, and the non-statutory consultation with the Council leaseholders of Northolt, as summarised in section 6.27 – 6.33 of this report and set out in detail in appendix 1.
4. Having regard to the results of this consultation, to agree that Northolt should be demolished and authorises the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to serve the initial demolition notice on the secure tenants of Northolt and to decide the timing of any final demolition notice that needs to be served.
5. Having considered the results of the consultation on the Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy as set out in section 6.40, to approve the final Broadwater Farm Rehousing and Payments Policy attached at appendix 2.
6. Having considered the results of the consultation on the Broadwater Farm Local Lettings Policy as set out in section 6.52, to approve the Local Lettings Policy attached at appendix 3.
7. To agree that the rehousing of tenants and leaseholders from Northolt should commence as soon as practicable, and delegates authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to determine the exact date that the rehousing of Northolt commences. The rehousing will be carried out under the Rehousing and Payments Policy recommended to Cabinet in 3.5 above.
8. To approve as required by Section 1 – Financial Regulations paragraph 5.23 (b) within the Housing Revenue Account a virement of £1.2m from the HRA

Building Regulations Review budget to a new budget 'Northolt Rehousing Costs'.

9. To delegate authority to the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning to amend the Rehousing and Payments Policy to allow all tenants who moved out of Tangmere and Northolt under the Policy or the Tangmere Priority Rehousing Scheme to be eligible for a second transfer with Band A priority following their first move out of the block. This would be regardless of whether their first move was through choice based lettings or through a direct offer, and this second move could be made at any time until either the tenant was offered one of the new replacement homes on the estate or he/she decides he/she does not wish to return.

Reason for decision

The Council has identified risks in a number of blocks on Broadwater Farm. Surveys have identified that Tangmere and Northolt have failed both the tests relating to Large Panel System (LPS) buildings, which means that there is a risk of progressive collapse caused by a force equivalent to a vehicle strike or bottled gas explosion. These risks have been mitigated through the introduction of measures set out in section six of this report, including:

- In Tangmere, which has piped gas, the replacement of gas cookers with electric cookers and the installation of gas interrupter valves, which will switch off the gas if a leak is detected. Northolt does not have piped gas.
- In both Tangmere and Northolt, a 24-hour concierge and a programme of home visits to reduce the risk that items such as bottled gas are taken into the building.

These mitigations reduce the risks, but do not remove them entirely. Further decisions are needed on how to address the structural problems identified in both blocks so that there is no risk of progressive collapse. In June Cabinet agreed, having considered the options that its preferred option was to demolish both blocks and replace them with high quality, new Council homes built on the estate. It further agreed that officers should consult residents of Tangmere and Northolt on the options for both blocks. This consultation took place between 12 September and 10 October and in the case of Council tenants was a statutory consultation under section 105 of the Housing Act 1985. The results of the consultation are set in sections 6.18 to 6.33 of this report, and show clear support for the Council's preferred option. Cabinet can therefore now make a decision on the future of both blocks in light of the results of the consultation alongside consideration of the technical and financial information presented in this report and the report to Cabinet of 26th June.

Because the Council was already aware of the requirement to rehouse residents of both Tangmere and Northolt (as all options to address the structural issues required each building to be emptied), in June Cabinet also agreed a draft Rehousing and Payments Policy for consultation. This consultation has now taken place, and a final

Rehousing and Payments Policy is presented for approval. The key commitments of the policy include:

- Guaranteed rights of return to the estate for all Council tenants and resident leaseholders who need to move out of Tangmere or Northolt.
- This includes a right to return to new build homes on the estate when they are built.
- Equity loans for resident leaseholders, to enable them to buy a new home in the borough with financial assistance from the Council.

In order to give residents who move out of Tangmere and Northolt the ability to return to Broadwater Farm more quickly if they want to, it is also proposed that a Local Lettings Policy is adopted. This will prioritise future lets on Broadwater Farm to these residents. The Council consulted on this proposed policy, and found clear support.

If Cabinet agrees that one or both blocks should be demolished, then demolition notices under Sections 138A and 138B of the Housing Act 1985 will need to be served on the secure tenants in those blocks.

Alternative options considered

The alternative options for rectifying the structural defects in Tangmere and Northolt were considered in detail in the report considered by Cabinet in June, and were explained in the consultation with residents.

Doing nothing is not an option, as both blocks have failed structural tests. The risks posed by the structural defects have been mitigated, but the blocks cannot remain occupied long-term as they are.

The main alternative option considered was to carry out major strengthening works to both blocks. Retrospective strengthening works would require the joints where walls, floors and ceilings meet to be strengthened. Windows would need to be removed to allow the strengthening materials to be fitted. The cost of these works to Tangmere is estimated at £13m while the cost of these works to Northolt is estimated at £12.5m. The works cannot be done while the residents remain in occupation.

In June, Cabinet decided, having considered the technical feasibility and the cost of the strengthening work that its preferred option is to demolish both blocks and replace them with high quality, new Council homes built on the estate. The consultation shows that a clear majority of residents agree with the Council's proposals.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY, 8TH NOVEMBER, 2018, 7.00 - 8.40 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Mahir Demir (Chair), Tammy Palmer, Dana Carlin, James Chiriyankandath, Julie Davies and Justin Hinchcliffe

12. 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'.

13. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Dixon and Cllr Moyeed. Cllr Hinchcliffe was attending the meeting as a substitute for Cllr Dixon.

14. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

16. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

17. MINUTES

In relation to item 7 (Service Overview & Performance Update) of the minutes of the previous meeting, Cllr Davies asked about unusual patterns in the recent SATs results. Eveleen Riordan, Assistant Director for Schools and Learning said that some initial analysis had been done and discussions were ongoing with the Haringey Education Partnership which will be prioritising schools where there are concerns. Asked whether there was a report about the school that had its SATs results annulled,

Eveleen Riordan said that the Harris Federation had commissioned an independent inquiry. The Council would ask the Harris Federation to share their findings. **(ACTION – Eveleen Riordan)**

AGREED: That the minutes of the Children & Young People’s Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 6th September 2018 be approved as an accurate record.

18. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Cllr Elin Weston, Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families, responded to questions on the following issues:

- With regards to reported financial difficulties at the Octagon AP Academy, Haringey Council’s current contract with the Octagon is due to end in August 2019 and so a review of how that contract has performed and options for the future is already underway, though this is not due to any specific concerns. This review was expected to be completed rapidly and officers have liaising with the new head of the Octagon, Connery Wiltshire. The Panel recommended that the Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Families should write to the TBAP Multi-Academy Trust expressing concerns about possible disruption to the education of pupils and a willingness of the local authority to explore taking provision of the services back in-house if TBAP is unable to provide adequate services themselves. Cllr Weston agreed to write a letter on this basis and also suggested that she provide the Panel with an update on the contract review in February 2019.
- That no update regarding the Ofsted inspection was available but the report was expected to be published in the first half of December.

AGREED: That Cllr Weston should write to TBAP Multi-Academy Trust on the terms outlined above and provide an update on the contract review to the Panel in February 2019.

19. PRIORITY 1 BUDGET POSITION (QUARTER 1 2018/19)

Paul Durrant, Senior Business Partner, introduced the report on the budget position for Priority 1 of the Corporate Plan for Quarter 1 of 2018/19. On the Revenue Budget there was a projected overspend of just under £4.9m. The largest cause of this was on Safeguarding and Social Care where there was a projected overspend of £3.6m. Of this:

- £2.3m was attributed to Local After Children (LAC) External Placements. Although the overall number of children in care had not risen, the number of high cost placements had gone up. Pressures on the budget to make savings had also been a contributory factor.
- £0.8m was attributed to The Young Adult Service, mainly due to the new duty on local authorities to support care leavers up to the age of 25 rather than 21.

- £0.6m was due to the use of agency staff which are generally more expensive than permanent employees.
- £0.4m was due to costs associated with No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) cases.
- There was one area of underspend, forecast to be £0.4m, due to lower than expected numbers of in-house foster carers.

The next most significant cause was on Prevention and Early Intervention where there was a projected overspend of £1.2m. Of this:

- £0.2m was attributed to Children Centres as the service has been unable to achieve the income generation through fees that had been expected.
- £0.6m was attributed to the Special Education Needs Service, mainly due to the statutory duty to provide transport for those over 19 years old.
- £0.3m was attributed to the Family Support service, mainly due to an increase in demand for respite.
- £0.2m was attributed to the Inclusion Service, mainly due to an unachievable savings target.

In response to questions from the Panel, Cllr Weston, Sarah Alexander, Ann Graham and Paul Durrant said:

- While the agency staff rate was higher than was desirable, Haringey was not unique in this respect as it is a national issue and some boroughs have higher rates. A lot of work had been done with Haringey's recruitment partners, Hays, to try and improve recruitment and retention. However, some people are choosing to use agencies as a method of working. Also, some positions are hard to recruit to and are particularly affected by caseload levels. Officers are doing what they can to make Haringey an attractive place to work and to persuade agency staff to become permanent members of staff, including through golden handshakes, but there was more that could be done such as raising the quality of practice.
- On the External Placements budget, there were a total of 40 young people in residential care at present with a range of placements used across the country, sometimes because specialist support is required which is only available in certain areas and sometimes because of safety concerns. However, the Council tries to keep children within the M25 area where possible. The average weekly cost of residential care placements for children was currently estimated to be £3,500.
- In relation to the overall overspend in Children's Services, Haringey is not an outlier as there are similar, if not larger, overspends elsewhere as there are national factors at play. The LGA had predicted a national deficit of £2bn from what Children's Services need and what was being provided by the government and a recent BBC report had indicated that demands on Children's Services had increased by 78% over the past 10 years.
- Asked about the current number of NRPF cases and the precise budget figures on this, further details would be provided to the panel in writing (**ACTION: Sarah Alexander and Paul Durrant**). Cllr Carlin said that she understood that

there was no longer a Home Office member of staff within the NRPF which she welcomed.

