

NOTICE OF MEETING

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL

**Tuesday, 17th December, 2019, 7.00 pm - Civic Centre, High Road,
Wood Green, N22 8LE**

Members: Councillors Adam Jogee (Chair), Peray Ahmet, Barbara Blake, Eldridge Culverwell, Julie Davies, Scott Emery and Julia Ogiehor

Co-optees/Non-Voting Members: Ian Sygrave (Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches)

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. **ITEMS OF 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 as noted below).

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

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

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

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

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

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

6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 10)

To approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

7. HERBICIDE USAGE ON COUNCIL LAND IN HARINGEY (PAGES 11 - 12)

8. SINGLE USE PLASTICS (PAGES 13 - 14)

9. SCRUTINY OF THE 2020/21 DRAFT BUDGET / 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2020/21 - 2024/25) (PAGES 15 - 102)

10. UPDATE ON CROUCH END LIVEABLE STREETS

Verbal update

11. CABINET MEMBER Q&A - CABINET MEMBER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE AND SUSTAINABILITY

Verbal Update

12. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (PAGES 103 - 112)

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at item 3 above.

14. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

5 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

Monday, 09 December 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF MEETING ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY
SAFETY SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY, 5TH
NOVEMBER, 2019, 7.00 - 9.45 PM**

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Adam Jogee (Chair), Peray Ahmet, Eldridge Culverwell,
Julie Davies, Scott Emery, Julia Ogiehor and Sygrave**

ALSO ATTENDING:

1. 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'.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Barbara Blake.

3. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Culverwell declared an interest in relation to the deputation as well as agenda item 10 as he is the vice-chair of the Friends of Finsbury Park.

5. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS

The Panel received a deputation on behalf of the Friends of Finsbury Park regarding the recent major events that took place in Finsbury Park during September and the resultant damage that had occurred. The lead depute was Clive Carter and the other members of the deputation party were Barbara Baughan and Martin Ball. Concerns were raised by the deputation party about the extent of the damage to the bandstand field, which was categorised as severe. It was suggested that the damage was not the kind which could be straightforwardly repaired and could cause long-term damage on the park.

Clive Carter advised the Panel that the Friends group represented residents across the three adjoining boroughs and not just Haringey. It was suggested that residents across the three Boroughs had enough of major events in Finsbury Park and that the

Council was exploiting a valued community utility for short term financial gain, generating significant ill will as a result. It was contended that the park was being ruined as a result of the damage caused. The deputation party set out that the noise levels were excessive during the recent major events, particularly in relation to bass frequencies, and that the music could be heard three kilometres away. It was suggested that the Council, in continuing to hold large scale major events, was ignoring the concerns of parks users and showing contempt for local residents.

In response to concerns raised about the events' adherence to licensing conditions, the deputation party were advised that any concerns around licensing conditions and adherence thereof, would have to be raised separately through the formal licensing process and were not within the purview of the Scrutiny Panel.

The Chair thanked the deputation party for their contribution.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of 3rd October were agreed as a correct record.

7. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP PRIORITIES AND CRIME PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

The Panel received a covering report and accompanying set of slides which provided an overview of Haringey's performance in relation to key crime performance statistics. The report and accompanying presentation were introduced by Sandeep Broca, Intelligence Analyst, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 9 to 21. The Borough Commander, Treena Fleming was also present to discuss the Community Safety Partnerships' priorities for the current year. The following key points from the presentation were noted:

- Overall recorded crime in Haringey had increased by 2.7% in the 12 months to October 2019, which was better than the London wide average increase of 8.3%. The main hotspots were located around Wood Green High Road and around the A10 corridor, from Bruce Grove to Seven Sisters. Wandsworth was the only London Borough to see a small reduction in overall crime in the 12 month period to October 2019.
- Overall sexual offences in Haringey decreased by 10.6% in the 12 months to October 2019, compared to a London wide average reduction of 2.1%.
- Non-domestic violence with injury offences had decreased in Haringey by 9.8%, compared to a London-wide increase of 0.8%.
- Personal robbery increased in Haringey, by 26%. Almost 2,200 offences a year took place. London wide offending had also worsened, experiencing an increase of 14%. North London in particular had seen large increases in robbery.

- The volume of overall knife injuries had reduced by 4.9% in Haringey, compared to an 11.7% London-wide reduction.
- Lethal barrelled firearm discharges in Haringey had decreased year on year by 18.4%. London had decreased by 15% over this same period. This was a notable improvement from mid-2018, during which significantly higher volumes of firearms discharges occurred. However, Haringey still had the second highest number of incidents in London. Firearm related incidents mostly occurred in the east of the borough, and showed some correlation with known gang linked areas. Offences also demonstrated some geographical clustering.

The Mayor's Police and Crime Plan (2017-2021) outlined key priorities: Sexual Violence; Domestic Abuse; Child Sexual Exploitation; Weapon-Based Crime; Hate Crime; Anti-Social Behaviour. In addition, Robbery and Non-Domestic Violence with Injury were agreed as local priorities.

The following was noted in discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The AD Stronger Communities provided an update to the Panel around the community conversation programme, which aimed to improve public confidence in the police and partners through adopting a proactive partnership approach to resident engagement. The Borough Commander emphasised the role of ward officers in getting out into the community and building up contacts and networks.
- b. In response to a question, the Panel was advised that knife crime was a subsidiary of a wider category of weapon based crimes, which was designated as a mandatory high harm crime for all London Boroughs. Knife crime, by contrast, was a local priority in Haringey.
- c. The Panel sought assurances around systems for anonymously reporting crime and requested an update on the safe haven scheme. In response, officers advised that Haringey Community Gold were undertaking work on the displacement of crime as well as a wider communications campaign for residents. The AD for Stronger Communities agreed to circulate a written briefing on the safe havens scheme to the Panel. **(Action: Eubert Malcolm).**
- d. The Borough Commander advised the Panel that in relation to youth engagement, the Police used teachable moments to involve youth engagement workers in the custody suite to talk to young people. The Borough Commander also advised that a new Inspector was due to join her staff who had significant experience and would be leading on ensuring that police officers adopted a trauma informed approach.
- e. The Committee set out that partners needed to adopt a targeted approach as well as a universal one and cautioned that young people should not be treated as a homogenous group. The Borough Commander acknowledged these concerns and advised that targeting the robbery issue would also tackle knife crime and serious youth violence due to the profile of those offenders.
- f. The Borough Commander emphasised the role of a whole systems approach which included targeted patrols in hotspot locations as well as sending schools officers out to local schools to engage young people and build up that community network. In addition, the police had established a robbery focus unit comprised of 1 Detective Sergeant and 12 police officers which was starting to

- yield significant results in terms of crime detection rates. In relation to robbery, the Panel noted that there was a keen focus on ensuring immediacy of response as well as ensuring visible policing patrols were in the correct locations as well as also ensuring a whole systems approach and safeguarding concerns were met, due to the profile of suspects being 14-18 years old. The Borough Commander advised that she was hopeful that significant improvements would be seen in this area in the coming months.
- g. The Panel queried the way the data was presented and questioned why the slides showed the trend over total number of offences. In response, officers advised that this was the standardised format used, but it could be adapted to prioritise total number of offences for future presentations to the Panel if that was requested. The Panel agreed to pick this up outside of the meeting. **(Action Panel Members)**. The Panel also commented on the use of three shades of green and the lack of an explanation for yellow RAG status in the key. **(Action: Sandeep Broca)**.
 - h. The Committee enquired about statistics on race and crime. In response officers acknowledged that there was a known disproportionality in relation to specific ethnic groups in the recorded crime statistics. In relation to hate crime, the Panel was advised that there was a national awareness raising week on hate crime and that work was being undertaken to encourage third party reporting as there was a known issue around under-reporting of hate crimes. The Panel requested that officers circulate the figure on hate crime as well as outlining what was being done to tackle the issue outside of the meeting and this would be brought back to a future meeting for brief discussion. **(Action: Sandeep Broca/Treena Fleming)**.
 - i. The Panel sought clarification around whether misogyny could be included as a hate crime going forwards. In response the Borough Commander advised that this was not something the Metropolitan Police were currently doing corporately.

RESOLVED

That the Panel noted the update in relation to Community Safety Partnership Priorities and the Crime Performance Overview.

8. UPDATE ON THE MERGING OF HARINGEY AND ENFIELD BCUS

The Panel received a verbal update from Treena Fleming, the Borough Commander on the merging of Haringey and Enfield Borough Command Units (BCUs). The following key points were noted:

- a. The Panel noted that the new Borough Commander had been in post since April and that, overall, the merger had gone well. It was reported that following an initial bedding in period, performance had stabilised and 80% of I grades were responded to within target times and 75% of S grades within the target time.
- b. The Borough Commander advised that her focus was on ensuring a high quality of service and on what the officers did when they arrived at the scene of crime rather than solely on how quickly they got there.
- c. Response teams were responsible for carrying out low-level investigations and there was a continuity of the investigating officer throughout the whole process.

- The Borough Commander advised that she was looking to upskill her officers to ensure that all of her officers were investigative.
- d. The Borough Commander welcomed the fact that sexual offences and child abuse had been assigned back to front line policing and that with the safeguarding teams in place, this allowed the police to offer a much more holistic service, with one point of contact and the ability to offer wrap around services to victims of those crimes. There police had also developed a much more joined-up risk assessment process.
 - e. The Panel were advised that the CID team was in place and that it was their responsibility to handle complex crime.
 - f. The merging of neighbourhood teams was going well and there were only a couple of vacancies, including those in the schools team. The Panel noted that there was significant best practice learning taking place in the neighbourhoods model and that the shift pattern for officers in neighbourhoods teams had been changed to ensure deployment between 4pm and midnight, as well as at key hotspot locations, in response to increased levels of criminal activity during those times.
 - g. Overall, the Borough Commander advised, the merged BCU offered a great deal of autonomy and flexibility in dealing with crime across both boroughs.