- That there is a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with other local authorities that Haringey is a signatory to which agrees not to pay agency staff over a certain rate.
- On the application for funding to the Young Londoners Fund no announcement had yet been made.
- The cost of transport (for the Special Educational Needs service) was complex as costs vary according to where placements are and the length of routes that were therefore commissioned. Other factors included the recently expanded age range and that a local transport provider had recently gone bust. Efforts were being made to keep expenditure in this area down but the overall cost had increased.

AGREED: That the report be noted.

20. HARINGEY LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD: THE TRANSITION TO NEW SAFEGUARDING PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS

Sarah Alexander, Assistant Director for Safeguarding and Social Care, introduced the report on the Haringey Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) which is the multi-agency partnership board that looks at safeguarding at a strategic level. New arrangements for the LSCB were being implemented on the basis of the new Working Together to Safeguard Children 2018 guidance. The new guidance incorporated recommendations from the 2016 Alan Wood Review which had concluded that there were deficiencies in the LSCB system. The new arrangements will involve three statutory safeguarding partners – the CCG, the Borough Commander and the local authority. The statutory partners are required to set out their local arrangements by 29th September 2019 so a lot of transition work was ongoing to achieve this.

In response to questions from the panel, Sarah Alexander and Ann Graham, Director of Children's Services, said that:

- the Council will be an equal partner with the other two statutory partners under the new arrangements, so accountability is moving from the Council alone to a shared responsibility.
- arrangements for the Designated Officer (previously known as the Local Authority Designated Officer or 'LADO') will remain the same and stay within the local authority.
- the new partnership will have to set out their arrangements for auditing.
- the day to day arrangements will not change during the transition period – the main changes are to the strategic approach which are aimed at improving accountability.

AGREED: That the report be noted.

21. JOINT TARGETED AREA INSPECTION (JTAI) ACTION PLAN - UPDATE

Sarah Alexander introduced the report on the December 2017 Joint Targeted Area Inspection (JTAI) the subject of which was the response of statutory safeguarding partners to children aged 7 to 15 who had been neglected. The inspectors provided a non-judgment inspection finding, highlighting areas where improvements could be made. Partners were then required to respond to the findings including through the publication of an action plan. This plan had led to improvements in areas such as the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) and in training for partners.

Asked whether there was data on neglected children by ward, Sarah Alexander confirmed that neglect was a bigger issue in the east of the Borough. Ann Graham said that it may be possible to produce some data but it would most likely illustrate levels of poverty, which is closely related to neglect. **(ACTION POINT: Ann Graham/Sarah Alexander)**

AGREED: That the report be noted.

22. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Dominic O'Brien, Principal Scrutiny Officer, set out the background of the Work Programme for the Panel which had been assembled following the 'Scrutiny Café' stakeholder event in September and included several possible scrutiny review projects and a number of one-off items for the panel meetings in 2018/19 and 2019/20.

After a short discussion the panel proposed to conduct their first scrutiny review on children with special education needs. This would be likely to examine the journey of getting help from the local authority including the assessment, diagnosis and services provided, including looking at blockages in the system and the support available for families going through the process. However, the full details of the terms of reference would be developed in discussions between the Chair and the panel scrutiny officer, in consultation with the other panel members.

The panel also proposed to carry out a scrutiny review on alternative provision.

AGREED: That scrutiny reviews on Special Educational Needs and on alternative provision be added to the panel's Work Programme.

23. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

24. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meetings of the Children & Young People's scrutiny panel are scheduled to take place on:

- 18th December 2018
- 4th February 2019
- 19th March 2019

CHAIR: Councillor Mahir Demir

Signed by Chair

Date

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY 16TH OCTOBER 2018

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Scott Emery, Adam Jogee (Chair), Julia Ogiehor, Reg Rice,
Matt White and Barbara Blake**

**Co-opted Member: Ian Sygrave (Haringey Association of Neighbourhood
Watches)**

27. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda Item 1 in respect of filming at the meeting. Members noted the information contained therein.

28. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

29. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

30. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

31. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

None.

32. MINUTES

In respect of item 21 (Cabinet Member Questions: Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety and Engagement), it was noted the Panel had requested further information regarding the “Big Conversation” with young people from the Cabinet Member. It was agreed that an update would be requested on this.

Mr Sygrave reported that the Panel was still awaiting a breakdown of Local Implementation Plan (LIP) funding, which it requested at its meeting on 31st January in response to the item on the Transport Strategy. In addition, the Panel had also requested details of the outcome of the review of CS1 as part of the discussion on the update of the implementation of the recommendations of the review of cycling. This was in response to concerns that had been expressed regarding an island bus stop on

the route which required people getting off buses to walk across the cycle lane. David Murray, Interim Assistant Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods, reported that the breakdown of LIP funding had recently been completed.

AGREED:

1. That the above-mentioned outstanding actions be followed up and responses circulated to Members of the Panel ahead of the next meeting; and
2. That the minutes of the meeting of 13 September 2018 be approved.

33. POLICE PRIORITIES AND UPDATE ON STOP AND SEARCH AND ILLEGAL FIREARM DISCHARGES.

The Panel welcome Helen Millichap, the Police Borough Commander, and Inspector Neil Billaney.

Ms Millichap reported on the policing priorities that had been set for Haringey. The Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) had specified that all boroughs would have sexual violence, domestic abuse, child sexual exploitation, weapon-based crime and hate crime as priorities as well as anti-social behaviour. In addition, local priorities of robbery and non-domestic violence with injury had also been set. Violence with injury and robbery had increased across the Metropolitan Police area. They had now both plateaued in Haringey and, in addition, the number of knife injury victims had seen a sustained decrease in the past year.

In answer to a question regarding what had led to these decreases, she stated that the borough had bid successfully for additional resources. Assistance from the Territorial Support Group had been obtained who had adopted a specific focus on Stop and Search. In addition, the Metropolitan wide Violent Crime Task Force had been active and this had included plain clothes officers targeting habitual knife carriers. Diversionary activities that had taken place over the summer had also appeared to have had an impact. In answer to another question, she stated that it was difficult to determine whether incidents involved schoolchildren or were gang related. It was estimated that about half of gun crime was related to gangs and slightly less than half of knife crime. There were now Police officers linked to all secondary schools within Haringey. In addition, the MOPAC had offered knife wands to all schools in London.

In answer to a question, Mr Billaney stated that it was acknowledged that there were limitations to the effectiveness of knife wands and arches as knives could be concealed elsewhere if it was known that they were going to be used. Wands could be used on a random basis, making their use more difficult to anticipate. Wands and arches also had an educational function. The Borough Commander commented that no single tactic was effective on its own. It was most important to influence young people at an early stage, before they began carrying a knife. She agreed to find out which schools had knife wands or arches and pass this information onto the Panel.

Sandeep Broca, Intelligence Analyst, outlined current statistics for illegal firearm discharges and stop and search. There had been a 15% increase in the past year but

this was slightly lower than the London average. There had been 38 discharges, which constituted one in ten within the capital. Haringey had the second highest number in London. The increase was nevertheless slowing down. Incidents tended to be clustered in the east of the borough.

He reported that there had been approximately 5,500 stop and searches in the previous year, which was the eighth highest number in London. The number had declined by 2%. The largest number of stops were for drugs. This was 55% and similar to the London average. The outcome of searches was also very similar to the London average, with 71% resulting in no further action. The rate of stops was 13 per 1,000 for people identified as white and 51 per 1,000 for people identified as black. The largest percentage of searches were carried out on young people between the ages of 15 and 19, where there were 107 per 1,000. This was higher than the London average of 83 per 1,000. The percentage of positive outcomes by demographic was broadly similar. In respect of Section 60 searches, where Police had special powers to search people in a defined area for a specific period of time, the Panel noted that 115 searches had taken place in the Duckett's Common area between January and August. The majority of these took place in April in response to a number of incidents.

In answer to a question, the Borough Commander stated that in 70% of searches in London, no further action was taken. This percentage had reduced in recent years as Police had got better at using stop and search effectively but she nevertheless wanted to see better figures. Its use also had a deterrent role though. It was important that stop and search was used fairly, was intelligence led and proportionate. She stated that the levels of diversity within the Police in London had changed and data was available to demonstrate this. The Commissioner was also still committed to maintaining a London focus in recruitment. However, the changed focus took time to fully filter through.

She stated that most London boroughs had seen an increase in Stop and Search. The numbers in Haringey had nevertheless reduced slightly and it was a challenge to maintain them at a high level. Officers were now wearing cameras on their bodies and these were proving to be a useful tool in ensuring that Stop and Search was deployed sensitively and effectively. She was not enthusiastic of the use of Section 60 searches as she felt that Police officers should be required to explain why searches were being undertaken. It was to be expected that Haringey would be in the top ten of boroughs for searches as this reflected the level of offences. Stop and Search hotspots correlated to crime hotspots.

In respect of firearm discharges, the Borough Commander reported that these did not mean that they were lethal. However, the outcome could still be serious. Mr Billaney commented that searches of young black men for drugs that yielded no outcome were a source of concern and efforts were being made to ensure that searches were evidence based. Videos of searches by officers were scrutinised to see how practice could be improved. He stated that he would like to see fewer searches for drugs and more for weapons. In particular, he felt that searches for cannabis could be divisive. The Panel noted that the terminology used to describe the outcome of searches was set centrally.

In answer to a question, she stated that the TSG had been used in Haringey on occasion. Local officers who were familiar with the area worked with them when they were deployed and efforts were made to ensure that they behaved appropriately. Most TSG officers had themselves been local officers. No local officers carried firearms.

Councillor Mark Blake, the Cabinet Member for Communities, Safety and Engagement, reported that the statistics did not convey the impact that Stop and Search could have in individual cases. Some children could be traumatised by the experience and the frequency with which some young people had been stopped was also an issue. The Panel noted that the number of violent offences in Haringey was still higher than in Enfield although the trajectory in Haringey was currently better.

In answer to a question, the Borough Commander stated that it was important that community relations were considered. The workforce of the Police was currently more diverse and reflective of the community. She felt that Police officers should not necessarily aim for the “easy pickings” such as young people smoking drugs as there was a danger of unnecessarily criminalising them. Action needed to be sensitive and proportionate. Stop and search was just one tactic that was used to address crime and disorder and its use was closely monitored. Research by the Godwin Law Foundation on the views of children and young people showed them to be in favour of the right people being stopped and apprehended. Early intervention was also important in addressing crime and actions such as the work that was undertaken in schools helped to develop good relationships with children and young people. The disproportionality that there was amongst those who were stopped was also reflected amongst victims of crime and perpetrators.

David Murray, Interim Assistant of Environment and Neighbourhoods, reported that the Council and its partners had noted the views of children and young people and efforts were being made to effect change at an earlier stage.

The Borough Commander stated that she was happy to speak to any young person who had had a negative experience of being stopped. In answer to a question, she stated that stop and search was monitored closely everywhere. Efforts were being made by the Police to establish a panel of young people to assist in monitoring within Haringey and, in particular, provide an element of challenge. She was happy to receive any suggestions regarding how this might be set up most effectively.

AGREED:

That the Borough Commander be requested to find out which schools have knife wands or arches and pass this information onto the Panel.

34. QUARTER 1 FINANCIAL REPORT FOR PRIORITY 3

Mr Murray reported that the projected overspend of £1 million had been reduced significantly. The bulk of the overspend in Commissioning and Client Services related to inflationary pressures within the Veolia contract and waste provision for Homes for Haringey (HfH) and action was being taken to mitigate these. There was also a dispute with Amey regarding the specification for the cleaning contract and action was

being taken to resolve this through arbitration. Parking income was under pressure as was funding for the maintenance and upkeep of parks. Staffing levels were extremely lean with no resilience built in. In addition, the Council was locked into a number of big contracts where there was little scope for manoeuvre.

In response to a question on the introduction of charges for bulky waste, he stated that there was not necessarily a link with fly tipping and removing them would not automatically lead to an improvement. He agreed to seek clarification of the figures for the projected shortfall in income as the report contained figures that appeared to be contradictory. Consideration was being given as to whether the targets were realistic. In respect of HfH, a service level agreement was being developed in order to resolve outstanding issues and provide greater clarity.

In respect of the development of Marsh Lane depot, the Panel noted that current proposals were for the construction were for a more modest building than previously had been planned and this had led to savings in the capital budget. Councillor Hearn, the Cabinet Member for Environment, agreed to circulate figures for the amended scheme.

Mr Murray reported that further consideration was being given to enforcement when houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) were the source of flytipping. In addition, how best to encourage landlords to behave responsibly was also being looked at. Licensing would be of assistance but would not be the solution to all problems. Specific consideration would be given to measures that had proved to be successful elsewhere.

The Cabinet Member reported that there would be discussions at Corporate Board on budget options and these would be put before Members. There was quite a large budget gap and this would need to be filled in order to achieve a legal budget. The budget for Environment was under particular threat and savings from it were not regarded as having the same human impact as other areas. Particular efforts were being made to maximise income but she felt that there was a need for a greater level of scepticism about targets.

In answer to a question, Mr Murray reported that there was a constructive relationship between the Council and Veolia. Stringent efforts were made to ensure value for money but it was important not to erode standards.

AGREED:

1. That the Interim Assistant Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods be requested to provide clarification of the shortfall in achieving income targets for the collection of bulky waste; and
2. That the Assistant Director of Planning be requested to provide a short briefing note for Panel Members on current plans for Council depot sites.

35. STREET CLEANSING, WASTE AND RECYCLING: CURRENT PERFORMANCE

Panel Members requested data on queueing times at waste and recycling facilities. It was felt that people were more likely to fly tip if it was difficult to use the Council's

facilities. Clarification on targets and definitions in respect of missed collections was also requested. Mr Murray stated that he would pass on the issues and aim to provide great clarity in future performance reports. He reported that efforts were being made to influence behaviour to reduce levels of waste and littering. One option that was being considered was to remove waste bins from some locations. However, there was no solution that was sufficient on its own.

Panel Members commented that jet washing of areas contaminated by fly tipping was not always entirely successful. The need for engagement with residents was also emphasised. Mr Murray stated that the service tried to learn lessons from what had been successful and what had not and were very keen to involve the local community in obtaining feedback.

36. CABINET MEMBER Q&A - CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT

Councillor Hearn, the Cabinet Member for Environment outlined key areas in her portfolio. She was concerned about the lack of money available for parks. She was keen to address littering and fly tipping by bringing about behaviour change and felt that this was an area where scrutiny could make a useful contribution to the development of policy. She was also prioritising work to reduce or remove the use of plastic and address air quality, for which specific funding had been obtained from the GLA.

In answer to a question, the Cabinet Member for Environment stated that it was regrettable that it had been necessary to close the Park View Depot Re-use and Recycle facility as part of budget cuts but there were no plans to open a new site for Tottenham.

In answer to a question on climate change, she stated that the greater use of solar power could make a contribution but a balance needed to be struck so that the promotion of cheap energy did not encourage greater use of it. In particular, she felt that there was a need to ensure that homes were energy efficient when refurbishments were taking place. She was also looking to increase the number of electric car charging points. In addition, work was being undertaken to encourage people to get out of their cars and walk or cycle through initiatives such as Liveable Streets.

In respect of fly tipping, the Panel commented that incentives could also be used to encourage responsible behaviour rather than just enforcement. There also needed to be simple and easy ways of enabling people to dispose of unwanted items. The Cabinet Member stated that she agreed with the use of incentives but there were still some people who it was necessary to pursue via enforcement action. There were websites such as Freecycle and charity shops that could also be used to dispose of goods and she would welcome alternatives being publicised.

In answer to a question, she stated that consideration was being given to increasing the monitoring of air quality. In respect of the Environmental Visual Audit (EVA) of Finsbury Park, it was agreed that details of this would be circulated to the Panel. In answer to another question, Mr Murray reported that the size of the parks maintenance team was being looked at to determine if it was sufficiently large.

Consideration was also being given to how standards of cleanliness could be improved as these were currently lower than those for streets.

AGREED:

That details of the outcome of the Environmental Visual Audit (EVA) of Finsbury Park be circulated to the Panel

37. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

AGREED:

1. That a further update on progress with the implementation of the Scrutiny Review on Cycling be added to the draft work plan; and
2. That, subject to the above, the draft work plan be agreed and submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 19 November for approval.

CHAIR: Councillor Adam Jogee

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ADULTS & HEALTH
SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY, 1ST NOVEMBER 2018,
6.30 - 9.25 pm**

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Pippa Connor (Chair), Nick da Costa, Mike Hakata,
Sarah James, Felicia Opoku, Sheila Peacock and Yvonne Say**

15. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from co-opted member, Helena Kania.

17. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Pippa Connor declared an interest by virtue of her membership of the Royal College of Nursing.

Cllr Pippa Connor declared an interest by virtue of her sister working as a GP in Tottenham.

19. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/ PRESENTATIONS/ QUESTIONS

Cllr Peray Ahmet, Cabinet Member for Adults & Health, provided a brief update to the panel on the following points:

- Budget planning and consultation was ongoing ahead of the next financial year, with adult social care services continuing to suffer from reductions to the budget of 40% since 2010 but the Council would do its utmost to protect the most vulnerable. Supporting vulnerable adults is a key objective of the new Borough Plan which is currently out for consultation.
- At the most recent Cabinet meeting [on October 9th], approval was given to plans for the acquisition of the freehold of the former health centre in Canning Crescent and to repurpose the building as a new multi-use mental health hub which will have 21 sheltered units and a crisis café.
- A meeting had been held last week on the redesign of adult social care.

- Plans were being developed to bring some of the closed day care centres back into use.
- Plans for a single homelessness hub had been approved at a previous Cabinet meeting.
- An “Understanding Adult Social Care” event was being held on 6th November at Tottenham Green leisure centre.

Cllr Ahmet and Charlotte Pomery, Assistant Director for Commissioning, responded to questions on the following issues:

- Options were being considered on future plans for OGNH. A co-design group chaired by Cllr Ahmet continues to meet and there is also a sub-group chaired by Gordon Peters. Representatives of the CCG attend these groups. It is anticipated that a decision on the future of OGNH would be made by Cabinet in March 2019 with the possible development process then taking approximately 18-24 months.
- On the possible reopening of day care centres, there was still a commitment to the Day Opportunities model and further discussions would take place on the future approach with the co-design groups but the main aim was to bring those assets back into use while following a needs-led approach. There was no timeline decided for this yet.

20. MINUTES

With regards to the minutes of the meeting held on 4th September 2018:

- Beverley Tarka, Director of Adults and Health, provided a performance update summary on Osborne Grove Nursing Home (OGNH) which was an action point from the previous meeting. She reported that:
 - There are a range of audits which identify how well the home is doing against the five CQC criteria including from the Council’s own Commissioning Quality Assurance team, the CCG and from external auditor Mazurs.
 - The OGNH Steering Group provides oversight and direction on areas including performance, safeguarding and the improvement plan.
 - Five safeguarding alerts had been raised in the last three months.
 - Improvement was required on fall risk assessments, recording of care given, mental health care including dementia, continence care, infection prevention/control, variety of activities and variety of menu.
 - Revised care plans were now in place, key worker arrangements had been implemented and a new clinical lead was in place.
 - The Mazurs audit had awarded a ‘substantial’ rating across a number of different areas including governance and staffing.
- In response to questions from members of the panel, Beverley Tarka said that:
 - The areas that required improvement, according to the Mazurs audit, were mainly operational practices such as the lack of a central operational manual, monitoring of staff claims and maintenance of the asset register.
 - The CQC report had highlighted issues with record keeping and there had been extensive monitoring and oversight to improve recording practice but there was still further room for improvement.
 - The Head of Operations, who directly line manages the registered manager at OGNH, has a place on the oversight committee.