The following was noted in response to the discussion of this item:

- a. In response to a question around how many new police officers were scheduled to come to Haringey and Enfield, the Borough Commander advised that the government had announced around 1300 new officers for the Metropolitan and that she was currently seeing around 10-15 new recruits coming through a month, along with some direct entry detectives.
- b. In response to a question around how well the relationship worked between the police and the Council, the Borough Commander advised that there were good relationships being developed with individual colleagues and that overall the relationship worked well. The Borough Commander advised that Sandeep was co-located with the Police and that she held regular meetings with the Chief Executive. Furthermore, her five Superintendents worked closely with the relevant directors within the Council. Overall, it was emphasised that the relationship between the Council and police colleagues was one of a critical friend.
- c. In response to a question about the exact number of vacancies in the Neighbourhoods teams, the Borough Commander advised that under the Met's Borough Workforce Targets, they were supposed to have 46 officers and they currently had 45, so there was only 1 vacancy. However, it was noted that of those 45 police officers some of them could be on sick leave at any one time or assigned to restricted duties if they had been injured.
- d. In response to concerns raised about the effectiveness of ward panel meetings and the self-nominating process involved, the Borough Commander acknowledged that the panels were only as good as the people who were involved in them and suggested that the key aspect was to see what learning and areas of best practice could be gathered from the successful ward panels.
- e. In response to a question around the spread of officers across the two Boroughs, the Borough Commander advised that she didn't have the exact figures but set out that the performance figures suggested that it was an

equitable service across both Boroughs and that the spread of resources should be broadly equal.

- f. The Panel sought assurances around the abstraction of local SNT officers to cover large scale policing events such as recent Extinction Rebellion protests. In response, the Borough Commander that requests for central aid did happen and that to some extent this was out of her control, however where local officers were abstracted she would back fill those frontline positions and had recently implemented 12 hour shift patterns in order to help provide cover.

RESOLVED

That the update was noted.

9. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR COMMUNITIES AND EQUALITIES.

The Panel received a verbal update from the Cabinet Member for Communities and Equalities on his portfolio area. The following was noted in discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Panel noted that the Council had signed a three-year £1.5m grant agreement with MOPAC which provided the core funding for community safety work; such as violent offender management, gangs work and supporting victims of domestic violence. The Cabinet Member advised that Haringey Community Gold had been live for around six months and had funded 9 projects. The early outcomes were characterised as being overwhelmingly positive.
- b. In response to a question around what the Cabinet Member's political priorities for his portfolio were, he advised that one of his key areas was around ensuring that there were additional resources for youth engagement. The Cabinet Member also advised that he was working on securing the next bid for Haringey Community Gold. Furthermore, he was reviewing invest to save proposals around violence reduction with officers as well as work to review the community conversation agenda and how best to work closely with voluntary sector partners.
- c. The Panel sought reassurance around engagement and early intervention and requested further information in relation to how the money was being spent and the outcomes that were sought. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that there was a rigorous process of engagement and reporting back to the Mayor's Office on how the money was being spent as part of Haringey Community Gold, along with regular joint meetings with officers and partners. The Panel requested further information on the activities and outcomes being undertaken as part of Community Gold. **Action: (Cllr Blake/Eubert).**
- d. The Panel also sought assurances around Community Conversations and raised concerns about it being led by voluntary organisations who were seeking funding through the project, rather than individual local residents. The Panel requested that the Cabinet Member give some further thought to how these groups were selected and what the selection criteria was for choosing them. **(Action: Cllr Blake).** In response, Officers advised that that as part of the funding for Community Gold, the Council went out into the community and invited bids for funding, so this was to some extent a self-selection process.

Officers reassured the Panel that those groups selected had regular engagement with the GLA as part of the process.

- e. The Panel requested some further information around the action plan, and the individual actions contained therein, that sat underneath the Youth at Risk Strategy. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that there would be a Member Briefing session on serious youth violence and the Youth at Risk Strategy in January that would update Members in detail.

RESOLVED

- i. That the update was noted.

10. UPDATE ON SLAMMIN' MAJOR EVENTS 2019 AND FINSBURY PARK RECTIFICATION WORKS

The Panel received an briefing paper on the Slammin' events 2019 that took place in Finsbury Park and the rectification works that had been undertaken following these events. Sarah Jones, Events and Partnerships Manager introduced the report as set out in the agenda pack at pages 23 to 26. The following was noted in discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel sought assurances around what could be done to restrict bass levels from future events. In response officers acknowledged that there was increase in complaints and that the noise had spread over a further distance than usual due to the prevailing weather conditions. Officers advised that specific conditions were set within the Licence and that there were currently three licences issued to promoters, with each one independent of each other and specific to the relevant licence holder. The conditions referred to in the deputation were for Live Nation events and that these were not transferable to the other premises licences.
- b. In response to concerns about the advertised complaints telephone number being difficult to get hold of and closing immediately after the event, officers acknowledged these concerns and advised that the volume of complaints was well above what was anticipated. The Panel noted that this was the fifth year of the event and it usually generated around 15 complaints, so one telephone line was usually suitable. However, 38 complaints were received in the afternoon this time, along with significant number of complaints to the Parks team in the days following the event. Officers agreed to reconsider how to best ensure the complaints line was organised for future events. **(Action: Sarah Jones)**.
- c. The Panel sought assurances around whether in light of the complaints generated, holding Major Events was in the Council's interests. In response, officers advised that the revenue generated was essential to the upkeep and maintenance of Finsbury Park, following significant budget reductions since 2010. Officers also advised that a lot of residents enjoyed the events and that they were seeking to ensure that there was a balance so that the number of events was kept relatively low whilst also providing a vital income stream.
- d. The Panel questioned whether the level of income being generated was enough to justify the events. In response, officers advised that the schedule of events for next year balanced the concerns of residents against ensuring enough revenue to support the park. It was anticipated that the revenue from next years' events would allow the Council to make some small infrastructure

improvements to Finsbury Park. The Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability advised that, in her view, the events were justifiable in order to ensure the ongoing viability and upkeep of the park.

- e. The Panel queried whether the events could be held every second year instead. Officers advised that in the case of Wireless, that this was an annual event and that the organisers would likely go elsewhere if the Council only permitted them to have it every other year. This would create a significant budget pressure.
- f. The Chair of the LCSP set out that the Council would need to find around £1m to fund the Park if it no longer permitted major events. It was also suggested that the Council seemed to have got a lot better at managing this process over the last five years and that Finsbury Park was immeasurably better than it was many years ago, partially as a result of the additional funding it received from these events.

RESOLVED

That the Panel noted the update on Slammin' Major Events 2019 and Finsbury Park rectification works.

11. LIVEABLE STREETS

The Panel received a verbal update on the Crouch End Liveable Neighbourhoods scheme from Peter Watson, Programme Manager Highway Major Events. The following was noted:

- The Project commenced last November and included significant consultation work and workshops with both residents and Members.
- The key aim was to engender modal shift away from cars towards using public transport. In order to do this vehicular traffic was restricted and a bus gate in operation on Priory Lane.
- As part of the justification for the trial scheme it was noted that 80% of the traffic going through Crouch End did not stop there and instead vehicles were using Crouch End as a commuting artery.
- Part of the purpose of the trial was to iron out any issues that arose around communications. The Panel were advised that following the two-week trial, around 3000 comments were received through the website. At the time of the meeting, officers had responded to 800.
- The Project Board, at its most recent meeting, had agreed to undertake additional communications work and officers would be going out to the public with a consultation exercise on the next stage of the scheme. Officers advised that there were no plans at present to install another bus gate in the second stage of the project.
- In response to a request for clarification on timescales for the communication exercise, officers advised that they were constrained by the recent announcement of a General Election and anticipated this being concluded by the end of January. In addition, there was also a pre-election period scheduled for 23rd March for the Mayoral election and it was noted that this would also determine when the second trial period could take place.

The following points were raised in discussion of this agenda item:

- a. The Panel sought assurances about whether any measurement of air quality was taken before and after the trial period to assess its impact. In response, officers advised that 26 sites were monitored across Crouch End over a twelve month period to develop a baseline from which to measure any improvements to air quality.
- b. In response to a question about the level of concerns raised by residents following the trial period and whether the Council was considering cancelling the project, officers acknowledged the concerns raised by residents and suggested that the scheme was always likely to cause some upset because of the impact on traffic flow. Officers also highlighted that Haringey was the only borough awarded funding who were able to complete the whole two week trial period. Both Newham and Tower Hamlets had to cancel similar schemes due to concerns over safety. Enfield and Waltham Forest undertook borough-wide closures, whereas Haringey's was targeted to a specific location.
- c. Officers advised that they would be examining all of the feedback to examine where improvements could be made and how some of the biggest concerns might be mitigated. Officers suggested that one of the key learning points was around residents feeling that they had not been properly engaged. Officers suggested that despite sending out thousands of leaflets, there were some concerns about the extent to which people read the communications literature. The Cabinet Member advised that she had circulated a 3 page list of all of the consultation work undertaken as part of this scheme to Members last week. Furthermore, officers had engaged with all of the local business owners face-to-face. Nevertheless, the Cabinet Member acknowledged that more needed to be done next time to ensure that residents were fully aware of what was happening and when.
- d. The Panel advocated that more consultation and engagement needed to be done about the closure of Middle Lane as a bus stop. The Panel also requested further information around the outcomes from the scheme as well as the impact on air pollution. Officers agreed to circulate a briefing on the Crouch End Liveable Neighbourhoods to the Panel outside of the meeting. **(Action: Ann Cunningham).**
- e. Cllr Emery enquired whether a Councillor from Muswell Hill Ward could be placed on the project board due to the impact the scheme had in Muswell Hill. The Cabinet Member advised that she was going to hold a meeting with ward Councillors from the neighbouring wards about the communications programme going forwards and how this would be communicated to residents. Concerns from Muswell Hill ward Councillors would be picked up at this meeting. **(Action: Cllr Hearn).**
- f. In response to a question around the costs of the two week trial, officers advised that the cost was £187k, with most of the cost being due to staffing costs.
- g. The Chair requested that officers circulate copies of the responses to any FOI requests that had been received in relation to the Crouch End Liveable Neighbourhoods. **(Action: Ann Cunningham).**
- h. The Cabinet Member advised Panel Members had four days left to respond with feedback on the two week trial period.
- i. The Chair requested that Team Noel Park be added to a future agenda meeting and that the Cabinet Member be invited to attend. **(Action: Clerk).**

RESOLVED

The Panel noted the update.

12. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

RESOLVED

That the Members noted the work programme update and approved any changes therein.

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

14. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

It was noted that the next meeting date was 17th December 2019.

CHAIR: Councillor Adam Jogee

Signed by Chair

Date

Report for: Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel – 17th December

Title: Herbicide usage on Council land in Haringey

Report authorised by : Zoe Robertson, Head of Commissioning and Client Services

Lead Officer: Simon Farrow, simon.farrow@haringey.gov.uk Ext. 3639.

Ward(s) affected: All

Report for Key/

Non Key Decision: For information

1. Describe the issue under consideration

The panel has requested a short briefing on the usage of herbicide on council owned land in Haringey.

2. Background information

Herbicides are used on a variety of land across Haringey. In general terms the herbicides used in the borough are used on no more than four occasions in anyone year, applied by trained, qualified professionals. Chemicals used are generally less toxic than chemicals available to the amateur gardener.

All the products used by the council are licensed by the EU and based on current evidence are safe to use for their intended purposes. This situation is regularly reviewed by the licensing bodies and the council monitors any changes in this guidance and legislation.

3. Highways and Homes for Haringey Land

Weed management on streets, footpaths and gullies is delivered through the integrated waste management contract with Veolia who subcontract the work to Complete Weed Control.

The Council does not specify the type of chemical for weed control, other than it must comply with relevant health and safety/EU legislation. Glyphosate is routinely used given its proven effectiveness.

The streets in Haringey are sprayed on three occasions each year, whereas the Homes for Haringey areas are sprayed on four occasions.

4. Parks and Green Spaces

Generally, one or two applications a year are made on shrub beds and around hard obstacles. The use is kept to a minimum in line with our commitments in our Green Flag Management Plans.

The method of application is by Total Droplet Control (TDC) formulation. This method of application significantly reduces the amount of chemical used. TDC is a low volume system that virtually eliminates spray drift and run-off, making it safer for operators, bystanders, animals and the environment.

Other chemical usage includes specialist application to treat invasive species such as Japanese Knotweed, Himalayan Balsam and Giant Hogweed. These infestations must be treated by the council by law and wherever possible any infestation is treated by direct stem injection of the chemical into the plant.

5. Exploration of Alternatives

Whilst Haringey has not been directly involved in alternative trials many of our neighbouring boroughs have and our professional networks have kept abreast of developments in this area.

Feedback on some alternative treatments to Glyphosates are:

- **Foamstream** – would costs 6 to 8 times more, is messy with foam being left all over the street, is slow and would require additional safety arrangements for operatives. This system has different environmental impacts - it requires a vehicle and a diesel generator emitting fumes and particulates, significant amounts of water and uses palm oil to create the foam.
- **Vinegar** – Not as effective as Glyphosate, washes off weeds and is odorous.
- **Hot water** – Labour and energy intensive, costly and not as effective as Glyphosate. Requires fossil fuels to heat water and increases the carbon footprint of the treatment.
- **Burning** – Requires fossil fuels to create heat and increases carbon footprint of the treatment.
- **Electricity** – requiring a vehicle and a diesel generator emitting fumes and particulates.
- **Hand Weeding** – Labour intensive and very costly.

The council is involved in a pilot working with the Friends of Tower Gardens to declare Tower Gardens a herbicide free area. In this trial the council's level of resource input is remaining the same and the Friends are increasing their work programme to cope with the hand weeding required.

Report for: Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel Dec 2019

Title: Single Use Plastic Update – December 2019

Report authorised by : Dan Hawthorn, Director of Housing, Regen & Planning

Lead Officer: Joe Baker, Head of Carbon Management

Ward(s) affected: All

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

1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 This report provides and update to the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel on work being undertaken to reduce the amount of plastic used by the Council and in the borough more generally.
- 1.2 The report also outlines the development of a policy on single use plastics and progress to date.

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

N/A

3. Recommendations

- 3.1 That the Panel note the content of the update in relation the development of a single use plastics policy.

4. Background information

- 6.1 Officers are currently working on creating a policy that will reduce the level of single use plastics in the Council and the community. Similar policies have been passed by councils such as Surrey and Lambeth. However, these vary in detail with some stating high level ambitions whilst others detail specific actions to be undertaken.
- 6.2 Haringey Council's goal is to develop a policy that has specific and timed actions, alongside long-term aspirations to reduce single use plastics across the borough by working with business and other organisations. This approach will demonstrate our desire to 'get our own house in order' and enable us to share best practice and advice from our experiences. The Council is already delivering work on moving towards plastic free, such as providing all new staff with re-usable water bottles and the Council is removing plastic cups at water

dispensers in River Park House and Alexandra House. And the boroughs community is already being supported by North London Waste Authority (NLWA) to reduce single use plastics in businesses around Crouch End.

- 6.3 The new policy has the goal to reduce the amount of single use plastics in the Council both through hard measures, behavioural change, and policy alterations. Some actions will be dependent on budget and financial considerations, but many will cost very little or nothing at all. The policy will also set out the ways in which the Council can work and inform local businesses to reduce single use plastics through the supply chain and their operations. We will also look into creating education advice for schools and other organisations in Haringey with NLWA.
- 6.4 This policy is being designed and developed with a range of services across the Council – HR, Waste and Recycling, Corporate Landlord, Carbon Management etc. It is aiming for adoption in April's Full Council meeting.

- Report for:** Budget Scrutiny Panels
- Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel, 16th December 2019
 - Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel, 17th December 2019
 - Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel, 19th December 2019
 - Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel, 6th January 2020
 - Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 14th January 2020

Item number:

Title: Scrutiny of the 2020/21 Draft Budget / 5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2020/21-2024/25)

Report authorised by: Jon Warlow, Director of Finance and Section 151 Officer

Lead Officer: Frances Palopoli, Head of Corporate Financial Strategy & Monitoring

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 2020/21 Draft Budget / 5-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2020/21 – 2024/25 proposals relating to the Scrutiny Panels' remit.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Panels consider and provide recommendations to Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), on the 2020/21 Draft Budget/MTFS 2020/21-2024/25 and 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. 2020/21 Draft Budget / 5 year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2020/21 – 2024/25

- 5.1 The MTFS agreed by Council in February 2019 recognised a budget gap of £13.1m in 2020/21 that would need to be closed through further budget reductions. The proposed 2020/21 new budget reductions required to help close this gap of £5.5m in 2020/21 (rising to £10.4m by 2024/25) are now presented for scrutiny.
- 5.2 The reason that the required level of budget reduction for 2020/21 has reduced compared to the February forecast is partly due to the announcements in the Spending Round 2019 (SR19). This confirmed social care funding at 2019/20 levels for 2020/21 as well as circa £5m additional funding. This level of Government funding had not been assumed in the last MTFS presented to Cabinet in February 2019. The Live Budgeting approach also contributed, as the Cabinet meeting in July 2019 approved a package of Invest to Save proposals put forward by the Children's service. This contributed budget reductions of £1.3m to the 2020/21 gap.

- 5.3 Even with the budget reduction options set out in Appendix C being approved when the budget is finalised in February, the draft 2020/21 Budget presented to Cabinet on 10th December 2019 still has a gap of £0.6m. Work continues to identify options to bridge this before the final Budget/ MTFs is submitted to Cabinet and Council in February 2020.
- 5.4 Based on the draft 2020/21 Budget/MTFS 2020-2025, further budget reductions of £23.2m will need to be identified across the period 2021/22-2024-25 as highlighted in Appendix B.
- 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 23rd January 2020 for discussion, prior to approval and referral to Cabinet for consideration in advance of the Full Council meeting on 24th February 2020. For reference the remit of each Scrutiny Panel is as follows:
- Housing & Economy Priorities - Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
 - Place Priority - Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel
 - People (Children) Priority – Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel
 - People (Adults) Priority – Adult and Health Scrutiny Panel
 - Your Council Priority – 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** provides a summary of the draft General Fund 2020/21 Budget / MTFs 2020/2025 by priority area.
- 5.8 **Appendix C** provides details of the new revenue and capital budget proposals. A summary is provided, followed by detailed information for each proposal. Any invest to save revenue proposal dependent on capital or flexible use of capital receipts for successful delivery has been clearly identified in the summary.
- 5.9 The then then Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government issued guidance in March 2016, giving local authorities greater freedoms over how capital receipts can be used to finance expenditure. The direction allows for the following expenditure to be financed by utilising capital receipts:
- “Expenditure on any project that is designed to generate ongoing revenue savings in the delivery of public services and/or transform service delivery to reduce costs and/or transform service delivery in a way that reduces costs or demand for services in future years for any of the public sector delivery partners.”*
- 6. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

6.1 The Budget Scrutiny process for 2020/21 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 included in the Budget report presented to Cabinet on 11th February 2020.

8. Use of Appendices

Appendix A – Key lines of enquiry for budget setting

Appendix B – 5-year Draft General Fund Budget (2020-21) / Medium Term
Financial Strategy (2020/21 – 2024/25) - Cabinet 10th
December 2019

Appendix C – 2020 (New) Budget Proposals

9. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Background papers: 2020/21 Draft Budget / 5-year MTFS (2020/21 –
2024/25) -Cabinet 10th December 2019

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?

Appendix B – Haringey Draft General Fund and Medium Term Financial Plan

	2019/20 Budget	Movement	2020/21 (Draft) Budget	Movement	2021/22 Projected	Movement	2022/23 Projected	Movement	2023/24 Projected	Movement	2024/25 Projected
Priority Area	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Housing	19,067	(816)	18,251	(709)	17,542	(136)	17,406	(136)	17,270	(136)	17,134
People - Children	59,293	(2,942)	56,351	(619)	55,732	(9)	55,723	400	56,123	300	56,423
People - Adults	83,535	(7,390)	76,145	(2,091)	74,054	(1,724)	72,329	3,174	75,503	3,102	78,605
Place	26,954	(2,505)	24,449	(2,061)	22,388	(1,053)	21,335	(64)	21,271	6	21,277
Economy	1,479	(390)	1,089	(120)	969	(130)	839	(120)	719	-	719
Your Council	37,811	(1,509)	36,302	(1,088)	35,214	(790)	34,424	(6)	34,418	-	34,418
Non-Service Revenue	18,530	11,070	29,600	10,144	39,744	10,785	50,529	9,540	60,069	6,266	66,335
Further Savings to be Identified	-	(612)	(612)	125	(487)	(1,209)	(1,696)	(6,946)	(8,642)	(3,766)	(12,409)
Council Cash Limit	246,669	(5,094)	241,575	3,580	245,156	5,734	250,889	5,842	256,731	5,772	262,503
Planned Contributions form Reserves	(5,487)	5,487	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total General Fund Budget	241,182	393	241,575	3,580	245,156	5,734	250,889	5,842	256,731	5,772	262,503
Funding											
Council Tax	(101,981)	(5,130)	(107,111)	(3,224)	(110,335)	(3,321)	(113,656)	(3,421)	(117,077)	(3,524)	(120,600)
Council Tax Surplus	(3,850)	1,700	(2,150)	-	(2,150)	-	(2,150)	-	(2,150)	-	(2,150)
RSG	0	(22,030)	(22,030)	(441)	(22,471)	(449)	(22,920)	(458)	(23,378)	(468)	(23,846)
Retained Business Rates	(33,484)	11,664	(21,820)	(1,339)	(23,158)	(418)	(23,576)	(416)	(23,992)	(480)	(24,472)
Top up Business Rates	(65,196)	7,525	(57,671)	(5,089)	(62,760)	(1,133)	(63,892)	(1,126)	(65,018)	(1,300)	(66,319)
NNDR Growth	(3,084)	2,684	(400)	400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total (Main Funding)	(207,595)	(3,586)	(211,181)	(9,692)	(220,873)	(5,321)	(226,194)	(5,421)	(231,615)	(5,772)	(237,387)
New Homes Bonus	(2,540)	341	(2,199)	-	(2,199)	-	(2,199)	-	(2,199)	-	(2,199)
Public Health	(19,677)	(551)	(20,228)	(405)	(20,632)	(413)	(21,045)	(421)	(21,466)	-	(21,466)
Other core grants	(11,370)	3,403	(7,967)	6,517	(1,450)	-	(1,450)	-	(1,450)	-	(1,450)
TOTAL (Core/Other External Grants)	(33,587)	3,193	(30,394)	6,112	(24,282)	(413)	(24,694)	(421)	(25,115)	-	(25,115)

MTFS Budget Reduction Proposals - Place

REF	Capital Scheme Ref/Flexible Use of Capital Receipts	Priority	Category	Title	Description	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000	Savings Total £'000	Capital Investment £'000
20/25-PL01		Place	New Delivery Model	Selective Licensing	To consider Selective Licensing of the Private Rented sector for 60% of the Borough . The overall aim is to improve living standards and make landlords accountable for the management of their properties. The proposal is for a Selective Licensing fee of £600. Saving assume 60% of the Borough will be licenced. Saving relate to existing costs of established positions (highlighted in yellow on the spreadsheet) . To maximise the use of additional fee income recharges for ancillary services such as ASB enforcement officers (noise, nuisance, waste, anti-social behaviour) and corporate overheads will be charged against the HMO licence fees. Training costs will be applicable during service delivery.	-	-	239	-	-	239	-
20/25-PL02		Place	Increase in income	Debt Recovery	Dedicated team of officers to proactively chase payment of outstanding debts from unpaid PCN's. Use of new IT system, additional CEO's and nuisance vehicle contract to remove offending vehicles and encourage payment of outstanding debt and improve overall recovery rate percentage. PL09 is an invest to save proposal, there is a required £150k Service Revenue investment to generate £360k income, with a net savings of £210k	210	-	-	-	-	210	-
20/25-PL03	FUCR	Place	Increase in income	CCTV enforcement of weight limits and emissions through ANPR/DVLA check	Use of new technology cameras to record vehicle reg plates and immediately look up DVLA database to establish vehicle weight and emissions. Will require significant investment in infrastructure and back office arrangements.	62	280	300	-	-	642	300
20/25-PL04		Place	Increase in income	Increase permit charges for highest emitting 'petrol' vehicles	A flat fee increase in Permit charge for the most polluting petrol emission band(s). Note a flat fee increase for diesel vehicles is already under consideration within Parking Action Plan and Parking Transformation. The new IT system would allow us to implement more dynamic permit and on street charges. The IT system will also allow us to determine the number of vehicles in each of the emissions band, so we will have accurate data to base decisions	75	25	-	-	-	100	-
20/25-PL05		Place	Increase in income	Increased trade waste	Invest to save model by increasing enforcement of trade waste to drive up compliance and income. Ensure time banding is adhered to and traders do not use residential collection services for their waste. Offending traders to be visited by Veolia-Haringey sales team. A three-month trial is recommended to quantify the overall benefits of this project to LBH . Traders who appear to be without contracts and traders who appear to have insufficient capacity will be visited.	25	-	-	-	-	25	-
20/25-PL06		Place	Efficiency savings	Contact Centre Efficiencies	The Veolia Contact Centre resource consists of ten staff who deal with reports of missed collections, cleansing requests, complaints and taking payment for charged services (e.g. Green Waste and Bulky collections). This proposal is to reduce the size of the team by two staff, seeking to channel shift customers online but ultimately accepting a lower level of responsiveness to customers (performance is currently high).	-	50	-	-	-	50	-
20/25-PL07		Place	Efficiency savings	Mechanisation of High Street Cleansing	We will move to an outcome based cleansing model that increases the use of machinery and ensures that resources are deployed to maintain streets to a consistent standard across the borough. We need further time to carry out trials in more residential streets, main roads and high roads to ensure any new operating model is robust.	-	150	150	-	-	300	-

20/25-PL08		Place	New Delivery Model	FM Transformation	Terminating the Amey contract for FM Services and bringing Soft FM back in-house, and transferring Hard FM to Homes for Haringey. Approximately 100 staff will be in scope for a TUPE transfer. The proposed saving will be achieved through improved efficiency and returning Amey overhead and profit to the council. The transformation will include purchase of a new Property IT system, and service improvements particularly relating to building repairs and maintenance.	150	-	-	-	-	150	-
20/25-PL09	FUCR	Place	New Delivery Model	Hybrid Mail proposal	Provide on-demand service to centralise print streams and optimise stationery and print costs, which will enable outgoing correspondence to be sent electronically to the mailroom, for automated printing and insertion into envelopes, franking and dispatch. The envisage solution can also handle inserts. It can deal with large scale mail out as well as individual letters. This will provide a more efficient solution for staff sending letters.	-	77	-	-	-	77	50
20/25-PL10		Place	Increase in income	Crematorium Lease	The council's Parks Service manages the lease on the borough's crematorium operated by Dignity. There is a contractual inflation rise each year in the income on this lease, plus a general increased share of their profits.	20	-	-	-	-	20	-
20/25-PL11		Place	Increase in income	New Lease Income v2	The Parks Service receives income from leases on a range of buildings in parks. Some of these leases have completed recently or will complete in next couple of years. The renegotiation of these leases on new rates could deliver a further £20k saving from 2021/22.	-	20	-	-	-	20	-
20/25-PL12		Place	Efficiency savings	Fuel Savings	There is an existing capital programme scheme to procure a new fleet of 15+ parks vehicles during 2020/21. It anticipated that the majority or all of the new fleet will be fully electric, hence there will be savings within the fuel base budget. This proposal contributes to the council's Zero Carbon targets.	-	25	-	-	-	25	-
20/25-PL13		Place	Increase in income	EV Charging	Lamp Column, Standard and Rapid - will increase this year. Income is based on medium or high uptake of EV charging. 38 CP' shave been installed and work is progressing on Phase 2. Work is also continuing on TfL funded (rapid) charging Points and GULC's funded charging points. However, progress for all EVCPs has stalled because of change in design specification (as per ULEV action plan) to prioritise installation on carriageway and not footways. Suppliers are resistant as this adds c£2000k to costs for a build-out. Carbon Management negotiating with suppliers to fund build-outs.	100	-	-	-	-	100	-
20/25-PL14		Place	Increase in income	Parking Transformation Programme	The Parking Transformation Programme (PTP) is a series of parking related projects and workstreams, which seeks to increase income and provide and more efficient and effective service.	1,360	840	300	-	-	2,500	-
TOTAL - ECONOMY						2,002	1,467	989	0	0	4,458	350

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

At present the evidence base is being considered and any scheme is subject to meeting the conditions set out in the Housing Act which includes consultation and Secretary of State approval.

However given previous work and the proliferation of PRS in the borough it would be highly likely that 20% private sector Housing threshold in many parts of the Borough.

There will be some costs of implementation related to IT and project support.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
(1 = not at all confident;
5 = very confident)

At this stage 2. Any thing over 20% of the Borough requires Secretary of State approval and the evidence base has not been worked through. There is always the risk of judicial review

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	01/07/2020	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2022
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No . There are three stages to consider. 1 evidence base, 2 Consultation and 3 Secretary of State approval		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

Success will be measured by: the number of applications received declaring compliance. •100% compliance from landlords in the submission of Gas Certificates (where applicable); and no licences being granted without this key document. Number of private rented properties improved.

Evidence base being considered Dec 2019, will require Cabinet Approval to consult June 2020.

Cabinet consideration of consultation outcome and evidence scheme April/ May 2021 Secretary of State consideration June-Jan 2021.

April 2022 implementation subject to evidence and conditions being met.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

- Licences require landlords to meet conditions throughout the licence period. Failing to comply with licence conditions is an offence.
- Drives up Living Standards.
- Increases available resource for Local Authorities to regulate.
- Licence holder who must be a fit and proper person to be responsible for the property.
- Significant enforcement tool to ensure Landlords take an active role in the management of their tenants and their property.
- A licence is for a maximum 5 year period but can be varied to shorter lengths by the local authority as a penalty for non-compliance.
- A public register of all licence holders contact details must be held by the authority and made available to the public. This is a very good tool for tenants to check landlord before they take on a property. It allows the public to see if a property is licenced within their community and report it if it is not. It allows other Council services working with landlords to very quickly ascertain who is responsible for a property or an offence.