- There is a service improvement plan and an ongoing programme of audit to address the issues of concern but there is no specific timeline for this as they relate to ongoing practice issues.
- In relation to whether the embargo on new residents at OGNH could be lifted, there had been a clear Cabinet decision in June to keep the existing residents there but not to admit any new residents.
- In relation to recent reported safeguarding alerts, it was not possible to provide the panel with additional information on this as this could be too easily identifiable due to the limited number of clients at OGNH.

AGREED: That the minutes of the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 4th September 2018 be approved as an accurate record.

21. HARINGEY SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD - ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18

Dr Adi Cooper, Independent Chair of the Haringey Safeguarding Adults Board presented the Board's annual report for 2017/18. The publication of an annual report is one of the three statutory duties that the Board has under the Care Act 2014 and it provides the opportunity to set out the Board's achievements, priorities and future improvements to the way that vulnerable people are safeguarded. Particular points highlighted by Dr Cooper included:

- That attendance at the Board is good and growing, now including representation from social housing providers and the local DWP.
- The Board has undertaken its first Safeguarding Adult Review (SAR) following the death of Robert which has been helpful in identifying areas for action, development and learning.
- The Board has started to do work across the North Central London (NCL) area to try to develop more aligned ways of working.

In response to questions from members of the panel, Dr Cooper, Beverley Tarka, Director of Adults and Health, John Everson, Assistant Director for Adults and Charlotte Pomery, Assistant Director for Commissioning said:

- That Homes for Haringey (HfH) are a member of the Board. There is not presently any representation from higher education providers but this would be worth exploring.
- With regards to the statement that over 60% of the Board's financing comes from Council (paragraph 1.9), the remainder of the funding comes from health and the police. There is never enough resources to do everything that the Board would like to do but there are conversations ongoing at national, regional and local levels about contributions from partners and about how to make the best use of the resources that are available.
- The SAR had been taken to the suicide prevention group which had been helpful although suicide prevention does not necessarily fit neatly into adult safeguarding.
- Processes put in place since the SAR mean that principal social workers now sit on the panels with housing colleagues in cases where vulnerabilities have been identified. This does not change HfH protocols but allows for knowledge on vulnerabilities to be explored as part of discussions as part of the learning from the SAR was that panel at the time didn't have full understanding of Robert's circumstances. An action plan for the SAR will include monitoring the embedding of new practices. Members with concerns about individual cases can raise these through Astrid Kjellberg-Obst, Executive Director of Operations at HfH.

- With regards to the outstanding action points on paragraph these were completed or ongoing as stated except for the one on staffing where there was a revised date although there had been some recent success in recruiting permanent staff to the vacant posts and the end was to complete this by the end of the year.
- The community alarm system (known as Lifeline) has its own operational performance information and so this was not included in the report but this information could be made available if required. Any safeguarding alerts originating from this system would be included within the report.
- The improvements to staff awareness about Making Safeguarding Personal (MSP) (paragraph 2.2.1) predominantly refers to Council staff although the expectation should be that staff from all partners would endeavour to work in this way. Evidencing that kind of data would likely require multi-agency case file audit work. The sub-group on quality assurance is developing a multi-agency audit tool which could help to collect this kind of data in future and further information is likely to be available in the next annual report.
- On the NCL learning event in Nov 2017 (paragraph 2.3), another event was planned this December so this was becoming an annual event and would help to improve joint strategic planning year on year across the sub-region.
- The delivery of safeguarding training (paragraph 2.4.1) in the care sector could be challenging because of the high turnover of staff but a lot of work with partners on workforce development was ongoing across the NCL area, including by developing portability of training between providers and maximising resources available to support training.
- There are aspirations to develop joint working with the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) through the action plan for this year. National changes around LSCBs are currently ongoing.
- On the low levels of MCA and DoLS training take-up at North Middlesex hospital (paragraph 3.4), Dr Cooper agreed to request an update be requested from North Middlesex and provide these details to the panel in due course. **(Action: Dr Adi Cooper)**
- Three advocacy services had recently been commissioned by the Council, one under the Childrens Act, one on mental health advocacy for adults and one under the Care Act for adults.
- It was difficult to obtain data on the types of abuse that occur within the home, officers agreed to check whether there was any data on this that could be provided. **(Action: Charlotte Pomery)**
- With regards to the demographic data in section 4 of the report, the reason that household income levels were not provided was because this was not included in the national returns and ward level data was not provided because the numbers were too small to be meaningful. The panel was concerned that information on social class was not available.

In summing up the panel's recommendations Cllr Connor commented that:

- A short summary capturing the key areas of the annual report would be useful next time given the length of the report.
- It would also be useful to receive information at the next annual report about process on the multi-agency case file audit tool.

- More information should be collected on safeguarding within the home setting and more training could be targeted at people that have access to vulnerable individuals within the home.
- Progress on joint working with the LSCB would be useful in next annual report.
- Information on ward data would be welcomed in the next annual report.
- Any additional learning from the membership of the DWP on the Board would be welcomed in the next annual report.

AGREED: That the Board's Annual Report for 2017/18 be noted with consideration to be given to the panel's aforementioned recommendations.

22. SUICIDE PREVENTION

Chantelle Fatania, Consultant in Public Health presented the update report on the Haringey Suicide Prevention Action Plan, supported by Professor David Mosse, Chair of the Haringey Suicide Prevention Group (HSPG), and Tim Miller, CCG commissioner for Mental Health.

Chantelle Fatania said that 55 people had died by suicide in Haringey between 2014 and 2016 representing a suicide rate of 10.3 per 100,000 people. This was the fifth highest in London and higher than the overall rate for England of 9.9 per 100,000 people. A 2016 audit of suicides in Haringey found that 75% of people of deaths were male, the highest rate being those aged 25-44, which is similar to national trends. 66% of deaths took place in the east of the borough.

The factors leading to suicide are often complex and a result of multiple factors so no one organisation is able to influence them all. A collaborative multi-agency approach to suicide prevention is therefore required and so the HSPG coordinates a range of local organisations to reduce risk factors and reinforce protective factors, particularly by providing social support to vulnerable people, raising awareness around suicide and supporting people who have been bereaved by suicide. The HSPG meets on a quarterly basis and the membership includes Haringey Public Health, the Clinical Commissioning Group, Metropolitan Police, Barnet Enfield Haringey Mental Health Trust, British Transport Police and local charities. The Haringey Suicide Prevention Action Plan uses the national Suicide Prevention Strategy for England's six "Areas for Action" framework as a best practice model. Actions within the plan include:

- A suicide prevention respite retreat provided by the Maytree charity supporting people in suicidal crisis in a non-medical setting.
- A psychiatric liaison service in the A&E department of North Middlesex Hospital, including peer support workers to support those in suicidal crisis.
- The Haringey well-being network led by the Mind charity which provides an integrated mental health support service.
- Mental health first aid training has been provided to over 200 front-line workers and residents in the last year.
- Suicide prevention fencing at Archway Bridge had recently been approved.

Professor David Mosse commented that, according to Public Health England guidelines the responsibility for local implementation of the national Suicide Prevention Strategy had been passed down to local authorities. While there was no mandatory requirement to do this, the recommendations were to establish a local suicide prevention plan, a local suicide prevention group and to carry out a suicide audit. This had happened in Haringey but what was different about the HSPG is that the lead is from within the community, hosted by Mind and with buy-in

from a wide range of organisation, both statutory and non-statutory. There was almost no financial backing from the local authority – a small amount of funding provided one member of staff for one day a week but the rest of the work is done on a voluntary basis. The HSPG has put together a business plan for suicide liaison service in the North Central London (NCL) area which would provide timely practical and emotional support for people who have been bereaved by suicide. This type of support is currently unavailable and there is a well evidenced business plan but no money had been made available. While the HSPG is providing an exemplary example of what the government expects through its national Suicide Prevention Strategy it is doing so with very little financial backing.

Responding to questions from the panel, Chantelle Fatania, Professor David Mosse and Tim Miller said:

- That the suicide data from coroners is a problem and that there is almost certainly a significant underestimation of the number of suicides in the official figures. The coroners' data also does not provide details on sexual orientation or ethnicity so there are no national figures on these. Without this data it is more difficult to identify communities in need of particular support.
- Participation from LGBT+ groups in Haringey with the HSPG would be welcomed.
- An app called Kooth, which provides online counselling and peer-to-peer support to 10-16 year olds, had been operational in other boroughs and had been shown to be effective.
- Recent analysis suggests that men working in the construction industry, many of whom are of eastern European origin, are at particularly high risk of suicide. Addressing this requires a multi-agency approach including buy-in from the construction industry. Cllr Connor agreed to raise this with the relevant Cabinet Members. **(Action - Cllr Connor)**
- Peer-supported Open Dialogue (POD) is being trialled in the south-east of Haringey. The principles of a person-first rather than diagnosis-first approach can be applied to primary care settings as well as in A&E settings.

Cllr Connor welcomed the presentations and agreed to take up the issue of suicide liaison service business plan with the Chair of the Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee for the NCL area, Cllr Alison Kelly. **(Action - Cllr Connor)**

Will Maimaris, Director of Public Health, commented that the issue of funding was a challenging one in the current circumstances but the suicide liaison service proposal and the Kooth app could both be looked at.