Negative Impacts

Businesses may feel that this is a business tax against a poor outlook investment-wise for the private rented sector. Mortgage income can not be offset against properties. Landlords will complain that the market is already poor and this will further affect them and might pass on the costs to tenants. Can be seen to penalise those who are already compliant. Tenants may fear that the costs of the scheme will be passed on to them. However there is no evidence of this in other schemes or reviews that this is the case.

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

Positive Impacts

- Licences require landlords to meet conditions throughout the licence period. Failing to comply with licence conditions is an offence.
- Drives up Living Standards.
- Increases available resource for Local Authorities to regulate.
- Licence holder who must be a fit and proper person to be responsible for the property.
- Significant enforcement tool to ensure Landlords take an active role in the management of their tenants and their property.
- A licence is for a maximum 5 year period but can be varied to shorter lengths by the local authority as a penalty for non-compliance.
- A public register of all licence holders contact details must be held by the authority and made available to the public. This is a very good tool for tenants to check landlord before they take on a property. It allows the public to see if a property is licenced within their community and report it if it is not. It allows other Council services working with landlords to very quickly ascertain who is responsible for a property or an offence.

level playing field for Landlords. Selective Licensing will be very light touch to compliant landlords and will focus throughout the 5 years on those that are unlicensed or non compliant. The general principal has been discussed at Landlord forums.

Negative Impacts

Businesses may feel that this is a business tax against a poor outlook investment wise for the private rented sector. Mortgage income can not be offset against properties. Landlords will complain that the market is already poor and this will further affect them and might pass on the costs to tenants. Can be seen to penalise those who are already compliant. Tenants may fear that the costs of the scheme will be passed on to them.

However there is no evidence of this in other scheme or reviews that this is the case.

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

Bringing in the scheme is a discretionary Statutory Instrument and will assist in the Regulation of the Housing Act 2004

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Any savings	H	M	Investment needs to be high to ensure success
Alienate Landlords	M	M	Landlords Forums, Regulation on Rogues
Judicial review	H	H	Robust evidence base and legal consultation
Non Approval or delay from S of S	H	M	Early Engagement
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?			yes
<u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>			
Is a full EqIA required?			yes

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

Based on estimates of outstanding debt and likelihood of retrieving savings and improvement in recovery rate through establishment of new team to proactively action against persistent evaders and outstanding warrants aligned with new operational practices. Please note that the revenue implication is that we will employ 3 staff members in the new Debt Recovery Team; with the expectation that each team members work generating additional income of £120k.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out? (1 = not at all confident; 5 = very confident)	3 - based on rollout of new IT System and increase in overall debt recovery rate
---	--

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?		No - this additional work/savings requires the implementation and development of the new IT system that has a scheduled implementation date of Apr 2020.	

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

Establishment of a dedicated team to investigate persistent evaders, unregistered drivers and liaise directly with removals service to identify and remove to the pound as soon as located.

New IT and CEO hand-held devices will make this operation more efficient and effective.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

This will enable the Council to pro-actively chase debt that is owed. This will result in additional resources for the Council, enabling savings elsewhere to be mitigated, thus benefitting all residents. The service will also remove unregistered vehicles which are often uninsured from the Highway.

Negative Impacts

Will increase workload for removals service, which may impact on other removals operations or slow response times.

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

Positive Impacts

Removal of unregistered and potentially uninsured vehicles from the highway.

Negative Impacts

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

In line with statutory duty to keep traffic moving.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
further costs of recovery and legal action	m	m	recovered through the debt collection process
potential to remove and dispose of vehicles	h	m	ensure that all statutory and regulatory processes are followed

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? <u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	Yes
Is a full EqIA required?	No

**Business Planning / MTFS Options
2020/21 – 2024/25**

20/25 - PL03

Title of Option:	CCTV enforcement of weight limits and emissions through ANPR/DVLA check		
Priority:	Place	Responsible Officer:	Ann Cunningham
Affected Service(s) and AD:	Parking	Contact / Lead:	Matthew Duhy

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 Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

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

The roll out of CCTV enforcement of weight restrictions on roads across the borough.

Weight restrictions not being enforced and oversized vehicles driving down residential or unsuitable roads. This causes congestion and increased pollution. The ability to enforce against over weight vehicles will be very well received by residents, pedestrian & cycle groups and Members as this will divert heavy and polluting vehicles onto more appropriate roads.

This measure will require significant investment in infrastructure and back office arrangements.

Financial Benefits Summary

Savings <i>All savings shown on an incremental</i>	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	Total £000s
New net additional savings	62	280	300	-	-	642

Capital Implementation Costs	2020/21 £000s	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	Total £000s
Total Capital Costs	100	200	-	-	-	300

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

To be developed further.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
 (1 = not at all confident;
 5 = very confident)

2 - limited experience of this enforcement to date and as a consequence budgeted expectations may not be realised.

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	N		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

This will require the implementation of CCTV cameras at selected locations. Surveys are being undertaken to identify and prioritise suitable locations.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

We receive a lot of complaints in relation to weight restrictions not being enforced and oversized vehicles driving down residential or unsuitable roads. This causes congestion and increased pollution. The ability to enforce against over weight vehicles will be very well received by residents, pedestrian & cycle groups and Members as this will divert heavy and polluting vehicles onto more appropriate roads.

This correspondingly improves movement of traffic and improved road safety, whilst also helping reduce transport related Carbon and NOx emissions, combating poor air quality as part the Councils Borough plan objectives.

Negative Impacts

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

Positive Impacts

This will ensure that they are compliance with current regulations, making their journeys safer for all road users and will reduce complaints about their operations.

Negative Impacts

Freight companies will need to use prescribed routes only.

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

--

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
That drivers appeal to PCN's stating that they were driving for access purposes.	H	H	Understand how LBI TMO's are worded to ensure effective enforcement and or ask for drivers to provide a delivery note or similar to prove they needed access. However, this may add to appeals processes/workloads
May achieve compliance quickly	H	M	Develop a programme to relocate cameras once compliance is achieved
Enforcement of weight limits is relatively new technology. Untested over a period of time. These cameras have not been tested	H	M	Invest in adequate maintenance package.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?	Yes
<u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	
Is a full EqIA required?	No

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

Proposed savings have been identified based on policy and current permit sale volumes.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
(1 = not at all confident;
5 = very confident)

3 - Requires a Policy change, a reduction in the volume of high emitting petrol vehicles

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	no		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

A change in pricing for most polluting vehicles will be possible through our new Parking IT system which will be operational from April 2020. Such a change will require member support and statutory consultation. However, the councils policy position on sustainable transport is to discourage private car trips and improve air quality and an increase in permit and on-street prices for the most polluting vehicles supports this.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

The councils policy position on sustainable transport is to discourage private car trips and improve air quality and an increase in permit and on-street prices for the most polluting vehicles supports this. Helping reduce transport related Carbon and NOx emissions, combating poor air quality as part the Councils Borough plan objectives.

Negative Impacts

It is perceived that residents in the poorest areas of the borough could be the most affected by such a change, as they may be the least able to afford to change to a lesser polluting vehicle.

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

Positive Impacts

--

Negative Impacts

--

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

A reduction in private car use and of the most polluting vehicles will assist in the Council contributing to achieving air quality targets.

--

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
There is a risk that residents move away from higher emitting vehicles and do not replace their vehicle at all. But this would be good from a air quality perspective	H	M	Continually review all permit pricing.
Complaints from residents who cannot afford to purchase lower emitting vehicles	H	M	Offer discount for lesser polluting greener vehicles. Encourage roll out of car clubs, which are easily accessed and often result in lower costs to the customer.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? <u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	Yes
Is a full EqIA required?	No

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

To achieve £25k net revenue from Haringey's 50% share of commercial sack sales requires an additional 100,000 sacks to be sold to businesses. Veolia-Haringey currently have 1000 sack customers using, on average, 280 sacks per year each. This figure appears low and may indicate existing customers are evading disposal costs - hence our current estimate of £25,000 income based on a 50% profit share.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
 (1 = not at all confident;
 5 = very confident)

2

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No - increased and consistent enforcement focus requires greater lead in		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

Empirical evidence from LBH's Enforcement Team suggests much of the non-compliance for trade waste is not a lack of Duty of Care documentation but rather traders running out of their supply of commercial waste sacks or holding them back to save money.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

Cleaner streets and improved management of time banding arrangements
Prevention of trade waste leaking into residential streams
With dedicated sack waste enforcement, a closer liaison with businesses

Negative Impacts

Traders fined by enforcement officers can use any waste collection operator and are not reliant on the Veolia-Council partnership.

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

Positive Impacts

Enforcement - Cleaner retail areas with improved liaison with traders

Negative Impacts

Traders fined by enforcement officers can use any waste collection operator and are not reliant on the Veolia-Council partnership.

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

Enforcement - Legislation allows for the Council to enforce, fine and prosecute traders that do not adhere to its rules for presenting trade waste. These powers are already used daily by LBH.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
market competition is strong and trade may go to other providers.	h	h	ensure that the Haringey commercial offer is competitive

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?	Yes
<u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?	No

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

The saving is based on reducing the FTE call centre staff by two.

This would be passed back to the Council as a saving through the core contract.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
 (1 = not at all confident;
 5 = very confident)

3

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2021
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No - staff need to be given notice and will be subject to a consultation period.		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

Veolia will consult with affected staff and seek to manage the reduction without redundancy though there is a risk that two staff may be made redundant.

There is some opportunity to channel shift customers online.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

Customer service is currently high. We hope this can be maintained by channel shifting some enquiries to other media. There is some risk that customer service metrics (eg calls answered within time) will reduce.

Negative Impacts

Customers may experience longer wait times though current performance is high. This may be part mitigated through channel shift.

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

Positive Impacts

Customer service is currently high. We hope this can be maintained by channel shifting some enquiries to other media. There is some risk that customer service metrics (eg calls answered within time) will reduce.

Negative Impacts

Veolia will seek to manage staff reductions through natural wastage rather than redundancy.

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

There would be no impact on our ability to deliver statutory requirements

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Performance regarding customer responsiveness declines e.g. time to answer calls and emails causing negative customer perception of the service/contract	M	H	Channel shift to online self service and reporting

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?	Yes
<u>EqIA Screening Tool</u> Is a full EqIA required?	No

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

Monitoring and scrutiny suggests that different streets at different times require less or more input to achieve and maintain the same level of cleanliness.

Longer term monitoring has shown other residential streets require greater input.

Our work to date suggests that there is potential resource that can be "lifted and shifted" at different times and in particular areas such as High Roads could benefit from greater use of mechanical sweeping which would offer efficiencies over traditional sweeping.

Further longer term trials are required to ensure that proposals are robust. Significant savings have been made in street cleansing over the past seven years and modelling and review is recommended prior to implementation.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
(1 = not at all confident;
5 = very confident)

3 - modelling and review is recommended

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2021
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No - further modelling must be undertaken before savings can be secured.		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

Detailed plans are yet to be drawn up but monitoring and scrutiny to date and historically support this. Further modelling will need to be carried out to ensure that our hypothesis about inputs required to achieve uniform standards of cleansing are robust.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

New or more visible machinery will likely be positively received by residents and businesses.

Negative Impacts

There is a risk that residents and other stakeholders will perceive a move from an input based (weekly sweep of all residential streets) to an outcome based (all streets maintained to same level but some swept less often) as a cut in service.

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

Positive Impacts

As above

Negative Impacts

As above

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

Councils are obliged under the Environmental Protection Act to maintain streets to an acceptable level of cleanliness. These proposals will not undermine that and will ensure greater consistency across the borough. Further modelling will give more certainty that the council will continue to meet its statutory obligations.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Changes are perceived as cuts by residents and stakeholders	M	H	Communications to explain the new operating model as achieving efficient and consistent outcomes across the borough.
New operating model fails to deliver necessary outcomes	H	M	Modelling to be carried out monitored and evaluated prior to full implementation.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?	Yes
<u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	
Is a full EqIA required?	No

Total Capital Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

Business case development was undertaken through development of a Commissioning Study, which was approved as part of a July

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
 (1 = not at all confident;
 5 = very confident)

3

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	no		

<p>Implementation Details</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required? •Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase. •How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?
<p>.A project team has been assembled, with a project plan (available on request).</p> <p>Mobilisation Phase: completed Business Design work: August to December IT Procurement: September to November Data Transfer and Cleansing: November to February TUPE Transfer and Staff Consultation: January to March GO Live: End March 2020</p> <p>Benefits Realisation will be measured through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial performance to measure the cost of delivery of the new service - Satisfaction surveys to measure perceptions of building/service users - Other Service KPIs, to be defined during the Business Design work.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)</p>
<p>Positive Impacts</p> <p>Improved service quality and perception</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customer satisfaction - Statutory compliance indicators - Staff feedback
<p>Negative Impacts</p> <p>Potential loss of procurement and supply chain flexibility</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?
List both positive and negative impacts.

Positive Impacts

Improved service quality, working environment, and environmental performance.

Negative Impacts

None identified or expected.

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

Improve performance in relation to statutory compliance with building and H&S regulations. Improved visibility of compliance data, ability to assign resources accordingly and deal with compliance shortfalls more efficiently.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
HFH mobilisation delays	M	H	Escalation to senior sponsors - in progress. Delays have occurred but some confidence that the project is still deliverable at this stage.
Technology - Failure to manage technology and data transfer change in time	M	M	Can sustain manual processes for a short period. External consultancy engaged to support the procurement of systems. Internal IT resources being engaged to ensure
Capacity- Insufficient internal capacity / resources	H	M	Provisioned funding for external resource support Engage business partner (s)

Has the EqlA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?	Yes
<u>EqlA Screening Tool</u>	
Is a full EqlA required?	Yes

Total Capital Costs	-	50	-	-	-	50
---------------------	---	----	---	---	---	----

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

The savings were determined through an initial analysis of current mailing volumes, and the current postal costs. Assumptions were made about the proportion of these volumes that would be suitable to delivery through a Hybrid Mail solution, and using these volumes an overall high level calculation made about the potential savings available to the Council.

There are different solutions available to the Council, which will need to be explored more fully to find a model that is suitable.

Investment is needed in the Council's print management software to accomodate the solution. Further investment is needed in business design and development. The Council will need to consider this proposal in relation to its ambitions around delivery of printing solutions (currently externalised).

Delivery Confidence

<p>At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out? (1 = not at all confident; 5 = very confident)</p>	<p>3 - this solution is envisages adoption of technology that is widely used elsewhere. Therefore there is confidence that the proposed change is realistic and deliverable. However the figures for costs and benefits will require further validation.</p>
--	--

Indicative timescale for implementation

<p>Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY</p>	<p>N/a</p>	<p>Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY</p>	<p>01/04/2021</p>
<p>Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?</p>	<p>No</p>		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

Additional resources needed for business design, technical design and procurement.

Initial consultancy and business design - Q1-2 FY20/21; Procurement Q3 FY20/21; Implementation Q4 FY20/21

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

No/miminal visible impacts for customers.

Negative Impacts

None anticipated.

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

Positive Impacts

Easier method for production and dispatch of letters.

Little or no engagement with stakeholders has taken place. This will need to commence during the business design phase.

A Comms Plan will be needed to ensure staff adopt the new solution.

Negative Impacts

At some point, the Council may wish to reject hand-produced letters from the Mailroom in order to ensure savings are realised.

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

Yes - no impact.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Uncertainties about insourcing of external print facilities. This may impact the proposal	H	M	Business analysis of the proposal and the preferred operating model, and engagement with Strategic Procurement
Staff do not adopt the new technology	M	M	Comms Plan
Unable to deliver the solution in the timescale	H	H	Identify and secure delivery resources

Has the EqlA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?	Yes
<u>EqlA Screening Tool</u>	
Is a full EqlA required?	No

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

The saving will be delivered through inflationary increase on the cemetery and crematorium lease as well as a share of the gross profit of the operation.

No additional investment is required.

The inflationary increase is a contractual arrangement and will be based on Consumer Price Index - CPI.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
(1 = not at all confident;
5 = very confident)

5

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

The additional income will be linked to CPI from the previous year and therefore can be delivered without further work other than reconciliation with the lease and previous years. Income will therefore be delivered in 2020/21.

Successful implementation will be measured by meeting the revised income target.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

None

Negative Impacts

This income will not be available to reinvest in the parks service - this would have paid for 0.6FTE within the front line parks service.

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

Positive Impacts

It contributes to balancing the council budget.

Negative Impacts

As above the service needs additional resources and therefore they will not be supported by this additional income.

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

Parks is a non statutory service with the excpetions of Allotments which would be unaffected.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
None			

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? <u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	No and not required
Is a full EqIA required?	

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

The savings are additional income derived from new or revised lease arrangements which are or will be concluded by 2021/22. No additional investment is required.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
(1 = not at all confident;
5 = very confident)

5

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2021
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

Those leases that are still to be concluded will be done so as BAU and within existing resources.
All will be in place to meet the increase in the income set out above for April 2021/22

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

The councils assest are being utilised to meet the Borough Plan objectives and buildings are being maintained at no cost to the council.

Negative Impacts

None

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

Positive Impacts

In terms of partners they will have access to buildings to continue or grow their business or community or sporting objectives in line with the Borough Plan and the emerging Parks Strategy.

Negative Impacts

The Parks service is very stretched and is struggling to match its resources to the expectation of good quality parks in the borough. This income would have funded a 0.6FTE in the frontline service.

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

The parks service is non statutory with the exception of the Allotment Service.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Lease that are still to conclude do not proceed.	H	L	All of the above are either renewals or new leases at Heads of Terms stages where cost are already agreed.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? <u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	No not required. No change in policy or approach.
Is a full EqIA required?	

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

This saving is subject to the successful procurement of the vehicles during 2020/21 and therefore savings should be available from 2021/22 onwards.

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out? <i>(1 = not at all confident; 5 = very confident)</i>	5
---	---

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2021
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	No - due to timetable of procuring new vehicles.		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

There is an existing capital programme (scheme 325) which will be used to procure the new fleet of vehicles. The timing of savings is subject to the delivery of the vehicles but assuming they arrive no later than Q2 2021/22 then this saving remains achievable. The remainder of the fuel budget is ring fenced for the increased cost in electricity consumption.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

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

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

Positive contribution of the vehicle purchase to the council's 2030 Zero Carbon target.
Contribution to improving Air Quality in the borough.

Negative Impacts

None

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

Positive Impacts

Staff will have improved vehicles, residents will see the council moving towards its own targets for carbon reduction and air quality.

Negative Impacts

This saving could otherwise be used to support the base budget position for Parks, such as front line staff.

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

Parks is a non statutory service with the exception of allotments. This saving will help the council meet its other statutory obligations.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Delays in the procurement / delivery of vehicles	M	L	Good Project Management and Governance arrangements. Whilst the vehicles arrival may be delayed the saving will be achieved within a few months.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? <u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	No. Not a policy change or affecting residents.
Is a full EqIA required?	

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

EV is already available in a number of Haringey locations. Further roll out will increase the opportunity to reduce carbon emissions, pollution and deliver safer streets. However, the charging points require initial investment in staff time (revenue).

GULCs Lamp Column £5k

GULCs Chagemaster £5k

BPL (Free standing) £77k

Rapid £13k

Delivery Confidence

At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out?
(1 = not at all confident;
5 = very confident)

3 - Dependant of increased usage and impact of rollout as result of new specifications

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	N/a	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?	no - because the planning, enabling and introduction timelines requirement and confirmation of design specification (on or off footway)		

Implementation Details

- How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?
- Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.
- How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?

The feasibility work will be picked up as part of the Parking Transformation programme.
 A recourse is required to manage design, statutory consultation and implementation process.
 Programme is determined by demand but estimates suggest that 300-600 EVCP's will be required across Haringey by 2025.

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
 List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)

Positive Impacts

EVCPs are in line with sustainable transport objectives, Transport Strategy and Borough Plan.
 There is an increasing demand from residents and businesses for the continued introduction of all types of EVCP's.
 The 'deal' we have with BPL gives LBH an income for each EVCP we install, plus a potential share of profit. BPL pay for the actual CP to be installed and ongoing maintenance.