23. PRIORITY 2 BUDGET POSITION (QUARTER 1 - 2018/19)

John Everson, Assistant Director for Adults, introduced the report on the budget position for Priority 2 of the Corporate Plan for Quarter 1 of 2018/19 and made the following points:

- There were a number of projected overspends totalling £4.4m.
- £3.5m of the overspend related to adult care packages, £2.9m of which related to underlying care package pressures that were brought forward from the previous year and £0.6m of which related to planned savings that had not been delivered. £1.8m out of the £2.4m of planned savings had been met however and work would continue on attempting to deliver the remaining £0.6m.
- £0.7m of the overspend related to the increased costs relating to the ongoing situation at Osborne Grove Nursing Home.

- £0.1m of the overspend related to variance on commissioning costs.

Responding to questions from the panel, John Everson and Beverley Tarka said:

- On the section marked “Other” in Table 1 of the report, further details about the breakdown could be provided to the panel in writing. **(Action – John Everson)**
- On the care packages overspend, the complexity of care is an issue which can be difficult to manage and creates a lot of the extra cost. People are being supported at an earlier stage, including through providing the right information and reablement at the right point but there are also opportunities to improve and provide better value care.
- On care assessments, practitioners are supported to use a strength-based approach building on the positives that an individual has with the aim of providing both value for money and quality of support. In relation to concerns that social workers could be put under pressure when assessing due to limited resources, it was pointed out that the functions of commissioning and assessments have been separated out in recent years with a separate brokerage team sourcing the care packages.
- The annual budget for OGNH is just over £1m so, with the overspend included, the total cost is approximately £1.7m.

Cllr Connor recommended that an overview on capital budget should be provided in addition to the revenue budget in future reports. More detail on budget pressures rather than just headline figures could also be provided.

AGREED: That the report be noted.

24. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

The panel discussed the draft work programme and preparations for the proposed scrutiny review on day opportunities. It was noted that the Joint Partnerships Board’s reference groups could be a useful source of information about the views of carers and service users about day opportunities. Various day centres, carers groups and luncheon clubs could also be approached in order to try and obtain a diverse range of views from across the borough.

25. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

CHAIR: Councillor Pippa Connor

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HOUSING AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY, 15TH NOVEMBER, 2018, 6.30 - 9.00 pm

PRESENT:

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

13. 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'.

14. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence had been received.

15. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

16. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

17. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

Tashan Bonner put forward a deputation to the panel on behalf of the TAG (Temporary Accommodation Group) Love Lane resident's group. In addressing the panel he focused on concerns that the group had relating to transparency and mistreatment.

On transparency issues Mr Bonner said that, like many of the Temporary Accommodation tenants, they were not informed when moved on to the estate that it was a future demolition site and had received no indicative or definitive answer as to where they will be housed after demolition of the site. Residents are concerned that they could be moved into the private rented sector. With regards to mistreatment, residents felt that they had no housing security. Furthermore there were a number of families living in overcrowded spaces and unliveable conditions, including in housing that have problems with damp and mould.

Mr Bonner recommended that the Council should stop the practice of moving more Temporary Accommodation residents into the estate. This is continuing to make the situation worse as it meant that more people have the same insecurity and uncertainty and will also need to be moved out prior to demolition. He added that all Temporary Accommodation residents on the Love Lane estate should receive an offer of permanent housing.

In response to questions from Panel Members, Mr Bonner said:

- That the residents had been provided with a schedule of the proposed Love Lane estate redevelopment but no definitive information had been provided of where residents would be housed in future.
- That he had personally been living in Temporary Accommodation on the estate for three years but some of the other residents had lived there for significantly longer.

Another member of the delegation, Reverend Paul Nicolson, commented that there were 4,400 Haringey families currently in Temporary Accommodation, 3,200 of which were housed within the Borough with the remainder moved out of the borough. In response to a Freedom of Information request, he had received information that 671 families had been moved into the private rented sector which results in a significant increase in the levels of rent thereby causing poverty for families.

Another resident commented that a lot of people on the estate felt emotionally drained by their experience, by not knowing where they will eventually be moved to and by bringing up children in the current living conditions on the estate. These difficult living conditions included problems with anti-social behaviour on the estate such as drug abuse and prostitution. Lifts in the blocks were often out of service and sometimes hazardous as the lift car did not always line up with the floor when the doors are open. Water sometimes leaked through internal ceilings within flats.

Cllr Ruth Gordon thanked the delegation for attending the meeting and putting their concerns forward to the panel. She informed the delegation that, as a scrutiny panel, they were not a decision making body. However, the panel was able to take up questions on behalf of residents and investigate issues further as part of their work programme.

AGREED: That the Panel would:

- **Consider investigating the delegation's concerns as part of the Panel's 2018/20 work programme.**
- **Raise concerns about the anti-social behaviour and the health and safety issues on the Love Lane estate with the relevant Cabinet member and invite members of the TAG Love Lane residents group to address the panel in future to ascertain whether these issues had improved or not.**

18. MINUTES

In relation to item 9 of the draft minutes of the panel's previous meeting on 17th September 2018, Panel members asked for further clarification about the Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Regeneration's comments about proposed changes to Appendices C & D of the Council's existing Housing Strategy and about the consultation process for a new Housing Strategy. Dan Hawthorn, Director of Housing & Growth, commented that at a meeting of the Cabinet earlier in the week (on 13th Nov 2018) changes to Appendix C were approved – this does not change the percentage of affordable housing required in new developments but addresses the preferences that the new administration has for the types of affordable housing. On the Council's Housing Strategy, this has a formal planning status so the review of it requires a public consultation, which will take place over the course of 2019, and must be considered by the Regulatory Committee and Cabinet before it is then adopted by full Council. Changing the percentage of affordable housing required by new developments would have to be done through the Local Plan which is subject to an examination by an independent Planning Inspector for viability which is a time consuming process. The Mayor of London is also in the process of updating the London Plan and this is expected to include a change in the overall strategic target of affordable housing in London from 40% to 50% when it is adopted in October 2019.

Asked whether the Planning Sub Committee could begin to base its decisions on an expected forthcoming change in affordability targets, given that it could take a couple of years before the policy could be formally adopted, Dan Hawthorn commented that decisions taken on this basis could be vulnerable to being overturned on appeal. However, the further the policy went through the adoption process, the greater the weight that could be placed on it when making decisions. The Panel also queried whether discussions with developers about future planning applications would be based on the expected future affordability target. Emma Williamson, Assistant Director for Planning, (who was not present at the meeting) could supply further written information to the Panel to provide more detail on these points. **(ACTION – EMMA WILLIAMSON)**

Cllr Barnes noted that there is a discrepancy between the figure of 3,000 Haringey households in Temporary Accommodation, as set out in Item 8 of the minutes of the previous meeting, and the figure of 4,400 Haringey households in Temporary Accommodation, as described by Reverend Nicolson in the deputation that had just been received. Dan Hawthorn confirmed that 3,000 is the figure that he works with and that he does not recognise the larger 4,400 figure.

Cllr Stone noted that he had been marked as not present in the draft minutes which was incorrect. This error would be amended in the final version of the minutes.

AGREED: That, following the aforementioned amendment to the attendance record, the minutes of the Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 17th September 2018 be approved as an accurate record.

19. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - STRATEGIC REGENERATION

Cllr Charles Adje, Cabinet Member for Strategic Regeneration responded to questions on the following issues:

- With regards to the Tottenham landowners forum, Cllr Adje had chaired it once and it was used as a way of engaging with the landowners in Tottenham with regards to the Borough Plan that was being consulted on. In view of the concerns about the forums expressed by Members, officers had been asked to review both the Tottenham and Wood Green forums.
- On Wood Green High Road, Cllr Adje confirmed that the previous proposal to demolish the Sky City and Page High estates would now not be proceeding. The new Wood Green AAP would be put out for consultation soon. The Council would aim to help ensure that disused shop units are not left vacant. Cllr Adje had recently met with Collage Arts which was now using the old Post Office building in the Mall which was a good use of a vacated unit. The Council was also working with the Future Wood Green Business Improvement District on initiatives to improve the High Road. Cllr Diakides welcomed the commitment not to demolish the Sky City and Page High estates.
- On concerns that loading bays would be used by lorries on the redeveloped High Road rather than rear access for loading and unloading, Cllr Adje said that this was news to him but that he would look into it. **(ACTION – Cllr Adje)**
- With regards to the Love Lane estate, Cllr Adje said he was concerned about the issues that had been raised earlier in the meeting through the deputation. Issues like leaks and damp should have been dealt with. CCTV had recently been installed on the estate to improve security.
- On the High Road West project more generally, this project is separate from the HDV, a legal contract had already been signed with Lendlease and a significant sum of money had already been spent. The Council therefore cannot withdraw from this but is having conversations about restructuring the development, including by increasing the number of social housing units. There were other complexities relating to the project. A ballot of Love Lane estate residents was now needed to demonstrate support for the proposals, as required by the Mayor of London, and this will take place next year. In addition, Tottenham Hotspur Football Club are also a stakeholder in the process as they own a section of land known as the Goods Yard where they intend to develop a public square as part of the High Road West site. Conversations were ongoing with the owners of the properties on the Peacock industrial estate. Asked what would happen if the ballot of residents opposes the redevelopment, Cllr Adje said that this was something that was being looked at with legal advice being taken and conversations ongoing with the Mayor of London's office. Asked if the panel can see the legal agreement, Cllr Adje said that this would be a matter for the Borough solicitor.
- On the future of Northumberland Park a letter had gone out to residents from Cllr Brabazon to explain the Council's aspirations for engaging with them about future plans. Cllr Adje clarified that while he is responsible for strategic

regeneration, Cllr Brabazon is responsible for neighbourhood renewal consultation.

- On the strategic approach to town centres in Tottenham, Peter O'Brien, Assistant Director for Area Regeneration, said that the role of the different town centres had been considered as part of the last AAP. Bruce Grove and Seven Sisters are the two historic district centres, viewed as having different roles to other parts of Tottenham. For example Seven Sisters has a lot of smaller businesses such as independent shops and ethnic restaurants. Proposals for north Tottenham meanwhile have more of a focus as an entertainment and leisure destination, complemented by the football stadium. The intention for the redevelopment of Tottenham Hale is not to increase the overall amount of retail but rather to move over from the current retail park model towards a more street-based pattern over time.

20. BUILDING COUNCIL HOMES FOR LONDONERS - BRIEFING NOTE

Due to time constraints, no questions were asked to officers on this report. Dan Hawthorn said that he would be happy to respond to any written questions from Members which could be conveyed via the Principal Scrutiny Officer.

AGREED: That the report be noted.

21. TOTTENHAM/WOOD GREEN LANDOWNER FORUMS

Peter O'Brien, Assistant Director for Area Regeneration, introduced the report on the landowners forums noting that:

- The Tottenham landowners forum was founded in the early period of the Tottenham Regeneration programme alongside other groups that were established at the time such as the Joint Strategic Forum and the Programme Delivery Board.
- In time these forums became seen as part of the wider engagement process on emerging policies and projects as a stakeholder group. The Wood Green landowners forum has, for example, has been used to support the good practice of engaging with landowners as part of the development of the Wood Green Area Action Plan (AAP).

Members of the panel expressed concerns about the public perception of a lack of transparency of the forums, the potentially influential role of the forums including by potentially enabling decision making between the Council and major developers.

Responding to questions from the panel, Peter O'Brien said:

- That the instruction received by officers from the Housing & Regeneration sub-group was to produce an options report for December 4th in relation to the landowners forums in light of the forthcoming Borough Plan and its approach to business engagement.

- That the quasi-judicial role of the Council as a planning authority needs to be separate from the Council's role in development management but that strategic planning policies, such as on the future of town centres or on the number of new homes, require dialogue with a variety of different partners including those that own land in order for these policies to be delivered.
- That the forums are not decision making bodies and any action points have been on very minor issues, such as on points of communication between those present at the meeting, rather than agreeing any formal decisions.
- That no budget was allocated for these forums. In terms of staff time, officers regularly attend a wide range of different stakeholder and community group meetings.
- That Robert Evans from Argent had been the chair of the Tottenham landowners forum up until 2014. Argent were particularly prominent in this field at the time partly because of their involvement in what was seen as a good example of redevelopment at Kings Cross.
- That at the time when the Tottenham landowners forum was formed there was relatively modest investment in Tottenham and one of the reasons why it was formed was to explore how further investment for development could be brought in. There has been a significant amount of investment since then, such as in Tottenham Hale, including housing and community infrastructure. Not all of this could necessarily be attributed directly to the forum but nonetheless the overall level of investment has increased.

AGREED: That the Panel consider this issue further when the report to the Housing & Regeneration sub-group has been produced.

22. PRIORITIES 4 & 5 BUDGET POSITION (QUARTER 1 - 2018/19)

Kaycee Ikegwu, Business Partner, introduced the report on the budget position for Priorities 4 and 5 of the Corporate Plan for Quarter 1 of 2018/19 and made the following points:

- On the Revenue Budget there was a £20k underspend forecast on Priority 4. On Priority 5 there was a break even position for the General Fund but a £231k overspend forecast for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). This overspend was due mainly to reduced rental income caused by the issues on the Broadwater Farm estate where some residents needed to be rehoused.
- On the Capital Budget there was an underspend of just under £11m forecast on Priority 4 which was due mainly to various schemes being delayed. On Priority 5 there was a break even position for the General Fund but there was an underspend of £3.7m for the HRA due mainly to the costs of leaseholder acquisitions on the Love Lane Estate being met from the General Fund.
- On the savings targets from the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2018/19, the savings of £300k for Priority 4 and £50k for Priority 5 were both projected to be achieved.

Responding to questions from the panel, Kaycee Ikegwu and Dan Hawthorn said:

- That the £300k savings for the MTFs for Priority 4 were originally due to be made through changes resulting from HDV programme but although that was no longer happening the savings were still projected to be achieved through staff vacancies in the property team and some increases in the income generated through the commercial portfolio. For Priority 5 the £50k savings were made through a reduction in spending on housing related support commissioning.
- On whether the matched leasehold properties on the redeveloped Love Lane estate would be taken from the social housing allocation it was confirmed that this would not be the case but further written information could be provided on how this related to the intermediate housing allocation. **(ACTION – DAN HAWTHORN)**
- That the Quarter 2 figures were expected to be in the public domain next month.

AGREED: That the report be noted.

23. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Dominic O'Brien, Principal Scrutiny Officer, reported that High Road West would be added as a potential scrutiny review to the draft work programme. The draft work programme and the scoping document for the Wards Corner scrutiny review had been submitted to the forthcoming meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

A site visit and evidence sessions for the Wards Corner review would be scheduled shortly. Cllr Ruth Gordon requested that the evidence sessions be recorded/broadcast where possible. She also said that she would circulate a possible list of witnesses for the review to the other panel members by email.

24. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

25. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meetings of the Housing & Regeneration scrutiny panel are scheduled to take place

on:

- 17th December 2018
- 15th January 2019
- 14th February 2019
- 14th March 2019

CHAIR: Councillor Ruth Gordon

Signed by Chair

Date

Report for: Budget Scrutiny Panels

- Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel, 17th December 2018
- Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel, 18th December 2018
- Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel, 18th December 2018
- Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 14th January 2019
- Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel, 17th 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 28th January 2019 for discussion, prior to approval and referral to Cabinet for consideration in advance of the Full Council meeting on 25th 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 12th 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 11th 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 11th 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	Movemen t	2019/20 Projecte d	Movemen t	2020/21 Projecte d	Movemen t	2021/22 Projecte d	Movemen t	2022/23 Projecte d	Movemen t	2023/24 Projected
Services	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
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
Total Budget Requirement	250,110	10,726	260,836	(11,304)	249,533	2,706	252,239	5,350	257,589	5,451	263,040
Funding											
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)
Total Main Funding	(213,004)	979	(212,025)	(1,379)	(213,404)	(3,691)	(217,095)	(5,350)	(222,446)	(5,451)	(227,897)
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)
TOTAL FUNDING	(250,110)	(10,726)	(260,836)	11,304	(249,533)	(2,706)	(252,239)	(5,350)	(257,589)	(5,451)	(263,040)

Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

General response to budget consultation process

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Recommendation	Cabinet Response
N/A	<p>In the context of continuing difficult financial circumstances, and in respect of learning from the experience of the MTFS to date OSC agreed scrutiny should be locked in to the process both of monitoring budget and performance and of evaluating strategy, considering risks and setting out mitigation.</p>	<p>Cabinet to examine how the Council can ensure that meaningful consultation is undertaken in response to the budget setting process.</p>	<p>The Council is required to consult with residents and businesses on any new budget proposals.</p>
		<p>Cabinet should regularly monitor progress on achievement of savings, and report regularly on budget, including achievement of savings, projections; risk; and mitigation.</p>	<p>The budget monitoring report is on the Council's forward plan to be considered by Cabinet on a quarterly basis.</p>
		<p>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.</p> <p>B) Quarterly briefings prepared for all panel chairs on priority performance, budget, risks and mitigation.</p>	<p>Cabinet Members and officers regularly attend scrutiny panel meetings and will continue to do so.</p>
		<p>Cabinet member for finance should then report to OSC on overall progress against budget, risks and mitigation.</p>	

Appendix C – Prior Year Overview & Scrutiny Committee Recommendations

This page is intentionally left blank

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)
	Your Council Totals	(319)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(6)	(341)

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

Ref: YC01

Title of Option:	Out of home advertising income generation		
Priority:	Your Council	Responsible Officer:	Joanna Sumner
Affected Service(s):	Strategy & Communications	Contact / Lead:	Lesley Gordon/Eleri Salter

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%

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
New net additional savings	175	5	5	6	6

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits
<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <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 income generation clearly allows us to work towards a situation where the communication function reduces its actual cost to the organisation.</p> <p>The digital aspect of these sites means that the council will be able to use them more flexibly for our own campaigns.</p> <p>There is a need to develop an organisation-wide protocol setting out our approach to income generation from sponsorship and advertising</p>
<p>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? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> <p>N/A</p>

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

Report for: Overview and Scrutiny Committee: 14 January 2019

Title: Haringey Brexit Preparedness: OSC Progress Update

Report authorised by : Rebecca Hatch, Head of Policy and Cabinet Support.

Lead Officer: Joe McBride, Leader & Cabinet Support Team Manager
joe.mcbride@haringey.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: All

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

1. Haringey Council workforce

We have run two briefing sessions for staff, alongside Unison, presenting the information we have about Brexit's impact on employment, and asking them to voice their concerns and questions so that we can build a bank of FAQs and information for staff. These have been welcomed and well-attended.

We have identified a person in HR – Nigel Wilson - to act as the key point of contact on Brexit-related workforce issues; he is monitoring anything that comes in via an internal mailbox.

Help with applying for citizenship/settled status

Corporate Board have agreed that we should pay the fee (£65) for the application for settled citizenship status for Council staff, and ask contractors to do the same. The easiest way to do this is for staff to claim the cost back through expenses.

We are also reviewing our HR processes to ensure we can provide the documentation that staff might need in order to process applications. We are looking at the service that the registrars provide to the public in checking citizenship and “leave to remain” documentation to see if we can adapt this to some form of internal support service.

Other issues to follow up

There are other issues that have the potential to affect people’s ability to do their jobs post-Brexit. We will need to ask HR BPs to work with services to define what these might be and check we have the answers to them. For instance – staff whose driving licence was granted in another EU country, social work qualifications, checks for criminal convictions in another country.