Negative Impacts

Some residents and pedestrian groups have complained about EVCP's being installed on the footway and feel that they should be installed on the carriageway. Some groups feel that EVCPs encourage car use.

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

Positive Impacts

EVCPs are in line with sustainable transport objectives, Transport Strategy and Borough Plan.
There is an increasing demand from residents and businesses for the continued introduction of all types of EVCP's.
The 'deal' we have with BPL gives LBH an income for each EVCP we install, plus a potential share of profit. BPL pay for the actual CP to be installed and ongoing maintenance.

Negative Impacts

Each EV space has to be taken from an existing resident space and so non EV drivers can / may object.

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

--

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
space requirements	M	H	careful planning and feasibility studies will enable the Council to determine how to optimise the location of new charging points whilst also not disadvantaging users who need traditional parking space
objection to EVCPs being installed on footway	H	M	establish if EVCPs can be located on build-outs on the carriageway

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? <u>EqIA Screening Tool</u>	Yes
Is a full EqIA required?	No

Financial Implications Outline

- How have the savings above been determined? Please provide a brief breakdown of the factors considered.
- Is any additional investment required in order to deliver the proposal?
- If relevant, how will additional income be generated and how has the amounts been determined?

The figures outlined above are best estimates at this stage as actual delivery has a number of dependencies at this point, this includes the actual go live date of the new parking management system; the outcome of statutory consultation on changes to permits; final decisions around proposed new Stop and Shop options; final rollout timings and locations of proposed CCTV.

The service has used previous experience and benchmarking in arriving at these estimates.

The capital investment required to support the overall parking transformation programme has been agreed previously and is included in the current capital programme.

Delivery Confidence

<p>At this stage, how confident are you that this option could be delivered and benefits realised as set out? <i>(1 = not at all confident; 5 = very confident)</i></p>	<p>3 Ongoing development of strategy</p>
---	--

Indicative timescale for implementation

<p>Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY</p>	<p>N/a</p>	<p>Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY</p>	<p>01/04/2020</p>
<p>implementation before April 2020? Y/N ; any constraints?</p>	<p>N</p>		

<p>Implementation Details</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required? •Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase. •How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?
<p>Proposed implementation Include:</p> <p>Events - New Operating Model</p> <p>This involves the recruitment and deployment of additional CEO's for events at the Tottenham FC New stadium, ensuring an appropriate infrastructure and resource base to meet the demand for efficient parking enforcement.</p> <p>Pricing Policy Charges and Inflation</p> <p>Diesel surcharge, 2nd and subsequent permit per household, Permit inflation. This involves the introduction of dynamic permit charging models which will be made possible through the new Parking IT system, which is programmed for delivery in April 2020.</p> <p>The new IT system will allow permit prices to be based not only on emissions but specifically on fuel type e.g. Diesels. The new IT system will also allow an incremental pricing model to apply for households which own multiple cars. Although the IT system will enable these changes, they will require Member approval and statutory consultation.</p> <p>Stop and Shop - Pay for Parking Stop (Contactless and Chip & Pin)</p> <p>In 2017 we moved to cashless parking and while the transition went smoothly, some businesses, customers and members have requested additional payment options to help support trade. We shall be investigating the introduction of contactless and chip & pin card payment options to be installed in our Town Centres. This will involve retrofitting existing (former P&D) machines or installing new machines.</p> <p>Moving Traffic Enforcement</p> <p>Additional cameras – increased CCTV PCN income. We will use data from traffic/video surveys to establish where there are the highest levels of moving traffic contraventions taking place across our borough. We shall then invest in CCTV camera technology to help enforce these locations and develop a programme to relocate cameras to new locations once 'compliance' is achieved at current sites. This will make best use of the cameras and encourage compliance and improve road safety across a wider area. We shall also seek to invest in mobile camera vehicles, which may be deployed across the borough and outside schools where we know there to be traffic and congestion issues.</p>

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

<p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?</p> <p>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Borough Plan 2019-23 objectives and outcomes)</p>
<p>Positive Impacts</p> <p>Events at the new Tottenham FC New stadium require an enhanced Transport and Enforcement Plan and Haringey have committed to a Code of Enforcement (CoE) to ensure that spectators and background traffic are managed safely. The Stadium Local Area Management Plan (LAMP) has been in place for nearly a year and the enhanced CoE which has been delivered through the New Operating Model have widely been viewed as a success. Increased enforcement of banned turns, yellow box junctions etc will benefit road safety and reduce congestion, improve bus running times , which in turn encourages more people to get out of private vehicles and use public transport which is better for the environment.</p> <p>Discouraging the use of diesel fuelled vehicles which are a major source of NOx in London, will help combat poor air quality. In addition measures to discourage multiple car ownership households will also help reduce transport related Carbon and NOx emissions.</p> <p>Stop and shop machines to facilitate Contactless and Chip & pin payments will be well received by the business community and their customers. It has been argued that some customers cannot or do not want to use contactless parking Apps such as Pay by Phone. The introduction of contactless and chip & pin card payment options will offer support to such customers and businesses/Town Centres</p>

Negative Impacts

Events - New Operating Model

Some drivers may see additional enforcement as 'overzealous'.

Pricing Policy Charges and Inflation

There will be concerns that a diesel surcharge may affect the poorest residents in the borough who may not be able to afford to purchase a ULEZ compliant vehicle.

Any increase in costs for parking will inevitably result in complaints.

Stop and Shop - Pay for Parking (Contactless/Chip and Pin)

Introduction of additional physical infrastructure may be seen as street-clutter by some, especially if contactless is a functional option which requires minimal infrastructure.

Moving Traffic Enforcement

Similar to additional 'on-street' foot patrol enforcement, additional CCTV camera enforcement may be seen by some as overzealous.

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

List both positive and negative impacts.

Positive Impacts

Town centres and businesses will benefit from the introduction of additional payment methods for short stay parking. In addition car reduction measures and measures that improve air quality will benefit the borough as a whole and also ensure that parking is available for those who need to use it.

Negative Impacts

Town centres and businesses will benefit from the introduction of additional payment methods for short stay parking. In addition car reduction measures and measures that improve air quality will benefit the borough as a whole and also ensure that parking is available for those who need to use it. This correspondingly improves movement of traffic and improved road safety.

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

Fair and robust enforcement of parking and traffic restrictions is in line with the Councils statutory responsibility to keep traffic moving freely through our borough. In addition all measures being considered contribute to the delivery of Borough Plan and Transport Strategy Objectives.

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
May achieve compliance quickly at CCTV sites	H	M	Develop a programme to relocate cameras once compliance is achieved. But it must be acknowledged that compliance is a positive outcome.
Additional payment options for short stay parking may not increase take up and use of those parking bays.	H	M	Install new payment facilities into a trial area and monitor performance and investigate complimentary measures which may support MTFS
Forecast income is not realised	H	M	Close monitoring of progress against delivery of each activity within the Programme
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal?			This will be done as those projects are developed further.
Is a full EqIA required?			as above

Capital MTFS Schedule - Place

REF	Revenue Savings Ref	Directorate	Category	Description	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000	Total £'000
326	-	Place	Borrowing	Responsive Maintenance works	184	184	184	184	184	920
327	-	Place	Self-Financing	Principal Road Maintenance for 2020/21 (to meet TfL budget reduction)	500	-	-	-	-	500
328	-	Place	Borrowing & Other	Street & Greenspace Greening Programme	345	100	100	100	100	745
329	-	Place	Self-Financing	Park Building Carbon Reduction and Improvement Programme	600	800	800	800	-	3,000
330	-	Place	Borrowing	Civic Centre Works	3,000	5,000	1,500	500	-	10,000
331	-	Place	Self-Financing	Updating the boroughs street lighting with energy efficient Led light bulbs	3,500	3,500	-	-	-	7,000
316	-	Place	Borrowing	Additional Asset Management of Council Buildings	4,000	4,000	4,000	1,000	-	13,000
Total					12,129	13,584	6,584	2,584	284	35,165

This page is intentionally left blank

MTFS Description of New Capital Schemes - Place**Additional Asset Management of council Buildings 2020/21 – 2024/25**

Scheme Ref.	Scheme Description	Borrowing (£'000)	Other (£'000)	Self-Financing (£'000)	Total (£'000)
316	Additional Asset Management of Council Buildings	13,000		0	13,000

The need for works to River Park House has been identified to address a range of issues in the building. This proposal is to deal with the highest priority items. An additional allowance has been provided to fund any essential works following a series of proposed condition surveys.

Road Maintenance 2020/21 – 2024/25

Scheme Ref.	Scheme Description	Borrowing (£'000)	Other (£'000)	Self-Financing (£'000)	Total (£'000)
326	Responsive Maintenance works	920		0	920

This scheme is for additional funding for borough roads responsiveness maintenance. This covers additional funding for responsive maintenance of the borough's highway network.

Principal Road Maintenance 2020/21 – 2024/25

Scheme Ref.	Scheme Description	Borrowing (£'000)	Other (£'000)	Self-Financing (£'000)	Total (£'000)
327	Principal Road Maintenance for 2020/21 (to meet TfL budget reduction)			500	500

This proposal is for additional resources to cover a projected shortfall in TfL funding. This proposal considers the continued deterioration of the highways network and represents the minimum level required to be able to maintain the operation of Principal Road Network during 2020/21 at which point it is hoped that TfL will reinstate funding of the programme. The funding is included in the proposals as self-financing now, with the expectation that TfL will reinstate the funding.

Street and green space greening programme 2020/21 – 2024/25

Scheme Ref.	Scheme Description	Borrowing (£'000)	Other (£'000)	Self-Financing (£'000)	Total (£'000)
328	Street & Greenspace Greening Programme	373	372	0	745

This programme seeks to increase the number of trees planted on Haringey's streets. This will have several benefits to residents as it will improve the visual amenity of their streets, improve air quality, reduce the heat island effect and slow the fall of rain onto the roads

reducing the impact of localised flooding. The tree planting, where possible, will also include localised sustainable urban drainage and phytoremediation planting (plants that clean up the air and water) to increase the benefits of these interventions further. In the initial two-year period, the scheme will predominantly focus on the nine wards in the borough where the tree canopy is less than 20%. Eight of these wards are in the east of the borough. In later years the funding will be used to match fund external funding, when it is available, to deliver the priorities that will be agreed as part of the forthcoming Tree & Woodland Strategy (part of the Parks and Green Space Strategy).

Park building carbon reduction and improvement 2020/21 – 2024/25

Scheme Ref.	Scheme Description	Borrowing (£'000)	Other (£'000)	Self-Financing (£'000)	Total (£'000)
329	Park Building Carbon Reduction and Improvement Programme			3,000	3,000

The parks service is responsible for a portfolio of 58 buildings the majority of which are leased to stakeholders within parks. Fourteen of these buildings are used operationally by the parks service either as depots, sports pavilions or plant nursery. All these buildings need improvement to meet current legislative standards, council accommodation standards and energy efficiency. This programme will ensure the parks estate plays its part in meeting the Council's carbon reduction targets. With energy costs predicted to rise between 10-20% per annum it is important that investments seek to future proof the service from most price rises. The programme will also seek to improve the standard of all the buildings to ensure each building meets its intended use and all relevant legislation. Match funding for the programme will be secured on a site by site basis through various sources, such as section 106, event income and external funding for renewable energy and sports lottery funding.

Civic Centre Refurbishment 2020/21 – 2024/25

Scheme Ref.	Scheme Description	Borrowing (£'000)	Other (£'000)	Self-Financing (£'000)	Total (£'000)
330	Civic Centre Works	10,000		0	10,000

At this stage the capital proposal is based on a high-level costing which in turn is based on a mid-level refurbishment. Currently, a detailed feasibility study is being undertaken which in conjunction with the accommodation strategy will determine the level of budget required for the Civic Centre. It is highly likely that whatever is decided in relation to the accommodation strategy and the future of the Civic Centre, there will be a need for significant investment.

Borough streetlights conversion to LED's 2020/21 – 2024/25

Scheme Ref.	Scheme Description	Borrowing (£'000)	Other (£'000)	Self-Financing (£'000)	Total (£'000)
331	Updating the boroughs street lighting with energy efficient Led light bulbs	0		7,000	7,000

This proposal is a self-financing one to replace the Council's current stock of inefficient streetlights with state-of-the-art LED bulbs. These bulbs have several benefits including, lower running costs, less greenhouse emissions, reduced requirement for night scouting, and central control enabling quicker repair of defective units. The proposal will pay for the investment through a reduced energy bill and further savings through reduced night scouting. The scheme cost also allows for a centralised control and monitoring system which will optimise efficiency.

Yearly Investments

Place	2020/21 Budget (£'000)	2021/22 Budget (£'000)	2022/23 Budget (£'000)	2023/24 Budget (£'000)	2024/25 Budget (£'000)	Total (£'000)
Current Capital Budget	17,101	14,020	11,380	10,660	0	53,161
New Capital Bids	12,129	13,584	6,584	2,584	284	35,165
Total	29,230	27,604	17,964	13,244	284	88,326

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel – 17 December 2019

Title: Work Programme 2018-20 - Update

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

Lead Officer: Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Coordinator
Tel: 020 8489 2957, e-mail: philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

Ward(s) affected: N/A

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

1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 This report provides an update on the Panel's work plan for 2018/20.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 That the Panel notes its current work programme, attached at **Appendix A**, and considers whether any amendments are required;
- 2.2 That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be asked to endorse the updated work plan at its next meeting.

3. Reasons for decision

3.1 The work programme for Overview and Scrutiny was finalised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 19 November 2018. Arrangements for implementing the work programme have progressed and the latest plans for the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel are outlined in **Appendix A**.

4. Alternative options considered

4.1 The Panel could choose not to review its work programme but this could diminish knowledge of the work of Overview and Scrutiny and would fail to keep the full membership updated on any changes to the work programme.

5. Background information

5.1 The work programme for the Committee and its Panels that was agreed is for two years – 2018/19 and 2019/20. It was finalised following a wide ranging consultation process that included partner organisations, stakeholders, the community and voluntary sector and local residents. There is nevertheless scope for flexibility and the Panel may update and amend it to taken into account any emerging issues not currently included as it feels fit.

- 5.2 A copy of the current work plan for the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel is attached as Appendix “A” to this report.

Scrutiny Review Projects

- 5.3 The Panel has concluded its evidence gathering for its Scrutiny Review around Blue Badges. The Panel need to meet to agree the recommendations from the Review and from there, officers will draft a report for the Panel’s approval. It is anticipated that Members will have more availability to meet following the conclusion of the election period on 12th December.

Forward Plan

- 5.4 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.

- 5.5 To ensure the information provided to the Panel 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>

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

6. Contribution to strategic outcomes

- 6.1 The contribution of scrutiny to the corporate priorities will be considered routinely as part of the Panel’s work.

7. Statutory Officers comments

Finance and Procurement

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

Legal

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

- 7.4 Under Section 21 (6) of the Local Government Act 2000, an OSC has the power to appoint one or more sub-committees to discharge any of its functions. In accordance with the Constitution, the appointment of Scrutiny Panels (to assist the scrutiny function) falls within the remit of the OSC.
- 7.5 Scrutiny Panels are non-decision making bodies and the work programme and any subsequent reports and recommendations that each scrutiny panel produces must be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such reports can then be referred to Cabinet or Council under agreed protocols.

Equality

- 7.6 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard to:
- Tackle discrimination and victimisation of persons that share the characteristics protected under S4 of the Act. These include the characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (formerly gender) and sexual orientation;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
 - Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.
- 7.7 The Panel should ensure that it addresses these duties by considering them within its work plan, as well as individual pieces of work. This should include considering and clearly stating;
- How policy issues impact on different groups within the community, particularly those that share the nine protected characteristics;
 - Whether the impact on particular groups is fair and proportionate;
 - Whether there is equality of access to services and fair representation of all groups within Haringey;
 - Whether any positive opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and/or good relations between people, are being realised.
- 7.8 The Panel should ensure equalities comments are based on evidence. Wherever possible this should include demographic and service level data and evidence of residents/service users views gathered through consultation.

8. Use of Appendices

Appendix A – Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel; Work Plan for 2018/20

9. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

N/A

Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel - Work Plan 2018-19

<p>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.</p>		
Project	Comments	Priority
Supporting Better Access to Parking for Disabled People and Blue Badges	<p>The review will examine the barriers faced by disabled people in getting and using a blue badge. The review will also try to examine how they find accessing parking services and where could improvements be made to this service (that sit within the remit of the Council). In doing this it will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are residents’ experiences of accessing and using a Blue Badge; • How can the process of issuing Blue Badges and replacement Blue Badges be improved? What, if any, are the delays involved in the process? Is there scope for issuing temporary Blue Badges; • What do disability organisations say about our Blue Badge and disabled parking services? How accessible is our parking services interface; • How helpful is our written correspondence to residents around Blue Badges. 	
Reducing the amount of plastic/developing a plastic free policy.	<p>Examining the Council’s recycling performance around plastic waste and seeing what more could be done to reduce the use of plastics. What could the Council do to lead by example in this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	

Appendix 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine how the Council could reduce plastic waste and increase its recycling performance, looking at innovative ideas from across the sector. • 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? • Examine the how the Council can develop a plastic-free policy and what other measures the Council could undertake to lead by example. 	
--	---	--

Date of meeting	Potential Items
13 th September 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions; Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel's terms of reference that are within that portfolio). • Membership & Terms of Reference. • Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member. • Service Overview and Waste, recycling and street cleansing data. • Work Programme: To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for this year. • Review of Fear of Crime: Update on implementation of recommendations.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knife Crime and MOPAC performance Overview.
16 th October 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police Priorities in Haringey. Will include an update on Stop and Search and Lethal Firearm Discharges as requested by the Panel. • Financial Monitoring: To receive an update on the financial performance relating to Corporate Plan Priority 3. • Cabinet Member Q&A – Environment: To question the Cabinet Member for Environment on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio. • Waste, recycling and street cleansing data • Work Plan update – The Panel to agree its work plan for OSC to formally approve on 19th November.
<p>Budget Scrutiny</p> <p>18th December 2018</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Scrutiny. • Air Quality. • 18 month follow-up on the recommendations to the Scrutiny Review on Cycling. • Green flags. • Work Programme and scoping document for Scrutiny Review into plastic waste.
11 th March 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Flags in parks – An update on the red and amber ratings awarded in parks. Cllr Hearn to attend. • Update around the Gangs Matrix.

Appendix 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing Criminalisation of Children. • Cabinet Member Q&A –Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).
8 th April 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Waste charges, Fly-tipping strategy and bulky waste collection • Update on Parks Transformation • Parking issues - disabled bays and blue badges • Cabinet Member Q&A – Environment: To question the Cabinet Member for Environment on current issues and plans arising from her portfolio.

2019-2020

11 June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership & Terms of Reference. • Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member. • Community Safety Strategy • Update on Youth at Risk Strategy • Work Programme
---------	---

Appendix 1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Questions; Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).
3 rd October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Q&A –Neighbourhoods: To question the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio. • Veolia Performance - Waste and Street Cleansing update. • Parks update including vehicle access and locking gates at night. • Update on the Parking Transformation Plan. • Update on Parking reports going to Cabinet. • Work Programme.
5 th November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet Member Q&A –Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio). • Community Safety Partnership; To invite comments from the Panel on current performance issues and priorities for the borough’s Community Safety Partnership. To also include an update on statistics on hate crime. • Update on the merging of Haringey and Enfield Borough Command Units. • Liveable Streets • Update on Events in Finsbury Park – Adobe Festival & damage to the bandstand field.

Appendix 1

17 th December (Budget Scrutiny)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Budget Scrutiny• Cabinet Member Q&A – Climate Change and Sustainability; To question the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio.• Single use Plastics & Toxic Herbicides• Update on responses/feedback from Liveable Crouch End.
2 nd March	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cabinet Member Q&A –Neighbourhoods: To question the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio.• Waste, recycling and street cleansing data• Team Noel Park• Performance update – Q3• Budget Monitoring Q3