Internal communications

We will create a mailing list for staff affected by Brexit issues, we will direct people to the FAQs, which will be up on the intranet once the answers have been checked, and set out the help that the Employee Assistance Programme can provide.

People at Work, who provide this service, have confirmed that staff who call with a “right to work” query can either speak to one of their advisers, be referred to Law Express who are their legal partner, or be referred to the Citizens Advice Bureau who have specialist immigration advisers on hand to help. (Ian Morgan).

We are looking at whether providing an opportunity for staff to come together and to share each other’s expertise would be helpful either through Yammer or a network based on the Haringey Champions model. As well as facilitating ongoing discussion and information sharing, senior officers, immigration officers and / or registrars could provide drop-in advice sessions for staff.

We are looking at the options for communicating with affected staff who are not based in offices.

2. Wider workforce in Haringey

Social care sector:

- Officers have met with CONEL about their interest in, and ability to, increase the focus on skills development for young people and adults, encouraging entry into the social care sector, and has had a very positive response. Plans include:
 - Work placements
 - Work with schools on care as a career
 - Model for career progression
- We have engaged with other colleagues across NCL as part of our workforce development work to ensure Brexit is given adequate focus, particularly in light of the wider shortage of nurses in social care
- We have discussed with Whittington Health the risks around community nursing particularly as well as health visiting and school nursing both of which have a direct impact on our wider work with children and young people

3. Support to Residents

We have set up a working group that is looking at the design, set up, and communication of a support offer, including digital assistance in our libraries and Customer Service Centres, and a passport verification service. We don’t currently offer the Passport Return service offered by many other London Boroughs, to enable EU citizens to apply for residency without sending off their passports.

The Home Office’s digital partner is ‘we are digital’ - more information at their webpage - <https://www.we-are-digital.co.uk/ukvi/>

There are three categories of help that can be offered via “we are digital”

1. Talking through the process over the phone

2. Drop-ins or appointments with someone sitting next to the applicant while they complete the process.
3. Home visits – if the applicant is not mobile.

It is the second of these that the Council will provide if people are referred on to us following a triage process by 'we are digital'. The Government will provide a payment for each applicant according to how long it takes to complete the application. Trials have found that 90% of people complete the online process within 30 minutes for which the payment to the Council is £25.

Customer Services are putting together a proposal on how to implement this. Questions to consider include:

- Do we recruit for this specific role using sessional / temporary additional staff, or train up existing staff and block out time for the provision of support as drop in sessions?
- Provide the service at Wood Green and Marcus Garvey or at all libraries?
- Only by referral from "we are digital", or can we direct residents to the libraries to be triaged as drop-ins?

For the passport registration scheme, £30 is the average London charge but this price varies significantly from £10 - £80 in other boroughs. Do we want to charge for this and if so how much? We will be able to verify passports using an app. There are some training requirements, which the Government will pay for.

Proof of residency checks

For most, this will be by National Insurance number. Proof can also come from GP registration, or electoral registration. We might want to encourage people to do these things in any case.

Criminal Convictions

The final check is on criminal convictions, and, as with current EU rules, the threshold is three offences within three months or a prison sentence. Applicants will be asked to self-declare. The Government will check every application on the national database, but say that they are not interested in "petty crimes". Overseas convictions will be checked based on self-declarations.

Home Office's EU Settlement Scheme Grant Funding competition

The Government is offering £9million of grant for VCS organisations to provide advice to affected residents. There are two categories of bid, between £5k-£40k and £40k – £750k. The deadline for submissions is 1st February.

We plan to organise a meeting in late December / early January that brings relevant voluntary organisations together to help put a bid together.

We have asked the Home Office for further information on the bid which is still relatively undefined i.e. who can money go to, can the Council co-ordinate / bid in partnership? A written response is expected in the next week.

What happens if there is no deal?

People already here will be allowed to stay, but there will be a cut-off point of the end of March. The implications for individuals might vary by nationality.

Citizens' rights in the events of a no deal are attached separately.

What happens if people don't apply?

The cost of the scheme - £65 for each adult and £32.50 for each child may put people off. Some won't be able to afford this and may risk not applying.

We will monitor who are engaging with and any VCS funding received from the grant above would be focused on identifying those residents who cannot afford to apply or have not applied for other reasons.

The cost to the Council of someone with No Recourse to Public Funds is an average of £8k, and residents who don't have settled status will become NRPF at the deadline for applications, 30 June 2021.

4. External communications

A Brexit page has been created on the council's website:

<https://www.haringey.gov.uk/news-and-events/latest-news/haringey-and-brexit>

Links to government advice on settled status and advice from VCS organisations are included.

There is a Home Office toolkit which provide a host of information, advice and communications' templates to local authorities:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/eu-settlement-scheme-community-leaders-toolkit/>

There is an awareness that we need to engage as early as possible but that we don't want to be seen to be accepting the inevitability of Brexit which would be contrary to Council position resolved at the recent extraordinary council meeting.

We will focus our communications early next year on setting out the programme of advice and support for residents wanting to understand their legal status, how they get hold of documents pulled together from existing organisations and contracts.

If we're talking to people that we don't normally talk to, we may want to talk to them about other things:

Electoral registration

The rate of EU elector registration remains strong. We will update our website wording to make it more prominent for EU citizens to find in the event that they need to have registered to vote in order to apply for settled citizen status.

External event

We intend to hold a one-off public facing event to be introduced by the Leader / Cllr Jogee. This could potentially be along similar lines as the information session held by Westminster Council, which involved experts from the Home Office, DExEU, CAB and the Migrants Resource Centre.

5. Risk / Contingency Planning

The Council has a Brexit-specific risk register.

We are also in the process of gathering from Heads of Service their assessment of the potential impact on Council services, focusing on key risks around the workforce, supply chain and additional demand/new burdens. We expect to complete that exercise by early-mid December.

6. Engagement with London Councils, Mayor of London, LGA and Government

The LGA have produced some material on No Deal implications for local authorities www.lga.gov.uk/parliament/briefings-and-responses/brexit-no-deal-briefing-councils/

London Councils have pulled together findings in response to a survey of London boroughs.

The Mayor of London has relaunched London is Open campaign, in the run-up to Brexit. There will also be a [Guidance Hub](#) on the GLA website to help European Londoners navigate Brexit, which may be useful for residents.

A Home Office teleconference on 4 December covered the latest advice on the settlement scheme.

7. Political Leadership

Leader statements to EU nationals and on the Council's Brexit position are published on the website.

Following the extraordinary full council meeting on Brexit a number of council resolutions have been actioned:

- A Brexit working group has been established
- The Leader has been appointed Cabinet Member with responsibility for Brexit preparedness. This has been updated on the website.
- Cllr Jogee has been appointed EU Citizens' Ambassador. We will provide some communications on this following the Purdah period.
- We have written to other Labour leaders requesting that they debate their response to the ongoing negotiations soon, if they have not already done so already.
- We have written to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government making a request under the Sustainable Communities Act 2007 for all governmental departmental information and analysis pertaining to the impacts upon Haringey's communities and businesses of the UK's withdrawal from the EU.

- We have written to the Members of Parliament for Hornsey & Wood Green and Tottenham and thank them for their work in highlighting the devastating impact of the governments Brexit negotiations and for standing up for the rights of the 54,000 EU nationals who are Haringey residents.
- Publication of a Cabinet report on contingencies in the event of Britain leaving the EU has been suggested for January Cabinet.

Report for: Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 14 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

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;
- 2.2 To approve the scope and terms of reference of the reviews by the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel review on Special Educational Needs and Disability (Appendix B) and the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel on Plastic Waste (Appendix C); and
- 2.3 That a replacement be appointed for Councillor James on the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel.

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

Introduction

- 4.1 At its meeting on 4 June, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed a process to develop a two-year work plan for the Committee and its panels. This included measures to ensure that the views of residents and stakeholders are taken into account in developing, including the setting up of a "Scrutiny Café" event. The Committee meeting on 23 July further developed this approach, which also included an on-line scrutiny survey.

- 4.2 The survey went live on 20 August and ran until 14 September. A total of 191 responses were received. Suggestions within this for areas to be looked at in detail were combined with those from the Committee and its panels and discussed at the Scrutiny Café. This took place on 13 September and attracted over 50 people, including a large number of people from voluntary sector and community organisations. A summary of the issues raised within the Scrutiny Survey and the feedback from the Scrutiny Café for each of the areas covered by the Committee and its panels was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 2 October.
- 4.3 Following this, the Chair and each of the scrutiny panel Chairs met with relevant officers to discuss further the issues raised relating to the respective areas covered by the Committee and their panels and how these could be addressed within work plans, including;
- Which issues would be best suited to dealt with by an in-depth scrutiny review;
 - Which issues might be better suited to “one-off” item at a regular meeting. In addition, there are also routine items such as performance data, budget scrutiny and Cabinet Member Questions which may also provide a means of addressing issues;
 - What other work may be taking place within the Council on issues raised so that any overview and scrutiny involvement complements rather than conflicts with this;
 - Whether issues may have already been looked at recently by overview and scrutiny recently and, if so, whether to re-visit them.
- 4.4 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.
- 4.5 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

- 4.6 After consultation with the Chair, an additional Committee meeting has been provisionally 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.
- 4.7 The Committee’s review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks is due to finalise an interim report shortly. Further work on this issue will be undertaken once the government has issued details of the process for the implementation of the recommendations of the Hackitt report. Following this, the Committee will begin work on its review on Local Business, Employment and Growth. Work on the scope and terms of reference requires completion.

Forward Plan

- 4.8 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.
- 4.9 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>

- 4.10 The Committee may want to consider the Forward Plan and discuss whether any of these items require further investigation or monitoring via scrutiny.

Panel Membership

- 4.11 In the light of Councillor James appointment to the Cabinet, a replacement for her will need to be appointed to the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel.

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;

Appendix B; Scope and Terms of Reference for Review on SEND.

Appendix C; Scope and Terms of Reference for Review on Plastic waste.

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"> Working together with local voluntary/community sector, strengthening their capacity and working with them to attract external investment in the borough; 	4.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • Involving and supporting voluntary organisations to bid for services. 	
Child Poverty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues in schools highlight food poverty, poor housing and increasing mental health needs. 	

<p>2. “One-off” Items; These will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Committee. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.</p>		
Date	Potential Items	Lead Officer/Witnesses
4 June 2018	Terms of Reference	Scrutiny Support Officer
	Work Plan	Scrutiny Support Officer
23 July 2018	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
2 October 2018	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
19 November 2018	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
14 January 2019	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
28 January 2019	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
	Review on Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks – Interim Report	Scrutiny Support Officer
25 March 2019	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	Assistant Director (Corporate Governance)
	Scrutiny Function	Scrutiny Support Officer
29 April 2018	Cabinet Member Questions - Finance	Cabinet Member - Finance
2019-20		
Meeting 1	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
Meeting 2	Cabinet Member Questions – Corporate Services and Insourcing	Cabinet Member - Corporate

		Services and Insourcing
	OSC Annual Report 2018-19	Scrutiny Support Officer
Meeting 3	Budget Monitoring – Q1	Chief Finance Officer
	Cabinet Member Questions – Civic Services	Cabinet Member for Civic Services and officers
Meeting 4	Performance Report – Q2	Performance Manager
	Cabinet Member Questions - Finance	Cabinet Member - Finance Chief Finance Officer
Meeting 5 (Budget Scrutiny)	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
Meeting 6	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

Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel

Review on Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) (2018/19); Scope and Terms of Reference

Review Topic	Review / Project Title
<p>Rationale</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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; • 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; • 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. <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"> • 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? • What are the waiting times for parents requesting an assessment, obtaining a diagnosis and receiving the extra support required? • What are the outcomes of children with SEMH and autism in relation to their diagnoses? • 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?

Scrutiny Membership	<p>Councillors Mahir Demir (Chair) Josh Dixon, Tammy Palmer, Dana Carlin, James Chiriyankandath, Julie Davies and Khaled Moyeed</p> <p>Co-optees/Non Voting Members: Yvonne Denny (Church representative)</p>
Terms of Reference (Purpose of the Review/ Objectives)	<p>To consider and make recommendations to the Council’s Cabinet on the effectiveness of the care pathway for SEMH and autistic children, where blockages occur and how outcomes might be improved.</p>
Links to the Corporate Plan	<p>Priority 1 - Enable every child and young person to have the best start in life, with high quality education</p>
Evidence Sources	<p>These will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant performance data for SEMH and autistic children; • Guidance, research and policy documents; • Interviews with key officers, partners and community organisations; and • Information and data from other local authorities.
Witnesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vikki Monk-Meyer; Head of Integrated SEND • Gill Gibson; Assistant Director for Early Help and Prevention • Haringey Involve • SEND Pact

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transition Reference Group • Haringey Clinical Commissioning Group • Barnet Enfield and Haringey Mental Health Trust • Schools (primary and secondary) • Other local authorities
Methodology/Approach	<p>A variety of methods will be used to gather evidence from the witnesses above, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk top research; • Evidence gathering sessions with witnesses; and • Visits
Equalities Implications	<p>The review will consider to what extent current arrangements are supporting the needs of children and young people with a special educational need.</p>
Timescale	<p>The Panel will aim to complete its evidence gathering by the end of this Municipal Year.</p>
Reporting arrangements	<p>The Director of Children’s Services will co-ordinate a response to the recommendations.</p>
Publicity	<p>The review will be publicised through the scrutiny website and scrutiny newsletter providing details of the scope and how local people and community groups may be involved. The outcomes of the review will be similarly published once complete.</p>

Constraints / Barriers / Risks	<p>Risks:</p> <p>Not being able to get key evidence providers to attend on the agreed date of evidence gathering.</p> <p>Not being able obtain evidence from key informants e.g. local authorities</p>
Officer Support	<p>Lead Officer; Robert Mack, Scrutiny Policy Officer, 0208 489 2921 rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk</p> <p>Service Contact; Gill Gibson, Assistant Director of Children’s Services (Early Help and Prevention)</p>

Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel

Scrutiny Review on Plastic Waste—Scope and Terms of Reference (2018/19)

Rationale	<p>During the Scrutiny Café event on 13th September 2018 and the online survey that was undertaken in parallel, a number of concerns were raised in relation to plastic waste and recycling. As part of these concerns, it was suggested that the Council could, and should, be doing more to reduce the use of plastics and to increase the provision of recycling facilities. It was suggested that one of the major sources of litter in around the high foot-fall areas was takeaway food containers and plastic bottles.</p> <p>The UN Environment produced a report, entitled Single-use Plastics: A roadmap for Sustainability, in June 2018 which set out a comprehensive assessment on the state of plastics. The report highlights that: “Around the world, one million plastic drinking bottles are purchased every minute, while up to 5 trillion single-use plastic bags are used worldwide every year. In total, half of all plastic produced is designed to be used only once — and then thrown away”.</p> <p>The report highlights the importance of recycling and identifies that “only nine per cent of the nine billion tonnes of plastic the world has ever produced has been recycled. Most ends up in landfills, dumps or in the environment. If current consumption patterns and waste management practices continue, then by 2050 there will be around 12 billion tonnes of plastic litter in landfills and the environment. By this time, if the growth in plastic production continues at its current rate, then the plastics industry may account for 20 per cent of the world’s total oil consumption”.</p> <p>https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/25496/singleUsePlastic_sustainability.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y</p> <p>In January 2018, the Government launched its 25-year plan to improve the natural environment including a pledge to eradicate all avoidable plastic waste by 2042. As part of this, a mandatory 5 pence charge was levied on all plastic bags and the government has brought in a ban on plastic microbeads in cosmetics.</p>
------------------	---

	<p>HM Treasury launched a consultation earlier in the year entitled: 'Tackling the plastic problem - Using the tax system or charges to address single-use plastic waste'. This received 162,000 responses which will formulate part of Defra's upcoming Resources and Waste strategy. It is expected that the strategy will be published later this year.</p> <p>As part of the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan and Resources and Waste Strategy the government will be looking at extended producer responsibility, including requiring packaging producers to fund the end of life costs of their packaging products, including the collection and disposal costs of packaging waste. Defra are due to launch a consultation on packing rules by the end of the year.</p> <p>https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/11/09/waste-reforms-could-give-councils-1bn-recycling-boost-forcing/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8,000,000 tons of plastic enters the oceans every year • 91% of plastic is never recycled • 450 years is the time it takes for a plastic bottle to decompose • 2050 is the date projected for when the amount of plastics in the ocean will equal the amount of fish • 6,400 microplastics are inadvertently swallowed by the average European shellfish consumer each year
<p>Scrutiny Membership</p>	<p>The Members of the Environment and Community Scrutiny Panel that will carry out this review are:</p> <p>Councillors: Adam Jogee (Chair), Eldridge Culverwell, Scott Emery, Julia Ogiehor, Reg Rice, Matt White & Barbara Blake</p> <p>Ian Sygrave, Chair of Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches</p>
<p>Terms of reference</p>	<p>The aims of this project are:</p>

	<p>1) To 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.</p> <p>2) To examine how the Council could reduce plastic waste and increase its recycling performance, looking at innovative ideas from across the sector.</p> <p>3) To 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?</p> <p>4) To examine the how the Council can develop a plastic-free policy and what other measures the Council could undertake to lead by example.</p>
Links to the Corporate Plan	<p>Priority 3: A Clean and Safe Borough where people are proud to live.</p> <p>In the draft Borough Plan 2019-2023 this links to Priority 3: A place with strong, resilient & connected communities where people can lead active and healthy lives in an environment that is safe, clean and green.</p>
Evidence Sources	<p>A broad selection of interested parties will be invited to take part in the review and to submit evidence. These will include residents and/or representatives from the local community, traders, academic experts, officers of the Council, Keep Britain Tidy and representatives of other relevant voluntary and community organisations.</p>
Witnesses	TBC
Methodology/Approach	<p>A variety of methods will be used to gather evidence, including: site visits; desk top research; and evidence gathering sessions with witnesses.</p>
Equalities	<p>The Council has a Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010) to have due regard to the</p>

<p>Implications</p>	<p>need to: (1) Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Act; (2) Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not; (3) Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Panel should ensure that it addresses these duties by considering them during final scoping, evidence gathering and final reporting. 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 service 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.</p> <p>The Panel should ensure that equalities comments are based on evidence, when possible. Wherever possible this should include demographic and service level data and evidence of residents/service-users views gathered through consultation.</p>
<p>Timescale</p>	<p>Draft scoping document submitted to Overview & Scrutiny Committee – 14th January 2019</p> <p>Evidence gathering sessions and site visits – January 2018 to March 2019.</p> <p>Analyse findings / develop recommendations – March 2019</p> <p>Report published – Spring 2019</p>
<p>Reporting arrangements</p>	<p>The Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods will coordinate a response to Cabinet to the recommendations of the panel’s final report.</p>

Publicity	TBC
Constraints/Barriers/Risks	We aim to complete the draft report before the end of spring 2019. However, the panel may receive a large amount of evidence so this may prove to be a challenging timescale. If the panel determines that this timescale is not sufficient to the gather and analyse the evidence required, then it may be necessary to extend the schedule. If the work isn't completed by April, there is a risk that the membership of the panel could change following the Annual Council meeting in May 2019.
Officer Support	Lead officer: Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Coordinator, 020 8489 2957, philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank