

## NOTICE OF MEETING

# OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Tuesday, 12th January, 2021, 7.00 pm - Microsoft Teams Watch it [\(Here\)](#)**

**Members:** Councillors Peray Ahmet (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Erdal Dogan, Ruth Gordon and Khaled Moyeed

**Co-optees/Non Voting Members:** Jhunjhunwala KanuPriya (Parent Governor representative), Jakhu (Parent Governor representative), Yvonne Denny (Co-opted Member - Church Representative (CofE)) and Lourdes Keever (Co-opted Member - Church Representative (Catholic))

Quorum: 3

### 1. **FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

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

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

### 2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

### 3. **URGENT BUSINESS**

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

#### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 12)**

#### **7. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS (PAGES 13 - 52)**

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

**Housing and Regeneration** – 19th November 2020

**Environment and Community Safety** - 3 November 2020

**Children and Young People** – 9<sup>th</sup> November 2020

**Adults and Health** – 17th November 2020

#### **8. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING AND CORPORATE SERVICES**

Verbal Update

#### **9. SCRUTINY OF THE 2021/22 DRAFT BUDGET / 5 YEAR MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY (2021/22-2025/26) - YOUR COUNCIL (PAGES 53 - 156)**

#### **10. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE (PAGES 157 - 186)**

**11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

**12. FUTURE MEETINGS**

18 January 2021

15 March 2021

Philip Slawther, Principal Committee Co-ordinator

Tel – 020 8489 2957

Fax – 020 8881 5218

Email: philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

John Jones

Monitoring Officer (Interim)

River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

Monday, 04 January 2021

This page is intentionally left blank



## **MINUTES OF MEETING Overview and Scrutiny Committee HELD ON Monday, 23rd November, 2020, 7.00 - 10.25 pm**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Peray Ahmet (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Erdal Dogan, Ruth Gordon, Khaled Moyeed, Mark Chapman, Luci Davin, Yvonne Denny and Lourdes Keever**

**ALSO ATTENDING: Mark Chapman, Luci Davin, Yvonne Denny and Lourdes Keever.**

### **14. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

The Chair referred Members present to agenda item 1 regarding filming at the meeting and Members noted the information contained therein.

### **15. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

### **16. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Chair declared a personal interest in relation to the deputation at Agenda Item 5, as she was a Noel Park Ward Councillor.

Cllr Moyeed declared a personal interest in relation to the deputation at Agenda Item 5, as he was also a Noel Park Ward Councillor.

Lourdes Keever declared a personal interest in relation to the deputation at Agenda Item 5, as her son was a leaseholder on the Noel Park estate.

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

Sarah Klymkiw presented deputation to O&S on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of November and outlined the following.

Leaseholders advised by Council to be patient and to pursue payment plans which are flexible and can be relinquished. The leaseholders were offered 25 years to pay the

debt or to resolve the remaining payment when selling property. So far there had been no conversations about alternatives to the Pods.

As of the evening of the 23<sup>rd</sup> of November, the leaseholders had yet to receive a response to their section 20 observation legal letter.

After speaking at full Council, the Leader had written to the deputation to advise that the December decision on the Noel Park Pods had been delayed until 19<sup>th</sup> January 2021. There had not been a confirmation of continuing meetings with the leaseholders. The leaseholders had been promised a further programme of engagement which suggested a series of meetings. The leaseholders wanted this to be a continuing dialogue and to present their case and be listened to.

In response to questions, the deputation provided the following information:

- Further to acknowledging the shocking notices and letters received by the leaseholders and highlighting the need to save on the cost of temporary housing of leaseholders, the deputation was asked about the red line in terms of the brick extensions. The deputation believed that there were three alternative options to the Pod and one of those was not to have a Pod at all. In the 1970's residents were asked by the Council to have a choice in having a Pod and at least five flats had refused. Therefore, it was known that there could be a solution without a Pod. The second option was a brick-built extension, and the current cost was not known. However, in 2015 a study was completed which showed that a brick built extension would cost the same as a replacement Pod of around £25k. The option of the rebuilt brick extension was not taken forward as it meant rehousing tenants. However, the deputation were aware that when works were being done on Noel Park estate, tenants were being moved and felt that this option should be offered to Gladstone Avenue tenants to be rehoused whilst the work is completed. It was not fully known how long these works would take and timescales of 3 months and 6 months was suggested and so this part of the proposal would be incomplete. The third option would be to re-clad the existing Pods and remove the asbestos. The deputation contended that this was being done to other properties in Noel Park. This would cost less than a new Pod, around £20k for a double pod and £10k for a single pod. This was another viable option the leaseholders felt could be put forward to tenants.
- The cost of decanting residents was too high when the brick-built extensions were £25k in 2015. The deputation questioned that given the cost of the replacement Pods had now doubled, it was likely to be more cost effective to decant residents and have a brick-built extension. At the time this was discussed, it was envisaged that the works would be between 6 weeks and 3 months and not the longer period now suggested. However, there was not enough information provided on these possibilities and there had not been any real consultation with residents in the past on these options.
- The deputation spoke about their shock of receiving a section 20 notice and payment demand. A number of leaseholders negatively impacted by the pandemic through loss of work, furlough, redundancies. Leaseholders were

faced with uncertainty and unknown bills for payment. Also, there was the added anxiety that the bills received later on could be even higher. The deputation had received a bill for £108, 450 which automatically caused significant anxiety alongside trying to learn Council processes and understand how to appeal against this situation, talking to strangers to ask them to care about the situation was overwhelming.

- The final bill for the works may not be received until 2022 by leaseholders and this was also impacting on life choices. The leaseholders also knowing that there could be an alternative way and these suggestions/ proposals not being taken forward was upsetting.
- The co-opted member suggested the deputation seeking a report from Homes for Haringey which was drafted in the 1970's when the Pods were added, and which provided the reasoning and logistics on this decision.
- The deputation spoke for herself and her Pod which was fine, as far as she was aware, but referred to Leaders comments on safety of the Pods at full Council and questioned if Homes for Haringey had an understanding of the condition of the Pods on Noel Park.

The Chair added that there was a mixed picture in relation to the conditions of the Pods.

The deputation felt that leaseholders was not being listened to by Homes for Haringey, the only option being offered was payment plan options.

The deputation expressed their constant feeling of frustration, despair, and anger, and felt the Cabinet should fully consider the impact of the decision on leaseholders which will cause financial ruin for some leaseholders and their families. The deputation spoke about having a wider view about equal improvement of life chances and making sure that by benefiting the life chances of some people, it was not ruining the life chances of others.

The deputation wanted the Cabinet decision in January to be delayed, allowing more time for consultation and dialogue.

The Chair moved to a recommendation that this issue is sent back to the Housing and Regeneration Panel and compile some recommendations to go forward to Cabinet.

The Chair advised that it would be perhaps better to move the decision from the January Cabinet to allow opportunity for options to be explored.

The Leader outlined that a report was planned for January Cabinet and expressed that he has misspoken about the safety aspect of the Pods at full Council.

## **19. MINUTES**

The Chair requested that an update on the Citizen's Panel be brought to the March Committee meeting.

**RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of 15<sup>th</sup> October were agreed as a correct record.

**20. MINUTES OF SCRUTINY PANEL MEETINGS**

**RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Children & Young Peoples Scrutiny Panel on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2020 were noted, and any recommendations contained within them were approved.

**21. LEADER'S UPDATE ON PRIORITIES AND COVID-19 RESPONSE.**

The Leader of the Council, Cllr Ejiofor gave a presentation to the Committee which set out the administration's Phase 1 recovery and Phase 2 response to the current Covid-19 pandemic. The Leader commented that the Committee may wish to provide a scrutinising role on the administration's response, going forwards. The Chief Executive, Zina Etheridge was also present for this item. The presentation was included in the second dispatch agenda pack at pages 3-16. The following arose during the discussion of this item:

- a. The Chair commented that she was concerned that children's centres remained largely closed, whilst schools were open and that there seemed to be a gap in the recovery of services for younger children.
- b. The Committee commented on the borough wide letter that was sent out to all residents last week on Covid-19 and sought clarification over the fact it was dated September. The Committee emphasised the need for these communications to go out in a variety of different languages as a matter of course and also sought clarification on how much the letter cost to send out to all residents. In response, the Leader advised that the date was a typographical error and agreed to provide a written response to the Committee members on the cost of the letter. **(Action: Leader of the Council)**. The Leader emphasised the importance of consistent public health messaging.
- c. In relation to a question around business loans and the support offered to businesses, the Leader advised that the Council had agreed to stay the loan repayments to local businesses during this period. The Leader agreed to provide additional information to the Committee on the number and status of loans given through the Opportunity Investment Fund, as well as information on businesses that had gone bust. **(Action: Leader of the Council)**.
- d. The Committee noted concern with the economic impact of the pandemic and questioned what the administration was doing to mitigate the impending crisis around poverty and joblessness. In response, the Leader highlighted the work done by the Council around addressing food poverty during the crisis and he advised that work would continue with voluntary sector partners to continue to deliver a response around tackling food poverty. Cllr Chandwani was also in the process of setting up the welfare assistance scheme. The Leader advised that the administration was also looking into how and whether the eligibility for free school meals could be expanded to help some of the poorest families in the borough.

- e. The Committee sought further information around the £17m budget gap identified in the presentation. In response, the Leader advised that this was due to a combination of additional spending due to the Covid response, a failure to meet some savings targets and a loss of income due to Covid and the lockdown. The Leader advised that this would be set out in detail in the report to Cabinet in December. It was also noted that further clarity on government support was anticipated from the Spending Review which was due later this week. The Leader advised that, whatever happened, The Council would pass a balanced budget in February.
- f. In response to a question around whether all care workers in the borough received sick pay, the Chief Executive confirmed that that this was case as far as she was aware.
- g. In response to a question around what support was offered to care workers, the Chief Executive advised that the organisation was working with those individuals who most needed support to provide group activities, even when day centres were closed, so that carers could get some respite. There had also been ongoing phone support all the way through the crisis for carers. The Chief Executive agreed to provide a written response to the Committee. **(Action: Zina Etheridge).**
- h. In relation to a question around the vaccine rollout, the Committee was advised that the policy for this was set nationally but the initial cohorts that were put forward by the JCBI prioritised care home residents, care home staff and the over 80s, as well as older people receiving domiciliary care.
- i. In response to a follow-up question around the communication strategy for particular groups, including those with disabilities & people suffering with autism, the Chief Executive acknowledged that there were a whole set of communication challenges around this including the groups mentioned, working with trusted community leaders within certain groups and also the prevalence of conspiracy theories. The Chief Executive commented on the need to build trust and work closely with NHS colleagues to get the messaging right.
- j. The Committee sought clarification on the amount of money that was expected to be received by government. In response, the Director of Finance advised that the overall pressure to the General Fund due to coronavirus was around £40m as of Q2. The authority had received £26.7m in central government funding so far and a further £8m in grant funding was anticipated. There were also ongoing costs to the HRA and collection accounts that would work through in coming years. The Director of Finance commented that the funding shortfall was coming down from an earlier estimated position of £70m.
- k. The Committee commented on the need for public health messaging for young people and the need to engage with that particular demographic. In response, the Leader acknowledged this and advised that the Council had been using a variety of different mediums to engage with young people, including a range of social media platforms.

## RESOLVED

That the update was noted.

## 22. BUDGET MONITORING UPDATE QUARTER 1

The Committee received a report which set out the Budget Monitoring position for Quarter 1, which was considered by Cabinet in September. The Committee also received a verbal update on the Council's latest financial position. The report was introduced by Jon Warlow, Director of Finance as set out in the agenda pack at pages 27-62 of the agenda pack. The following key points were noted from the Director of Finance's verbal update:

- The total Covid financial pressure to the Council was set out in the report as £44.44m.
- The budget pressure from non-delivery of savings was identified as £8m.
- The report set out that, as of Q1, the government had provided £18.3m in un-ringfenced emergency grant funding which was effectively a subsidy to cover the additional costs to the authority from Covid. Following the recent receipt of tranche 4 funding, the Council had received £26.74m to date in un-ringfenced emergency grant funding.
- The Director of Finance advised that he anticipated that the Council would receive an additional £8m from the government to cover the costs incurred from a loss of income, such as car parking and highways income.
- As at Q1, the report highlighted that the unfunded costs of Covid were £18m, but an additional £8.3 million had been received since then.
- There was also an additional pressure on the Council's budget of £4.96m arising from non-Covid related spend. This figure had remained largely consistent.
- The biggest impact on additional costs from Covid was within Adult Social Services due to the costs of providing care packages. There was also a significant hit to income streams across the Council of around £10m.
- The cost to the HRA arising from loss of rental income had improved from around £9.6m in Q1 to a forecast position of around £4m.
- Another area of concern highlighted was around the Dedicated Schools Grant, the deficit for which had increased from last year despite additional income from government. It was anticipated that the overspend position at year-end could be £15m. This figure was ringfenced and so could not be subsumed by the General Fund. The Director of Finance advised that other local authorities were in a similar position and that there was some hope that the government would provide additional financial assistance to help cover the cost of the overspend in this area.
- The Government had allowed local authorities to spread the impact of non-collection of Council Tax and Non-Domestic Rates over three years.
- There was a significant slippage within the Capital Programme due to Covid. Much of the capital allocated for housing delivery would be rolled over to futures years.
- The Director of Finance assured the Committee that the authority did have the means to overcome the impact on its budget, regardless of the level of additional government support, but there would be a detrimental impact to the Council's resource position for next year onwards in doing so.

The following arose during the discussion of this item:

- a. The Chair sought clarification around the High Needs Block and the nature of the lobbying for resources that was taking place. The Chair also requested further information around what the recovery plan with key partners was for the

- High Needs Block. In response, officers set out that it was the overspend in the High Needs Block that was driving the forecast overspend within the DSG. The Committee was advised that this was an issue across local government and that lobbying was taking place at a national level for additional financial support from central government.
- b. The Committee requested further details from the Director of Children's Services on the recovery plan and involvement of key partners around the High Needs Block. **(Action: Ann Graham).**
  - c. The Committee sought clarification around the overall pressure on the budget from the Bernie Grant Art Centre. In response, officers advised that the Council was providing grant relief to the centre by forgoing some income that was due to be paid to Council. This amounted to around £35k. The Council would use the money due to them to pay down a grant that was due to be cleared by the organisation. In effect, the organisation would be receiving an ongoing additional grant as the Council would be paying down the debt from the grant on their behalf. The grant was around £340k over a 9-10 year period.
  - d. In relation to a query around the nature of non-Covid pressures, the Committee was advised that the two main areas of pressure identified in the report were Children's Services and in Place. Overall, the level of non-Covid pressures identified was not felt to be an extreme position and the Director Finance was hopeful of reducing this figure before year-end.
  - e. In relation to support for local SME business, it was noted that the Council had been active in providing business rate relief as well as business grants to the sector.
  - f. In relation to a query around contingency funds and whether that effectively enabled the government to hold back funding for local government, the Committee was advised that there was some capacity to absorb financial shocks through contingency reserves. However, the Director of Finance advised that he had seen no evidence that grants from government were impacted by the level of reserve held by a particular authority. It was not thought that the level of grant received by Haringey had been impacted by its balance sheet or its financial strategy.
  - g. In relation to contingencies within the capital strategy, the Director of Finance set out that a capital contingency was established within the MTFS to allow the authority to respond quickly to circumstances. However, this contingency was not used and a new financial plan would be presented to Cabinet as part of the updated MTFS in December.
  - h. In response to a question, the Director of Finance advised that there was a Covid slippage of £8.3m from the £16.538m savings target for 2020/21, however, this position had improved during Q2. The Director of Finance advised that the key was how the non-delivery of these savings was picked up in future years. This would be addressed in the latest MTFS.
  - i. In response to a request for clarification, the Committee was advised that the Directorate level forecast at Appendix 1 of the report showed both Covid and non-Covid related budget pressures, totalling £49m.
  - j. In response to a question around contingencies in the event that the government did not provide all of the grant funding promised, the Director of Finance restated that an additional £8.3m had been received in grant funding since the Q1 position and the authority was continuing to pressure the government to fill the gap in the cost of responding to Covid-19. There was a

contingency built-in to the budget around non-delivery of savings and the uncertainty around the impact of Brexit, this would be used to offset any shortfall in the first instance.

## **RESOLVED**

That OSC:

- I. Noted the forecast revenue outturn for the General Fund (GF), including the impact of Covid, and known and estimated levels of announced Covid funding, is a net overspend of £23.1m. This is before any further emergency grant support (Section 6, Tables 1a and 1b, and Appendix 1 of the report). This excludes the DSG forecast.
- II. Noted that Directors have been asked to focus on actions to bring the forecast overspend down before the end of the year.
- III. Noted the net Housing Revenue Account (HRA) forecast of £9.6m overspend (Section 6, Table 2, and Appendix 2 of the report).
- IV. Noted the net DSG forecast of £4.6m overspend, the actions being taken to seek to address this and the potential implications for the GF (Section 7 and Table 3 of the report).
- V. Noted the forecast budget savings position in 2020/21 which indicates that 50% (£8.3m) may not be achieved. (Section 8, Table 4 and Appendix 3 of the report). This is incorporated in the GF budget pressures addressed in recommendation I above.
- VI. Noted the proposed budget adjustments and virements to the capital programme as set out in Table 5 and Appendix 4 of the report and note the forecast expenditure of £251.5m in 2020/21 which equates to 43% of the revised capital budget (Section 9, Table 5 and Appendix 4 of the report).
- VII. Noted the budget virements as set out in Appendix 5 of the report.
- VIII. Noted the debt write-offs approved in Quarter 4 2019/20 (Appendix 6 of the report).
- IX. Noted the Council's income recovery practices, operative from 1 October 2020, following the temporary changes made since April of this year (Section 10 of the report).
- X. Noted the approach to providing assistance to the Bernie Grant Arts Centre, as set out in section 6.17.6 of the report.

## **23. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR FINANCE AND STRATEGIC REGENERATION**



The Committee undertook a verbal question and answer session with Cllr Adje, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration. The following was noted in discussion of this item:

- a. Cllr Adje outlined that a grant of £850k had been awarded from the GLA and MHCLG for public realm improvement works in Wood Green. Similarly, work was progressing around the Turnpike Lane Improvement Plan and phase one public realm improvement works at Northumberland Park Station were under tender. In response to this, the Committee made a plea to the Cabinet Member to engage with local residents around these schemes.
- b. In relation to a question around business intelligence groups, the Cabinet Member advised that this was part of an intelligence gathering approach of the recovery and renewal work. This involved a borough-wide event with a number of themes, only one of which was around business intelligence. The aim of the event was to gather intelligence around how the sector could support business recovery in light of Covid-19 and lockdown. The Cabinet Member clarified that as far as he was aware the group had not met since and that an all-Member presentation had been provided by Cllr Bull on work being done to support local businesses post-Covid.
- c. In relation to a follow-up question around whether any meetings had taken place in the last six months between developers, senior officers and Cllr Adje, the Cabinet Member advised that there had been no such meetings.
- d. The Committee noted concerns with disabled access in and around Wood Green, including shops not being disability access friendly, narrow pavements and a lack of dropped kerbs. The Committee requested that when developing future public realm works that these issues needed to be addressed as a priority. In response the Cabinet Member acknowledged these concerns and advised that dropped kerbs should be factored into any highways works programme and that the planning process should pick up disability access in shops. The Cabinet Member agreed to feed these concerns back to highways and planning officers respectively. **(Action: Cllr Adje).**
- e. The Committee commented on a general lack of consultation and engagement around estates and questioned what was contained within the Council's portfolio. The Committee requested that the decision on replacing bathroom pods on the Noel Park estate be delayed by Cabinet, in order that the Housing Panel have sufficient time to scrutinise this decision properly. The Committee noted that this was a decision for the Leader. The Cabinet Member advised that the Council's Asset Management plan had been considered by Cabinet and was publicly available on our website. The Asset Management Plan was regularly updated and contained a list of Haringey's estate portfolio.
- f. The Committee requested a written briefing from the Cabinet Member regarding the update he provided in his introduction on upcoming public realm works in and around Wood Green. **(Action: Cllr Adje).**
- g. In response to a question around the Voluntary Sector Assistance fund, the Cabinet Member advised that this was a pot of money set aside by the authority to assist the voluntary sector with during the Covid crisis. It was commented that the total value of the fund was roughly £200k-£300k.
- h. In relation to a question around the Bernie Grant Centre and the Voluntary Sector Assistance Fund, Cllr Adje agreed that he would ask Cllr Blake to respond back to the Committee. **(Action: Cllr Adje/Cllr Blake).**

**RESOLVED**

Noted.

**24. BREXIT - IMPLICATIONS FOR THE BOROUGH**

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the potential implications of Brexit on the Borough. The report was introduced by Jean Taylor, Head of Policy as set out in the agenda pack at pages 65-80 of the agenda pack. The following arose during the discussion of this item:

- a. In response to a question around the level of digital support in place, officers acknowledged the importance of tackling a digital deficit and advised that one of the key areas of digital support was around supporting those applying for settled status through an online process, particularly around access and then providing proof of status.
- b. In response to a further question, officers advised that they were happy that there were sufficient links into different communities in the borough, with assistance from the BRT and that barriers to information and advice had been removed.
- c. In relation to Paragraph 2.12 of the report and the point around recruitment of international social workers, the Committee requested further information on this and whether there was a particular shortage of social workers (as opposed to social care workers). The Head of Policy agreed to take this away and provide a response. **(Action: Jean Taylor)**.
- d. In response to a question, officers advised that they were disappointed not to secure funding for assisting with settled status applications but advised that internal resources would be redirected to support this role.
- e. The Committee sought clarification around the finance sensitivity analysis referred to in the report, officers acknowledged that this was over a year old and was not suitable to be shared widely. The document was more a piece of modelling, rather than in-depth analysis.
- f. The Committee sought further information around which areas of staffing within the Council were affected/particularly at risk because of Brexit. The Head of Policy agreed to come back with a written response on this point. **(Action: Jean Taylor)**.

*\*21:50: Clerk's note – As per Committee Standing Order 63, the Committee agreed to suspend Committee Standing Order 18 and to continue the meeting past 22:00 hours.\**

- g. In response to a question around supply chain issues as a result of Brexit and in particular for PPE, officers advised that they were not aware of any particular risks on this issue and that work was ongoing across different areas of the organisation to ensure that there was an ongoing supply of PPE.
- h. The Head of Policy agreed to provide an update at the next meeting in relation to a query about the value of contracts due to expire 2021. **(Action: Jean Taylor)**.
- i. The Committee sought further information about the impact of Brexit on regeneration schemes, particularly in relation to anecdotal accounts that

developers were getting rid of housing stock and how this reflected on current market conditions. The Head of Policy agreed to include information on this in the next update to the Committee. **(Action: Jean Taylor)**.

- j. In relation to a request for clarification around the officer group responsible for managing the risk register, officers advised that this was a legacy group bringing together work stream leads and overseen by the Chief Executive. This function was now managed by the Council's Covid-19 Gold meetings, chaired by the Chief Executive and attended by the Leader.

## RESOLVED

That the Committee considered the update and noted the risks and the updated Brexit risk register.

## 25. COMPLAINTS ANNUAL REPORT

The Committee received a report which provided an update on performance of Complaints, FOIs, Member Enquiries and Ombudsman cases. The report was introduced by Elaine Prado, Head of Customer Experience and Policy and Debbie Darling, Acting Corporate Feedback and Business Support Manager as set out in the addendum report pack at pages 15-33 of the agenda pack. The following arose during the discussion of this item:

- a. The Committee sought clarification as to who sat on the Partnership Improvement Group around complaints and whether there were any residents or councillors on that group. In response, officers advised that this was an internal group made up of officers at a Head of Service level, who had the authority to implement changes and the improvements sought. Officers acknowledged the relevance of hearing people's experiences and commented that they would give some further thought on how to improve this and the potential for councillors to be represented in some way. The Committee requested a written briefing on this, including how the group would improve complaint processes and who would sit on the group. **(Action: Debbie Darling)**.
- b. The Committee emphasised the importance of understanding how complaints were being dealt with in order to prevent cases being referred to the Ombudsman.
- c. In response to a request for clarification, officers advised that the number of complaints being escalated past Stage 1 in Children's Services had decreased in volume. Officers agreed to provide a breakdown of this across the different teams within Children's Services. **(Action: Debbie Darling)**.
- d. In response to a question around staffing levels following a merger of teams, the Committee was advised that there were now more people working in the Corporate Feedback team than in the previous year.
- e. In response to a question, officers advised that the number of FOIs had decreased from 1434 to 1384 in 2019/20.
- f. Officers agreed to come back with a comparative year on year breakdown of the costs of Ombudsman decisions to the Council. **(Action: Debbie Darling)**.

## RESOLVED

That the contents of the report were noted.

**26. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

N/A

**27. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

The Committee agreed that members of the Youth Advisory Board would be involved in Scrutiny as part of an initiative developed through Haringey Community Gold. It was agreed that from January representatives of the YAB would do some mentoring/shadowing with individual Scrutiny Panels and that the Committee would then consider how to further involve them in the scrutiny process at a later date.

The Chair suggested that she would also like to see the YAB do some mentoring with officers as well as panels and panel chairs. **(Action: Rob Mack).**

The Committee also commented that perhaps some though could be given to mentoring roles on schools governing bodies.

**RESOLVED**

That the current work programmes for the main Committee and Scrutiny Panels at Appendix A of the report were agreed.

That the appointment of Cllr Das Neves was agreed as a representative to the North Central London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and an additional Member to the Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel.

**28. FUTURE MEETINGS**

- I. 12 January 2021
- II. 18 January 2021
- III. 15 March 2021

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HOUSING AND REGENERATION SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON THURSDAY 19TH NOVEMBER 2020, 6.30pm - 10.00pm**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Ruth Gordon (Chair), Dawn Barnes, Zena Brabazon, Isidoros Diakides, Makbule Gunes, Bob Hare and Yvonne Say**

#### **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**

None.

#### **3. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

#### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

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

The Panel received a deputation from Sarah Klymkiw and Michael Jones on behalf of a number of leaseholders in the Noel Park area of Wood Green. It was noted that a similar deputation had been made to the meeting of the Full Council on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

Sarah Klymkiw introduced the deputation covering the following key points:

- That in September 2020, a number of leaseholders on Gladstone Avenue in Noel Park were issued with Section 20 Notices for major works incurring costs of up to £120,000 for some households. The leaseholders understand that these are the second highest set of estimates for leaseholder work that have been issued anywhere in the UK.
- The affected properties are maisonettes in the Noel Park conservation area. In the early 1970s the Council had installed temporary prefabricated bathroom

'pod' structures to the rear of the properties which should have been removed 30 years ago. Sarah Klymkiw said that she understood from comments made by Cllr Ejiofor at the Full Council meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2020 that these structures were now considered to be unsafe so she queried how long the Council had had concerns about this and why action had not been taken sooner.

- In the 1970s, residents had been offered the option not to have a pod at all. However, in 2020 residents were not being given that option as they were being told that the old pods will be replaced with new pods despite other options being possible. The justification for this appeared to be convenience rather than sustainability or value for money because the change could be made in a day without the need for residents to be decanted.
- Leaseholders had been told by the Council that the new pods would last as long as brick built structures, which she said were claims that simply parroted the manufacturers' PR. She said that the 60-year warranty for the pods did not mean that they would actually last for that long or that the cladding would not need replacing as it was a risk-based warranty for mortgage purposes.
- The proposals also involved replacing windows and doors, but no justification for the need for these works had been given and tenants were now concerned that these extra works would cause delays to the work on their bathrooms.
- Detailed individual surveys would be carried out only after the contracts had been signed which raised concerns about the impartiality of the surveys in terms of incentives to drive down costs or determining the works that are necessary.
- In the opinion of residents, communications and consultation had been handled very poorly by Homes for Haringey (HfH) and many questions from residents had not been answered.
- Leaseholders agreed that the situation with the pods needed to be addressed, did not want to prevent tenants from benefitting from these works and did not expect the money to come from the rent of tenants. However, the leaseholders had been led to believe that the costs to leaseholders would be in the region of £25,000, but the expected costs were now ruinous as they reached figures of up to £120,000 and she said that leaseholders should not have to pay for Council failings. The only solution being explored was flexible payment plans that would do nothing to address the overall cost.
- The leaseholders proposed that the scheme for new pods be scrapped and that the Council and HfH work with leaseholders to explore alternative options that offer best value for money.

Sarah Klymkiw and Michael Jones then responded to questions from the Panel:

- Cllr Hare asked if there had been anything like a 20-year notice to allow for the leaseholders to plan ahead. Sarah Klymkiw said that, in her case, when she purchased her flat five years ago she was told was the cost of the pod would be

£12,500 and so they borrowed on the mortgage accordingly. When going through the process of buying the property the quoted cost then jumped to £25,000. However, there was no indication that the costs would ever reach the current amount of £108,000 that was now being estimated which would effectively be a second mortgage. Leaseholders had tried to engage in dialogue with HfH about possible solutions and there had been no indication of the level of costs until leaseholders received S20 notices. The only other option offered by HfH was to relinquish some equity. Michael Jones added that the first that he had been aware of the costs associated with the bathrooms was in 2009 when the figures for costs talked about were £20,000. He had yet to receive a full breakdown of costs which he said was another example of the lack of information being provided by HfH.

- Cllr Brabazon asked whether Sarah Klymkiw had received a reply to her letter of 21<sup>st</sup> Oct 2020 to Tracey Downie at HfH which included a number of questions. Sarah Klymkiw said that she had not yet received a reply and had been notified by the Council on 12<sup>th</sup> Nov 2020 that there would be a delay. Cllr Brabazon requested that the members of the deputation keep the committee informed about any response that they received.
- Cllr Brabazon asked about the cladding and the potential fire risk associated with the new pods. Sarah Klymkiw said that there were a lot of unanswered questions on this, many of which had been included in the letter to Tracey Downie. Cllr Brabazon observed that the wrong type of cladding can render properties uninsurable.
- Cllr Brabazon asked about the door-step meetings with Cllr Ibrahim and Sean McLaughlin on 8<sup>th</sup> Oct 2020 quoted in the letter to Tracie Downie. Sarah Klymkiw said that these were impromptu meetings and she did not feel that the leaseholders' main concerns were addressed through these meetings.
- Cllr Barnes asked whether there had been the opportunity for leaseholders to have formal meetings with officers. Michael Jones said that there were two formal meetings, one in November 2019 and one in summer 2020. Since the S20 notices had been issued there had been a further meeting with the Leader of the Council (Cllr Joe Ejiofor) and the Managing Director of HfH (Sean McLaughlin). At the November 2019 meeting no indication had been given of the potential high costs that were now being quoted. Cllr Gordon asked if any minutes had been taken at the meeting with the Leader of the Council. Michael Jones said that he was not aware of minutes being taken and had not been notified of minutes being taken.
- Robbie Erbmann, AD for Housing, informed the Panel that there were 242 properties that the works were planned for, 76 of which were leasehold properties (39 resident leaseholders and 37 non-resident leaseholders).
- Asked by Cllr Diakides about the potential for alternative options, Sarah Klymkiw said that the leaseholders wanted a pause to be able to discuss options with officers and Cabinet Members. Alternative options could include:

- not having a pod at all and to incorporate the bathrooms back into the properties;
- to renovate and reclad the existing pods, estimated to cost around £10,000 per pod;
- to create permanent brick-built structures on the back of the properties.
- Asked by Cllr Brabazon whether the leaseholders had received a full breakdown of the estimated costs, Sarah Klymkiw said that she had only received a partial breakdown and that leaseholders had requested further information but were still waiting for this.
- Asked by Cllr Brabazon whether the leaseholders had been invited to attend meetings with officers/Cabinet Members, Sarah Klymkiw said that there were no meetings booked in but Catherine West MP had offered to Chair a meeting on their behalf. The leaseholders intended to take her up on this offer and would also be writing to Cllr Ejiofor to request his attendance. Michael Jones added that a recent letter from Cllr Ejiofor indicated that he would “be in touch shortly to confirm how we will conduct a further programme of engagement”.

Cllr Gordon thanked Sarah Klymkiw and Michael Jones for their deputation and for the information pack that they provided to the Panel. Cllr Gordon said that the Panel was not in a position to answer the questions raised through the deputation as the Leader of the Council would be responsible for this. Cllr Gordon proposed that a special meeting of the Panel be held to which the Leader of the Council and others would be invited so that the Panel could put these questions to him directly.

**RESOLVED: That a special meeting of the Housing & Regeneration scrutiny panel be organised to discuss the issues raised by the leaseholders of Noel Park and that the Leader of the Council be invited to attend to respond to questions from the Panel.**

## 6. MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2020 were approved as an accurate record.

## 7. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - STRATEGIC REGENERATION

Cllr Charles Adje, Cabinet Member for Finance and Strategic Regeneration, responded to questions from the Panel on regeneration issues:

- Cllr Yvonne Say asked about the take up on priority-option purchasing for local residents at major residential developments at Tottenham Hale. Cllr Adje said that he did not have that information to hand and that this matter fell under the Housing portfolio rather than his Regeneration portfolio. He said that he would discuss this with officers and arrange for this information to be provided to the Panel. **(ACTION)** Cllr Diakides added that these kind of measures were



important factors when the Planning Committee makes its determinations on planning applications so this information would be useful to see in order to monitor how effective the measures have been. Rob Krzyszowski, Head of Planning Policy, Transport and Infrastructure, informed the Panel that all the Section 106 (S106) agreements were monitored including the clauses on priority housing for local residents. The more detailed monitoring was carried out by the Housing Enabling team. Asked by Cllr Diakides which Cabinet Member and senior officer was responsible for S106 agreements, Cllr Adje said that these were Cllr Matt White (Cabinet Member for Planning and Corporate Services) and Rob Krzyszowski.

- Cllr Brabazon asked whether any data was available on the progression of sales at Tottenham Hale. Cllr Adje said that he would need to engage with the Housing Enabling team to obtain that information, which he would then provide to the Panel. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr Brabazon asked for an update on negotiations with the GLA on funding for the redevelopment at Love Lane/High Road West. Cllr Adje said that more information was currently being awaited on this from GLA on next steps. He indicated that he would be happy to provide a further written update to the Panel if more information on this became available. **(ACTION)**. Asked by Cllr Diakides which Cabinet Member and senior officer was responsible for GLA negotiations, Cllr Adje said that the Regeneration team would usually lead in this area where he was the responsible Cabinet Member, supported by Peter O'Brien (Assistant Director for Regeneration and Economic Development). The Housing department may also be required to contribute in this area, led by Robbie Erbmann (Assistant Director for Housing).
- Cllr Say asked for an update on the Wood Green Area Action Plan (AAP). Cllr Adje said that the Plan had been revised following the last consultation, but the Planning Policy team were still awaiting a decision to be made on the Council's Accommodation Strategy. A number of sites within the AAP area were currently owned by the Council so the outcome of the Accommodation Strategy would have a significant bearing on the allocations and guidance and it would be premature to progress the AAP before this point. Asked by Cllr Gordon for a possible timescale on this work, Cllr Adje said that he could not provide a timescale but an engagement process with Members on the Accommodation Strategy would be taking place shortly and after this the next steps should become clearer. Asked by Cllr Hare whether there was anything to report on the possible Crossrail links relevant to the AAP and whether Panel Members could be provided with some written information explaining the current position, Cllr Adje said that he had nothing new to report on this. He added that the proposals were primarily the responsibility of TfL but he would find out what information could be provided to the Panel. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr Gordon asked for details on the Council's commercial portfolio, including on vacancy levels, the impact of Covid on the budget and what strategy was in place to maximise revenue. Cllr Adje said that in Q1 an offer was made for anyone experiencing difficulties given the Covid situation to contact the Commercial Portfolio Unit to discuss their requirements. The number of

contacts received from this offer was low but there was engagement with those that did, dealt with on a case-by-case basis. The process was repeated in June, again with a low number of new contacts received. As a result, a total of 83 rent deferrals were agreed in total. This has since reduced to 59 as some tenants have been able to pay in full or in part. There had been very few voids as a result of Covid, but with further adverse effects of Covid and the second lockdown on tenants, some increase in voids was expected in future with a consequent negative impact on commercial income. The Strategic Property Team has continued their work to conclude new leases and lease renewals which had resulted in some increases being achieved in rental income. The upgrading of commercial units was currently being looked at and an update would be available when work had progressed. Cllr Gordon asked if a written update could be provided detailing how many voids there were and what impact the reduction in income amounted to in actual figures. **(ACTION)**

- Cllr Gordon asked how many staff within Regeneration were directly employed by the Council and how many were retained on consultancies or as interims. Cllr Adje said that most Regeneration staff were permanent employees and less than 1% of staff were interims, either covering short-term pressures or utilising specific technical skills. The Regeneration team was constantly reviewing the need for interims and always looked to utilise the most efficient way of securing the resources required. Cllr Brabazon said that the 1% figure did not provide enough detail and asked for a more detailed breakdown explaining how many consultants and temporary staff were in use. **(ACTION)** Cllr Diakides observed that an audit seen by the Corporate Committee had raised concerns about the use of interim consultants in the property section. Cllr Adje said that the property team was not in his Regeneration portfolio but noted that the issues had been discussed at Corporate Committee and steps were being taken to deal with those matters.

## 8. HOUSING DELIVERY PROGRAMME UPDATE

Introducing this item, Cllr Ruth Gordon noted that the Panel was already familiar with this programme but wished to continue monitoring it on an ongoing basis including any 'red flag' issues. She noted that the Housing team had provided a spreadsheet to the Panel listing the housing delivery sites.

Robbie Erbmann, AD for Housing, said that good progress had been made on the number of sites on the programme in the previous couple of months and seven new people had been recruited to the team. Building work was progressing at Joy Gardner House on Templeton Road which was the first direct delivery site. Despite the lockdown, the team was feeling confident about hitting 1,000 starts by March 2022, though it would take quite a lot longer than originally planned to reach 1,000 completions.

Robbie Erbmann then responded to questions from Panel Members:

- Asked by Cllr Gunes about the potential impact of Covid or other adverse factors on the programme, Robbie Erbmman said that there had been a significant impact on the programme caused by the first lockdown, such as migration of staff to online working, the pausing of work on some sites and the shortage of some building supplies. The impact of Covid was continuing in the second wave with most sites estimated to be working at only approximately two-thirds of their normal pace but the same pattern of problems was not being seen in the second lockdown when compared to the first.
- Asked by Cllr Barnes what a realistic timescale for the 1,000 completions would be, Robbie Erbmman said that the latest estimates were for May/June 2024, though the timescales for this type of project does often change.
- Asked by Cllr Barnes what a realistic housing completion target for the next administration might be, Robbie Erbmman said that there were now sites with capacity for up to 2,000 under active development so, given the time required to get developments planned and built on a site, finishing the 1,000 completions and then getting a further 1,000 starts on site could be a reasonable target for a 2022-26 administration.
- Asked by Cllr Barnes about demand for different types of home, Robbie Erbmman said that the existing aim was to build decent sized homes with outdoor space and he wasn't sure that the pandemic had dramatically changed people's housing needs, but should make everyone resolute not to deliver bad housing because poor quality accommodation causes additional problems for people in such circumstances.
- Asked by Cllr Barnes about the potential impact of Brexit on the programme, Robbie Erbmman said that this would depend on whether there was any disruption in the market or on building supplies. The supply of labour could also be a problem, and while local labour initiatives and apprenticeships could play a part in encouraging local people into the industry, the shortage of labour could impact negatively on timescales for the programme. As this was a national issue, it would be difficult to mitigate against these problems, not least because contractors for around half the programme had not been selected yet.
- Cllr Brabazon welcomed the spreadsheet listing the housing delivery sites but noted that it did not include more information about each project and said that the Panel needed to see more detail on the progress and finances for each site. Robbie Erbmman said that some information can be shared with the Panel, but other details, such as commercially sensitive financial information, cannot be shared. Robbie Erbmman said that another conversation about specifically what information can be shared with the Panel could take place after the meeting. **(ACTION)** Cllr Brabazon accepted that commercially sensitive information was confidential but said that the most important aspect that the Panel needed to see was the project management information which showed which aspects of the programme were making progress and where there was slippage.

- In response to a question from Cllr Diakides, Robbie Erbmann said that about 200 completions could be expected by March 2022. He said that he did not have figures to hand on how many of these would be direct delivery and how many would be acquisitions but would supply this information after the meeting. **(ACTION)**
- Asked by Cllr Diakides about whether there was any risk of underspending GLA subsidies for housing, Robbie Erbmann said that he was comfortable that the Council's allocation would be spent. The allocation was to start 600 homes on site by March 2022, but his expectation was that it could go some way beyond that.
- Asked by Cllr Diakides about weaknesses in consultation processes, Robbie Erbmann said that two new people had been recruited to work on engagement and consultation. This brought the number of staff up to a team of three and it was possible that further resources may need to be added. There were around 70 sites in the programme which would require a lot of consultation. He added that moving to online consultation processes was also a difficult new aspect that everyone was learning to do better.
- Asked by Cllr Gunes for more general information about the programme, Robbie Erbmann noted that a summary report had been provided to the Panel at the previous meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> September. This was before Cllr Gunes had joined the Panel but the report and minutes were available on the website. Any further information required could be provided on request.
- Asked by Cllr Gordon whether building work on the Welbourne site had stopped due to Covid, Robbie Erbmann said that a number of workers had to come off site for a short period but the progress on the site was actually ahead of schedule so this was not expected to have a major impact on the programme.

Cllr Gordon proposed that the Housing Delivery Programme should become a standing item for future Panel meetings. **(ACTION)**

### Community Benefit Society

Robbie Erbmann then introduced the report on the Community Benefit Society (CBS). He said that in July 2018 the Cabinet had agreed to establish the CBS which enables the Council to acquire homes using retained Right to Buy receipts and lease them to the CBS, which then lets them to homeless households. The leases last for seven years after which the properties return to the Council's HRA. The additional income generated from the lease helps the Council to secure higher quality homes in, or near, the borough; and also ensures that these homes are let at affordable levels.

The CBS had been operational for about a year and it was now leasing 134 homes, of which 129 were occupied. Another 20 properties were expected to be leased in the

next month. In addition, 21 modular units from Ermine Road would be leased from March. An additional donation of 16 units had been received from the Hill Foundation.

To date, £46.7m had been spent on these properties, 30% of which came from retained Right to Buy receipts.

Robbie Erbmann then responded to questions from the Panel:

- Asked by Cllr Say what would happen to properties outside the Borough after the seven year period, Robbie Erbmann said that they could be sold, but that there was already some Council housing outside of the Borough so there would be a number of options, including another seven-year lease.
- In response to a question from Cllr Brabazon, Robbie Erbmann said that Homes for Haringey (HfH) provide the housing management on behalf of the CBS. Cllr Brabazon asked about an incident of overflowing rubbish at the IBSA blocks in Barnet which are owned by the CBS, as it had been difficult to establish responsibility for the housing management. Robbie Erbmann said that the problem had been caused by the properties being furnished and then residents taking their own furniture out of storage resulting in some furniture being left outside the blocks. All residents had been contacted and items were being removed by the HfH Estate Services team.
- Asked by Cllr Brabazon for further details about governance structures, Robbie Erbmann said that the CBS had five Board Members. Of these, two were appointed by the Council (of which he was one) and three were independent. The management services were provided by HfH and problems were dealt with in the same way as any other properties in the Council's portfolio. An ALMO client management team was being introduced which would include a role specifically for looking after the CBS properties.

Due to time constraints, it was agreed that the report on Woodside Avenue be deferred to the next meeting. **(ACTION)**

## **9. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - HOUSING AND ESTATE RENEWAL**

Cllr Emine Ibrahim, Cabinet Member for Housing and Estate Renewal, responded to questions from the Panel:

- Cllr Gunes asked about the type of social housing to be delivered through the Housing Delivery Programme. Cllr Ibrahim said that all of the social rent properties to be delivered through the programme would be Council homes at Council rent levels.
- Asked by Cllr Diakides whether she was confident that the financial problems with ALMOs experienced in Croydon could not occur in Haringey. Cllr Ibrahim said that a number of solutions had been put forward by various Councils over the years to try to meet the challenge of delivering social housing. Haringey

Council had decided to deliver this through the HRA a couple of years ago, when the HRA borrowing cap was lifted, so she was confident that Haringey would not end up in the same situation.

- Cllr Diakides asked about weaknesses in consultation processes, Cllr Ibrahim said that she was aware of the issues, which were common across the sector, and expressed concerns about the problems of engaging with hard to reach groups. This would be exacerbated by the need to rely on online solutions in the current circumstances so it would be important to continue to try to find solutions.
- In relation to the Housing Delivery Programme, Cllr Brabazon asked about the West Indian Cultural Centre which was marked on the spreadsheet provided to the Council as 'direct delivery', though she said that her understanding was that it was being delivered through Paul Simon Magic Homes. Cllr Ibrahim said that, to her knowledge, there was an ongoing conversation with the Cultural Centre about delivering something in partnership. Robbie Erbmann added that there was a long leasehold interest at the Centre, which had an existing relationship with Paul Simon Magic Homes, but that did not necessary mean that the Council would need to deliver the new homes through this route. In response to further questions, he added that there was no current agreement between the Council as freeholder and the leaseholder interest to deliver a scheme.
- Cllr Brabazon queried why Stokely Court and Chettle Court were listed on the Housing Delivery Programme spreadsheet as she had understood that these were not being put up for development. Cllr Ibrahim said that, in relation to Stokely Court, the debate had been on the type of development and what happened to the existing blocks and not on whether there would be more homes delivered there. The Council did intend to deliver something on this site, but a conclusion had not been reached on what this would look like. She said that, in relation to Chettle Court, the development would be on a piece of vacant land. This would not involve the demolition of the block and residents had been written letters to reassure them of this.
- Cllr Say asked about Waltheof Gardens being listed on the Housing Delivery Programme spreadsheet as she understood that a conservation area was being extended to cover this area. Robbie Erbmann said that he would provide written information to the Panel on this site. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr Gordon said that, of the 379 units listed as being delivered up to March 2021, 320 were acquisitions rather than direct delivery. She asked whether this trend would continue throughout the programme. Cllr Ibrahim said that acquisitions were obviously quicker, so were showing up near the beginning of the programme, but this was not the basis of the programme as a whole. The acquisitions could only be purchased for the purpose of using them for Council rent if they could be obtained for the right price. She said that direct delivery would be the more sustainable option in the long-term. Cllr Gordon said however that the expected demolition of Council housing and the acquisition of

500 homes from Lendlease at Love Lane would continue the trend of acquisitions. Cllr Ibrahim said that this was a historic scheme and did not sit within her portfolio as it was a redevelopment issue.

- Cllr Gordon asked about the number of staff employed in the Housing Delivery team and whether any of the team had been diverted to other duties because of Covid. Robbie Erbmann said that the team was now up to 25 staff and all were working directly on the programme and had not been diverted elsewhere. More staff would need to be recruited as the programme developed. Cllr Brabazon asked how this recruitment was being funded. Cllr Ibrahim said that they were funded through the HRA and Robbie Erbmann added that the costs can be capitalised as they were working on major capital programmes.
- Asked by Cllr Brabazon how she engages with the HfH governance processes, Cllr Ibrahim said that she meets with the Managing Director of HfH, Sean McLaughlin on a regular basis. She confirmed that she attended the last Board meeting and would continue to do so.
- Cllr Diakides asked whether the delivery of new homes by March 2022 could be speeded up. Cllr Ibrahim said that it would be difficult to do this as it was important not to cut corners in terms of planning and the quality of build.
- Cllr Diakides asked about the cost of acquisitions and whether Council properties could be sold to the CBS rather than to developers when cross-subsidies were required, Cllr Ibrahim said that this was a good question and that she would arrange for a written response to be provided to the Panel on this. **(ACTION)**

Cllr Gordon noted that there had not been time to go through all the questions that had been submitted to Cllr Ibrahim in advance and it was agreed that the written answers should be circulated to the Panel. **(ACTION)**

## **10. MAINTENANCE SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS - HOMES FOR HARINGEY**

Mark Baigent, Interim Executive Director of Property Services at Homes for Haringey (HfH) introduced the report for this item which set out how the communal repairs on Council estates are carried out by HfH. There were around 9,000 such repairs carried out each year and the report set out how those works were ordered and the improvements made in this area.

Mark Baigent responded to questions from the Panel on the report:

- Cllr Barnes noted the targets for response times as set out in paragraph 3.1.1 of the report and asked how often these targets had been missed. Mark Baigent said that he did not have this information to hand and would respond on this in writing, noting that there are monthly performance indicators for the target time on emergency repairs and for non-urgent repairs. **(ACTION)** He explained that the data reported on was for all repairs and not just those in communal areas. Cllr Barnes said there would be no need to separate out the

- communal repairs from the data as she would prefer to see the data for all repairs in full.
- Asked by Cllr Barnes how residents report repairs if they do not use the App. Mark Baigent said that residents can call the Contact Centre which would report jobs through to the Repairs team at HfH.
  - Cllr Diakides asked whether there was a cyclical maintenance programme to minimise the long term costs. Mark Baigent said that HfH was working on a new Asset Management Strategy which would set out plans for the next five years and was scheduled to go to Cabinet for approval in January. This would cover all areas of the programme including cyclical works. Cllr Diakides suggested that the Panel should look at the Strategy to see if it could make any useful suggestions. **(ACTION)**
  - Asked by Cllr Diakides whether there was a sinking fund for leaseholders to pay in to cover maintenance costs, Mark Baigent said that he would look into this and provide a written response to the Panel. **(ACTION)**
  - Cllr Brabazon said that some communal areas on estates, such as Broadwater Farm, could sometimes be poorly lit and asked why improvements to these had not been carried out. Mark Baigent said that, as noted in the report, the Haringey Repairs Service will sometimes identify areas in need of improvement and major works in the course of carrying out a repair and will then provide a report to the Asset Management Team with their recommendations. He added that he would speak to David Sherrington, Director of Broadwater Farm, to see how had been built into their refurbishment plans for these blocks. **(ACTION)**
  - Cllr Barnes said that she was aware of cases when residents reported problems at annual site inspections and, though these were logged, residents later reported that the repairs had not been carried out. Mark Baigent said that the Estate Management staff who had carried out the inspection would feed the reports back to the Repairs team. There would then be conversations about the priority for works to be carried out and then orders placed on the repairs system. Safety issues would usually take priority. Mark Baigent confirmed that the reports were logged and could be tracked through the system. Cllr Gordon also described occasions when she had attended estate inspections where issues were diligently logged by officers only to find many of the same issues being reported again the following year having not been fixed. Mark Baigent said that he would need to take this feedback to look into why this was occurring.

## 11. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Cllr Gordon noted that the additional special meeting of the Panel on Noel Park would be added to the Work Programme.

Cllr Gordon proposed that the remaining evidence sessions for the High Road West scrutiny review, which had been suspended earlier in the year due to the pandemic,



should be held in long sittings of the Panel, perhaps over two days. Cllr Hare agreed with this approach and expressed an interest in gathering further evidence on some of the examples of developments in Brussels that had been described by Professor Mark Brierley in his evidence to the Panel.

Cllr Gordon also reported that she had been approached by the Chair of the Adults & Health scrutiny panel about the possibility of holding a joint scrutiny meeting on the subject of sheltered accommodation which could be added to the Work Programme.

Cllr Diakides suggested that an item on funding models relating to the General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and an item on asset disposals be added to the list of items to be considered by the Panel for future meetings.

**RESOLVED – That the Work Programme for 2020/21 be updated on the basis of the above discussion and circulated to the Panel.**

**12. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- 15<sup>th</sup> Dec 2020
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Mar 2021

CHAIR: Councillor Ruth Gordon

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank

## **MINUTES OF MEETING Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel Tuesday, 3rd November, 2020, 18:30**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Barbara Blake, Julie Davies, Scott Emery, Julia Ogiehor, Dana Carlin, Mike Hakata and Khaled Moyeed (Chair)**

### **ALSO ATTENDING:**

**Ian Sygrave, Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches**

### **32. 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'.

### **33. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **34. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **35. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

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

None.

### **37. MINUTES**

#### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> September be agreed as a correct record.

### **38. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Panel

- I. Noted the terms of reference at Appendix A of the report, and the Protocol for Overview and Scrutiny Committee at Appendix B;
- II. noted the terms of reference/policy areas and membership for each Scrutiny Panel for 2020/21 at Appendix C of the report.

**39. APPOINTMENT OF NON VOTING CO-OPTED MEMBER**

**RESOLVED**

That a representative from Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches be appointed as a non-voting coopted Member of the Panel for the 2020/21 Municipal Year;

**40. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS: CABINET MEMBER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE, EQUALITIES AND LEISURE**

The Panel undertook a verbal question and answer session with the Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Equalities and Leisure. The following arose from discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel sought assurances around the proposed charges for use of tennis courts and questioned the disproportionate impact that this would have on low-income families. In response, the Cabinet Member advised that she had paused the introduction of charges, pending a review of the policy and the pricing levels. It was noted that this applied to the remaining tennis courts that did not already have charges in place.
- b. The Panel also sought clarification around the extent to which parks funding would be protected going forwards. In response, the Cabinet Member set out that the Council had a significant budget deficit due to the coronavirus epidemic and that she was not in a position to guarantee that there would be no budget savings made in parks. However, the Cabinet Member advised the Panel that she would be looking to protect frontline services in parks. Officers clarified that proposals in the MTFs on parks were primarily focused on income generation. The three savings proposals put forward for parks were around; increasing property income, income from sports court charging and staffing reductions in the events team (non-front line roles).
- c. The Chair enquired about the four oak trees in Queens Wood and sought assurances around what conversations had taken place with the Cabinet Member and both officers and demonstrators on this. The Cabinet Member advised that she had met with the campaigners, who had also met with the homeowners. The current position was that a second report had been commissioned by Axa and the Council was awaiting the findings of this report. The Cabinet Member advised that she had asked officers to find alternatives to felling the trees, which would not cost the Council £300k. The Cabinet Member advised that she had been very clear on this issue and that she did not want to see those trees felled.
- d. In response to a follow-up question on whether the Council would pay for under-pinning the trees, the Cabinet Member commented that she would like to

- see Axa pay for the underpinning given their corporate stance on climate change and desire to be seen as a green/sustainable company.
- e. The Panel sought assurances around the impact of the new lockdown restrictions on parks and what contingencies were in place. In response, the Panel were advised that it was not anticipated that there would be the same impact as in the summer, because of the weather and parks being less busy during the winter months. However, it was acknowledged that there would likely be some increase in parks usage due to the imposition of a new lockdown.
  - f. In regards to the impact of the new restrictions, it was noted that sports facilities would be closed, along with outdoor gyms. Whilst, playgrounds would remain open, along with benches and picnic tables. Cafes would have to operate on a takeaway-only basis. Public toilets would also remain open.
  - g. In response to a follow-up question, officers advised that there were some exemptions in terms of support groups and volunteering being able to continue under the restrictions. This would include the continuation of school PE lessons.
  - h. The Panel suggested that the Council had been slow in reopening sports facilities and tennis courts in the wake of the first lockdown and sought clarification as to whether there was a plan in place this time to address it. In response, the Panel was advised that delayed reopening was done deliberately on the advice of public health colleagues, due to an increased risk of young people gathering and transmitting the virus. The high risk facilities were reopened in a supervised way in the run up to the summer holidays. It was felt that there were some equalities considerations from reopening tennis courts before other facilities were opened and a conscious decision was taken to delay this, in line with other sporting facilities.
  - i. In response, it was suggested that private tennis courts were opened in the west of the borough and that there was an argument that not reopening Council managed courts had the opposite effect intended in terms of equalities. The Cabinet Member commented that the tennis courts at Bruce Castle in the east of the borough were available.
  - j. Officers advised the Panel that reopening facilities should be done a lot quicker this time, as they did not have miles of temporary fencing to take down.

## **RESOLVED**

Noted.

### **41. SINGLE USE PLASTICS**

The Panel received an update on the development of a Single Use Plastics (SUP) Policy and the accompanying action plan. The report was introduced by Zoe Robertson, Head of Place, as set out in the agenda pack at pages 47-61. The following arose from the discussion of this item:

- a. The Panel sought clarification about the proposal around milk deliveries. In response, officers advised that when the waste produced by the council was examined, a surprising amount of plastic was generated through milk cartons used by staff. As a result, one area of the action plan was to examine options to reduce this, including seeing whether an old fashioned milk delivery in glass

- bottles could be sought and then distributed to staff through some kind of shared system.
- b. The Panel enquired about the single use plastics procurement requirements and how these would be monitored and measured. Officers agreed to come back to the Panel with a response. **(Action: Zoe Robertson).**
  - c. In relation to a question around what percentage of council generated waste was made up of single use plastics, officers advised that the amount of recycling coming out of the building was monitored and that they would come back to the Panel with a response on this. **(Action: Zoe Robertson).**
  - d. In response to a question, officers advised that the go green guide for events was still in development, but that it was targeted at both large and small event organisers across parks and green spaces and included areas such as food and drink sourcing, paperless tickets, electricity generation, use of water standpipes and the transport used to get to events. The Council was working with Friends of the Earth to ensure all plastics bottles from large events were recycled.
  - e. In relation to a question about incentivising businesses to go plastic free, it was acknowledged that there were costs associated with provision of plastic cutlery and straws etcetera. The Panel was advised that that NLWA had been piloting a plastic free scheme in Crouch-End before the lockdown and part of this was around engaging with business owners on the economic as well as environmental case for reduction of plastic usage. Officers hoped that the NLWA would be able to replicate this across a number of business communities in the borough in future. The Cabinet Member suggested that incentivising businesses was something that could be picked up with Cllr Bull going forwards.
  - f. The Panel enquired whether there was fixed end date in mind for the use of single use plastics, given that other local authorities undertaking similar schemes had done this. In response, officers advised that the action plan would likely evolve over time but all of the individual actions contained within it had a specific end date.
  - g. The Chair requested further information around how many hits the dedicated web page had received. The Chair also queried what was being done to advertise this dedicated page and communications activity around single use plastics. Officers agreed to follow up on this. **(Action: Zoe Robertson).**

## **RESOLVED**

That the information contained in the report be noted.

## **42. PARKS PERFORMANCE**

The Panel received a report which provided an update on Parks performance during quarters 1 & 2 of 2020/21, including the national COVID-19 lockdown of March to June. The report was introduced by Simon Farrow, Interim Head of Parks & Leisure as set out in the agenda pack at pages 63-66. The following arose from the discussion of the report:

- a. In response to a question around performance targets, the Panel was advised that the targets were set according to what could be realistically achieved with the resources available.

- b. In response to a question around why performance was better in Q2 than in Q1, officers advised that April, May and June saw a sustained period of good weather and that parks were being heavily used, particularly as parks were the only place people could go and socialise during the period of national lockdown.
- c. The Panel enquired about the level of engagement undertaken with Friends groups during this period and whether arranging litter picks with them was considered. In response, officers advised that there was engagement with stakeholders, including friends groups but it was not felt appropriate to arrange litter picks due to the public health crisis. Members commented that that Alexandra Palace were able to utilise a regular group of litter pickers and that further exploration of working with mutual-aid groups should be considered in the event of further lockdown restrictions.
- d. Members emphasised the importance of hygiene standards in parks and raised concerns around a 55% hygiene score being quite low. Members suggested that hygiene standards should be prioritised over other areas such as grass cutting. In response, officers acknowledged that safety and hygiene standards were key considerations and agreed that there was a choice to be made around how resources were applied to parks. Members were advised that performance during this period was hampered by very high footfall in parks corresponding with 15% of staff being off work as they were shielding, meaning that there was a lack of flexibility in being able to respond to additional pressures.
- e. The Chair sought clarification as to whether hygiene performance reflected additional activities undertaken in response to COVID-19. In response, officers advised that the performance measure related to pre-Covid hygiene activities of picking up litter, graffiti and emptying bins and did not capture the additional activities carried out due to the pandemic.
- f. In response to a follow up question about the extra activities that had taken place, officers set out the following activities:
  - All parks operational buildings were risk assessed and made Covid secure.
  - Officers worked with café owners to undertake risk assessments and make them Covid secure.
  - Public toilets were made Covid secure.
  - Staff were working in a socially distanced manner, which also impacted the use of vehicles as a result.
  - Twice weekly sanitisation of outdoor play equipment and gym equipment.

## **RESOLVED**

That the report was noted.

### **43. PARKS AND GREENSPACE STRATEGY**

The Panel received a report which provided an update on the development of a new Parks & Greenspaces Strategy. The council made a commitment in the borough plan 2019-2023 to develop a new Strategy for the borough to guide the development, management and use of parks and greenspaces over the next 15 years. The report

was introduced by Simon Farrow, Interim Head of Parks & Leisure as set out in the agenda pack at pages 67-72. The following arose from the discussion of the report:

- a. In response to the report setting out that consultation would take place and that officers were looking to engage with a variety of groups, including those that the Council did not usually hear from, the Panel sought clarification on who those groups were. Officers advised that the groups included young people, BAME groups, dementia groups and working with public health colleagues around improving accessibility of parks for older adults. Officers agreed that they would be happy to share the list of stakeholder groups with the Panel when this was developed.
- b. In response to a question, officers advised that many of the recommendations from the Scrutiny Review on Parks would be picked up in the Parks & Greenspaces Strategy.
- c. Panel Members raised concerns around safety and street lighting in parks, with a rise in drug use and other anti-social behaviour. The Panel also set out that there had been concerns raised by local police colleagues about the fact that the Council had stopped locking parks at night. Priory Park and Chestnuts were noted as particular examples where crime and ASB were taking place. In response, officers advised that there had been a conscious decision taken during the pandemic not to lock park gates in order to focus resources elsewhere. Simon Farrow advised that he would pick up the concerns raised with colleagues in Community Safety and come back to the Panel. **(Action: Simon Farrow)**.
- d. The Panel commented that there was an opportunity to adopt a co-production model for this strategy. The Panel commented on the need to involve other services from across the Council in the development of the strategy, such as the Regeneration team, Children's Services and Public Health.

## RESOLVED

That the report was noted.

### 44. STREET TREE PLANTING AND QUEENS WOOD TREES UPDATE

The Panel received an update on the Council's street tree planting programme for 2020/21 as well as the four oak trees in Queens Wood which have been implicated in a subsidence claim. The report was introduced by Simon Farrow, Interim Head of Leisure and Parks, as set out at pages 73-78 of the agenda pack. The following arose from the discussion of the report:

- a. The Panel welcomed the street tree planting programme and noted that it would be the biggest for over ten years.
- b. The Panel commented that a number of trees had been removed on Harringay Green Lanes and around the Ladders over recent years without being replaced. It was commented that there seemed to be no trees in the plan designated for this area. In response, officers advised that there had been no direct funding for replacements for the last two years and that any replacement trees had been funded externally during this time, which often dictated where those trees were planted. Officers advised that the initial planting schedule was only part of the programme and that further replacement street trees would be factored into the programme going forwards.



- c. The Panel commented that they would like to see CIL money used to pay for additional planting of street trees.
- d. In response to a question, officers advised that around 400-500 trees were felled in the borough in a year. The Panel requested figures on the net number of trees in the borough going forwards. Simon agreed to provide an update to the Panel on the net figure for number of trees in the borough, either via email or an update to be brought to the next Panel meeting.

**RESOLVED**

That the update was noted.

**45. AIR QUALITY UPDATE**

The Panel received a report which set out the headline data regarding air quality across Haringey for 2019, which was the latest full years data available. The report was introduced by Joe Baker, Head of Carbon Management as set out in the agenda pack at pages 79-80. The following arose in discussion of this report:

- a. It was noted that overall, there was an improvement in air quality across the borough, but there were still five locations which exceeded the national objective for air quality.
- b. In response to a question, the Panel was advised that Holy Trinity School and the Welbourne School were identified as the worst performing schools in the Mayor's Air Quality Action Plan, this was due to their proximity to Tottenham High Road. In response to this, the Council was launching a trial programme to put in place an air quality fence at Holy Trinity School. In response to a follow up question about why that school was chosen, officers advised that it was the only school that responded positively to the Council's offer and that if the trial was successful they would look to try and roll this out to the other affected schools in the area.
- c. The Panel noted that Enfield had recently trialled their tenth LTN and had also set up local air quality monitoring posts to monitor the impact on local air quality levels in support of this. Officers advised that as part of the Air Quality Action Plan, Haringey was increasing the number of monitoring stations in the borough including two automatic sites, which would support the School Streets initiative. Joe Baker agreed to speak to Cllr Hearn about how passive air quality monitoring stations could be used to support LTNs. **(Action: Joe Baker).**

**RESOLVED**

That the update was noted.

**46. RECYCLING RATE**

The Panel received a verbal update on the recycling rate from Nathan Vear, Interim Head of Waste. It was noted that the 2019/20 outturn figure was 30.14%, which was down from 30.17% the year before. The Quarter 1 outturn for the current year was

31.14%, which reflected a 1% increase so far. The main reason for the increase was because of an additional 900 tons of dry recycling collected. It was suggested that people were consuming more at home due to the lockdown. It was noted that the key challenges going forwards were identified as prevention of contamination of recycling bins and increasing the amount of food waste collected.

The Panel noted with concern the fact that the recycling rate had decreased for the fourth year running and sought further information around what challenges were faced by Haringey in relation to other London boroughs on this.

The Chair requested that a written report be drafted and circulated to the Panel, which included information in relation to the above point. The Panel would then submit written questions to officers in response. **(Action: Nathan Vear).**

**47. WORK PROGRAMME**

The Panel suggested the following areas for inclusion in the work programme:

- Impact of COVID-19 on BAME communities
- The development of the Cycling and Walking Action Plan

**RESOLVED**

The work programme was agreed.

**48. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

N/A

**49. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

10<sup>th</sup> December 2020

4<sup>th</sup> March 2021

CHAIR: Councillor Khaled Moyeed

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

## **MINUTES OF MEETING CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON MONDAY 9TH NOVEMBER 2020**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Erdal Dogan (Chair), Dana Carlin, James Chiriyankandath, Josh Dixon, Tammy Palmer**

**Co-opted Members: Mark Chapman and Luci Davin (Parent Governor representatives), Yvonne Denny and Lourdes Keever (Church representatives)**

### **55. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

### **56. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

### **57. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **58. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

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

None.

### **60. MINUTES**

#### **AGREED:**

That the minutes of the meeting of 29 September be approved.

### **61. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MEMBERSHIP**

#### **AGREED:**

1. That the terms of reference and Protocol for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and its Panels be noted; and

2. That the policy areas/remits and membership for each Scrutiny Panel for 2020/21 be noted.

## **62. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.**

The Cabinet Member for Children and Families, Councillor Kaushika Amin, outlined key developments within the areas of her portfolio as follows:

- Local authorities had been disappointed at the lack of government support for the provision of free school meals during the Autumn half term. However, support had instead been provided locally by the Council and this had included provision for children from families with no recourse to public funds (NRPF). Following the campaign that there had been on this issue, the government had now pledged to provide support during the Christmas holidays. The detail of the arrangements for this was not yet known though;
- School attendance was in line the national average but lower than before the pandemic. Schools were isolating any pupils who became infected with Covid-19 and had worked closely with the Council to put necessary preventative measures in place. Risk assessments had been done and support provided by the Council's Public Health service. Remote learning provided a means of enabling children to continue to receive education if they were unable to be in school and could provide a useful learning tool for the future. Some schools had been particularly effective in providing remote learning that was engaging, including Mulberry Primary School. However, access to the necessary IT equipment and broadband was not enjoyed by all. Schools were doing their best to assist in such circumstances;
- An increasing number of parents and carers were electing to home school their children. In a number of cases, this was due to health concerns. Some of those who were home schooled were vulnerable. The Council was looking at how home schooled children and young people could be best supported;
- Ofsted inspections had been temporarily suspended but interim ones would be taking place from the autumn onwards. Preparations were continuing to be made in case there was an inspection in Haringey;
- In respect of the social workers in schools scheme, there were now seven secondary schools that were included within the scheme.

In answer to a question regarding digital access, she stated that this was a big challenge. A range of actions were being taken. In particular, schools were providing support and had been able to lend laptops to some children. Funding had been made available from the Department for Education (DfE) for vulnerable children. In addition, some families had been referred to charities. A number of these were involved, including Children in Need. Schools were providing written materials as well so that families did not have to rely completely on IT for learning. It was noted that there were still gaps though and that the aspiration was for each child to have access to at least one device. Schools were endeavouring to help when children and young people were required to self-isolate. Eveleen Riordan, Assistant Director for Schools and Learning stated that work was being undertaken with schools to identify where there was specific need. Camden Council had begun a crowd funding campaign to fund IT equipment for school children and consideration was being given to launching a similar scheme in Haringey. Donated equipment was welcome although there were a lot of issues in respect of donated IT equipment and the provision of new devices was therefore being prioritised.

Panel Members emphasised the importance of access to IT equipment, which they felt was essential for all children from Year 5 upwards. They noted the initiatives that had been undertaken in some other London boroughs. It was felt that the government could not be relied upon to provide assistance and that a Council policy on this issue was required urgently. The Cabinet Member stated that she supported the development of a specific Council policy on digital access for pupils in schools and work could be undertaken with Haringey Education Partnership to develop one.

In answer to a question, the Cabinet Member reported that there had been a lot of work undertaken in response to the recent high court judgement regarding a disabled child. A review had been undertaken by Islington Council and the recommendations of this were being implemented. In addition, an independent review of the Disabled Children's Team was continuing and an audit of court cases had nearly been completed. The outcomes of these would all be considered by Haringey Safeguarding Children's Partnership. She welcomed the introduction of Covid winter grants, although the detail of these had not yet been made available. Action would be taken to ensure that they were received by families most in need.

Concern was expressed by Panel Members at the possibility of funding cuts to Children's Centres. It was felt that they provided very important support to disadvantaged children and parents. The Cabinet Member stated that she understood the importance of Children's Centres. There were challenges within the budget though and she wanted to look at how the Centres worked so that they could be better used. Their impact could be enhanced if more disadvantaged children and parents used them. Other boroughs included a range of additional services within their centres. The proposals would focus on improving the centres rather than cutting them.

In answer to a question, she commented that the fragmentation of education was a challenge as school provision in the borough was no longer under the overall control of the local authority. Although Haringey Education Partnership were working to hold schools within the borough together, this was not the same as having a proper structure.

In answer to a question regarding precautions to prevent transmission of Covid-19 in schools, she stated that a "bubble" approach was followed. In addition, social distancing measures were in force. Every school had undertaken a detailed risk assessment. Ms Riordan commented that contact between pupils was limited in order to minimise the number who would have to self-isolate should any become infected.

**AGREED:**

That it be recommended that a specific policy on digital access for pupils in schools be developed by the Council in partnership with Haringey Education Partnership.

**63. HARINGEY LOCAL SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN'S BOARD; ANNUAL REPORT (APRIL 2018 TO SEPT 2019)**

David Archibald, the Independent Chair of the Haringey Local Children's Safeguarding Board (LSCB), introduced its Annual Report for 2018/19, which also included the period up to its dissolution on 29 September 2019. The LSCB had been replaced by a new multi-agency body, which had been named Haringey Safeguarding Children's Partnership. The Partnership aimed to ensure continuity and consistency so a similar name had been chosen. The new arrangements specified three strategic partners – the Council, Police and Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) – who had joint and equal accountability. Other partners nevertheless continued to be actively involved. He felt that the new arrangements were working well and had responded well to the challenges posed by the Covid-19 pandemic, despite them still bedding in. The strategic partners had worked especially well together. The Annual Report was the last one required by the old legislation and the first report put together under the new arrangements was due in eight months' time.

In answer to a question on the lack of reference to school governing bodies within the report, he commented that this was a valid point. There had been some debate when the government was developing proposals for the new arrangements on whether to include schools as the fourth strategic partner. However, it was felt that including all schools would not work well. It was nevertheless recognised that schools had an extremely important role to play. There was good involvement from Headteachers in Haringey, who were part of the Leadership Group. He would be happy to talk to school governing body Chairs on how they could best be involved in the new arrangements. Ann Graham, the Director of Children's Services, agreed to refer the issue of how best to involve school governing bodies to the next meeting of the Executive of the Safeguarding Partnership.

In answer to another question regarding to decrease in the number of children subject to a child protection plan, Ms Graham reported that numbers had been steadily climbing two years ago and action had therefore been taken to reduce them. The same levels of protection were still being provided though through the effective use of the signs of safety policy and the early help that was offered as part of the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub. Help and support was now being provided instead of a formal intervention.

In response to a question regarding the disproportionate funding of safeguarding partnerships by local authorities, Mr Archibald stated that there had been requests at a national level for clarification regarding budget arrangements. It had been suggested that each statutory partner should contribute one third but this had not been built into the guidelines. The three statutory partners were required to make their own decisions locally but the issue was currently under active review. The matter continued to be discussed within Haringey. Specific government guidance on contributions from agencies other than the three statutory partners would be welcome.

In answer to a question, he stated that it was important to compare performance with statistical neighbours. There also needed to be clarity regarding what constituted good progress. Beverly Hendricks, Assistant Director for Safeguarding and Social Care, reported that high standards had been maintained in the timeliness and responsiveness of child protection assessments. It was agreed that work would be undertaken to ensure that there was greater clarity in statistical data in future reports and, in particular, whether developments were positive or negative.

Mr Archibald reported that it had been intended to set up a Shadow Children's Board in order to engage and involve young people. This had been delayed by the pandemic but it was hoped to progress this shortly.

**AGREED:**

1. That the issue of how best to involve school governing bodies in the Safeguarding Partnership be referred to the next meeting of the Haringey Safeguarding Partnership Executive;
2. That an interim report on the effectiveness of the new partnership arrangements for safeguarding be submitted to the Panel ahead of the publication of its first annual report; and
3. That work be undertaken to provide greater clarity in statistical data in future safeguarding partnership reports and, in particular, whether developments are positive or negative.

**64. EDUCATION UPDATE**

Ms Riordan provided an update on education issues as follows:

- 89 pupils and 81 staff had so far been confirmed as having contacted Covid-19. Measures had nevertheless been put in place in schools ahead of their reopening to minimise the risk of infection;
- There had been no standard assessment tests (SATs) for year 6 children this year and no predicted score was given. Instead, primary schools had used existing data to inform schools ahead of secondary transfer;
- There had also been no GCSE or A Level exams in England in summer 2020. An algorithm process had instead been used to predict A level results initially. This had resulted in many young people being awarded grades that were significantly below that which had been predicted. Some had missed out on their chosen university after issues had been rectified due to places already being allocated. Many young people had deferred university until 2021, which was likely to put additional pressure on places next year;
- Although grades had been awarded, they had not been published and there were no school league tables. GCSEs and A Levels would be going ahead in 2021 but had been moved back to give young people more time to prepare. SATs were expected to go ahead;
- All children and young people had needed to rely on remote learning for at least time in recent months. A joint report had been published with five other London boroughs that looked at what had worked well in order to share good practice. Haringey Education Partnership (HEP) was working with schools in order to assist them and it was also being taken up as part of continuing professional development for teachers. Action had been undertaken to ensure that it was possible to switch to remote learning smoothly should the need arise. Hard copies of learning materials had been provided where necessary. Measures had also been taken by schools to share IT equipment with families who did not have easy access. Some assistance had also been provided by the government to assist vulnerable children in accessing IT; and

- In respect of free school meals, the government had now pledged to provide further assistance during the Christmas school holidays. The detail of this was still awaited.

In answer to a question, she stated that children were isolated if they began to exhibit Covi-19 symptoms whilst at school and parent or carers were contacted and asked to pick them up. If they tested positive, they were required to self-isolate for 10 days. Schools would look at who they had come into contact with. There was little evidence so far of in-school transmission. All pupils for Year 7 upwards were required to wear masks when moving around within schools.

In answer to another question, she stated the quality of teaching was the most important factor in motivating pupils to work remotely. It had been steep learning curve for all schools. A range of tactics had been used to work effectively with the most difficult children to engage with. She reported that she was unaware of the severity of the infections that those who had tested positive for Covid had suffered but children normally only became mildly unwell.

**65. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE**

It was noted that the next evidence sessions of the Panel's review on Schools would be taking place on 10 November, when evidence would be received from the Catholic and Church of England Diocesan authorities. The next regular meeting of the Panel would be focussing on the proposals for the Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2021-24. In addition, there would be an update on the implementation of the recommendations of the Panel's review on SEND and Cabinet Member Questions, with the Cabinet Member for Communities.

**AGREED:**

That the Panel's work programme for 2020/21 be noted.

CHAIR: Councillor Erdal Dogan

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ADULTS & HEALTH  
SCRUTINY PANEL HELD ON TUESDAY 17<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2020,  
6:30pm - 9:20pm**

**PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Pippa Connor (Chair), Zena Brabazon, Nick da Costa,  
Sheila Peacock, Daniel Stone and Helena Kania**

**12. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

**13. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

**14. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

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

Cllr Nick da Costa declared an interest by virtue of his ownership of a company working with the NHS, medical providers and healthcare practitioners on a variety of projects, none of which, to his knowledge, work in Haringey Borough though they do work in surrounding areas and with service providers across London.

**16. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/ PRESENTATIONS/ QUESTIONS**

None.

**17. MINUTES**

Cllr Connor noted that at the previous meeting there had been a discussion on the Living Through Lockdown report by the Joint Partnership Board. The Panel had recommended that the response from officers to the report should be made first to the Joint Partnership Board and then later to the Adults & Health scrutiny panel. Cllr Connor requested that this be added to the minutes. **(ACTION)**

**RESOLVED: With this amendment made, the minutes of the previous meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2020 were approved as an accurate record.**

**18. UPDATE ON ADULT MENTAL HEALTH**

Tim Miller, Joint Assistant Director for Vulnerable Adults and Children for Haringey Council and North Central London CCG, and Andrew Wright, Director for Planning and Partnerships at Barnet, Enfield & Haringey Mental Health Trust, provided an update for the Panel on adult mental health.

Tim Miller noted that, in addition to the points about mental health services that were highlighted in the slides provided, there had also been a lot of recent work in primary care including the commissioning of a new primary care service for adults with severe mental illness with a focus on physical health. Many of the services had been targeting those at greatest clinical risk from Covid and from health and social inequalities, including BAME communities and areas of greatest economic deprivation. Safe Haven, a non-clinical crisis service, had been introduced as a virtual service with Mind in Haringey. A joint effort across partners in Haringey to support people experiencing homelessness during the Covid pandemic had been effective in reaching those at greatest risk.

Andrew Wright added that demand for mental health services had decreased during the first Covid wave and then increased quite significantly over the summer. There had been only a small reduction in demand following the second lockdown. Commissioners and providers were mindful of the longer-term implications of the wider economic and societal impact on people's mental health.

Andrew Wright also provided a brief update on Blossom Court, the new mental health inpatient unit at St Ann's Hospital. The unit had opened in August with a ceremony attended by Cllr Peacock in her capacity as the Mayor and he thanked colleagues at the Council for their support in getting to this stage as the benefits of the new facilities for patients and staff had been huge.

Tim Miller and Andrew Wright then responded to questions from Members of the Panel:

- Cllr Brabazon asked how services deal with complex anti-social behaviour problems arising when a person with mental ill-health lives in shared accommodation or a block of flats. She noted that Members often found it difficult to obtain multi-agency action in such circumstances when dealing with casework. Andrew Wright responded that, as the local provider, the Trust was very aware of how difficult this type of situation can be for the individual, as well as for neighbours, families and friends. He said that the Trust works closely with colleagues in social care, housing services and other partners to seek to agree solutions with the patient and their families. Cllr Brabazon explained that, from the perspective of a local Councillor, it can be difficult to establish relevant facts in such cases due to confidentiality requirements making it more difficult to get action taken. Cllr Connor added that, in her view, a single point of contact for Councillors for such cases would improve the situation. Andrew Wright said that Councillors were welcome to contact him directly if they had a specific issue and that he would provide some contact details that could be used. Cllr Brabazon said that establishing who is responsible for taking action is difficult and so a multi-agency pathway to deal with such problems should be established. She suggested that the Panel could examine this matter further at a future meeting. Rachel Lissauer, Director of Integration (Haringey) at the NCL CCG, said that local commissioners are trying to drive towards a position where all the different agencies connected with a person with complex needs are brought together on a locality basis to identify and prevent potential crises from escalating. Cllr Connor recommended that a conversation after the meeting could follow to establish contact details for Councillors and a potential pathway for action. **(ACTION)**
- Helena Kania asked about difficulties with warm transfers and of passing people from the 111 team to the mental health team and whether staffing levels could be part of the problem. Andrew Wright said that the Trust's new crisis line acts as a 24/7 access point into mental health services for service users, families, friends and GPs. This should include an interface with the 111 service and he said that he was not particularly aware of a problem in that regard but that he would be happy to look into this further. Andrew Wright suggested that he contact Helena Kania by email after the meeting to obtain further details on the matter. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr Stone asked for further details on the benefits of the new services at Blossom Hill, St Ann's Hospital. Andrew Wright said that, prior to the summer, the inpatient wards at St Ann's Hospital had been among the worst in the country. The hospital had not been built to provide mental health services which only started there in the 1990s, many of the wards had shared bedrooms and there had been a lack of facilities such as en-suite toilets. However, the new building was purpose built, meets all of the national standards and had involved a long process involving services users, carers, staff and others to assist with the design of the facilities. Patients all had single rooms with en-

suite facilities and access to outside space, and the new facilities had also improved the working environment for staff.

- Cllr Peacock showed Members a copy of an information booklet that she had received when visiting St Ann's Hospital which she said was very useful and recommended that copies be circulated to Members. Andrew Wright said that he would be happy to circulate this and added that he would like to invite Members to visit the facilities in future when safe enough to do so in terms of Covid. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr da Costa asked about IAPT (Improving Access to Psychological Therapies) waiting times and the impact of Covid on waiting times. Tim Miller said that the local IAPT service, known as Let Us Talk, provided by Whittington Health was the largest mental health service in the Borough and treats around 7,000 Haringey residents each year. The Haringey service had for some time performed above the national standards for waiting times and had sustained that through the Covid period. However, waiting times were still an issue and could depend of the type of therapy that people want. Service users may also have preferences, for example, on the gender of their therapist, the time of day or the language for their therapy, all of which can vary the waiting time that they may experience. The number of people referred to IAPT during lockdown did fall but the service also had to adapt to providing services online and, while there had been some impact, waiting times over the period were broadly comparable. At present 95% of patients were being seen within 6 weeks (against the national target of 75%) and the average wait between the first and second appointment was around 13 weeks, though wait times could be shorter or significantly longer for certain types of therapy. Cllr da Costa asked if further information could be provided on the number of people dropping off because of frustration with waiting times. Tim Miller said that he didn't have information on drop-offs to hand but would provide this to the Panel. **(ACTION)** Rachel Lissauer added that the IAPT service had been considering, through the use of workshops, how best to provide services for people experiencing anxiety/depression as a result of Covid. Cllr Connor expressed interest in exploring the data further on the long waiting times between the first and second appointments and the reasons for this. **(ACTION)**
- Cllr Connor asked a new community mental health model being co-designed with BEH-MHT, the Council, the CCG and other partners which she understood to involve building the capacity of grassroots community groups that offer early help and prevention. Tim Miller said that NHS Long Term Plan includes a commitment to a new community framework for mental health. An approach to build capacity in the voluntary sector in Haringey had been ongoing for some time. The focus had been particularly on how to ensure that a range of support available to meet a range of needs is available from a better co-ordinated system. The new model was at a very early stage and there was now a working group led by BEH-MHT to look at how this might work in practice, but this

would be a journey that would take a number of years. Andrew Wright added that, from the Trust's point of view, this offers some significant changes, such as peer support workers with lived experience supporting the service. This could also involve helping with wellbeing and prevention where the voluntary sector could bring its expertise and community networking to complement other services. A paper on this was expected to be taken to the Trust's Board in a couple of weeks' time. Cllr Connor said that the Panel would be interested in receiving any papers on this matter that they were willing to share and recommended that the Panel continues to monitor this issue and potentially bring it back for discussion at a future Panel meeting. **(ACTION)**

## 19. DOMESTIC ABUSE BRIEFING

Chantelle Fatania, Consultant in Public Health, introduced a briefing on domestic abuse supported by members of the Violence Against Women & Girls (VAWG) team, Manju Lukhman (VAWG Strategic Lead), Catherine Clark (VAWG Coordinator) and Caterina Giammarresi (VAWG Coordinator).

Chantelle Fatania highlighted the following key points from the report provided in the agenda pack:

- During the first national lockdown there had been an increase in calls to the national domestic abuse helplines for victims, rising use of the Women's Aid online support tool, an increase in calls and messages to the Respect perpetrator phone line and website and an increase in calls to the NSPCC from children experiencing domestic abuse.
- Locally, service providers and partners such as the Police also reported increased contacts compared to the previous year and there was a widespread recognition that domestic abuse victims faced additional barriers to reporting during lockdown and were less likely to be able to contact others for help.
- Since the start of the pandemic, Haringey Council had worked with partners and service providers to identify and support residents who needed help. All commissioned domestic abuse services continued to operate with some transitioning to additional online and telephone support and referrals continued to VAWG and domestic abuse providers as normal. All specialist services commissioned by Haringey Council had reported increased levels of risk, complexity and severity at the point of referrals during lockdown.
- The Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy (IDVA) service offers support to women experiencing domestic abuse who are at a high risk of serious harm or homicide. There is also a Floating Support service, provided by Solace Women's Aid, which offers support to women experiencing domestic abuse who are at a medium and standard risk of serious harm or homicide. Both services had transitioned to operating online and by telephone.
- The IRIS service offers support to women experiencing domestic abuse who present to their GP. Their clients had reported that the lockdown had made it

harder to leave or get space from their perpetrator, had caused an increase in childcare responsibilities, that perpetrators have been using the pandemic as an excuse to further control the victim and that clients were reporting a decrease in emotional wellbeing.

- The Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (MARAC) is a meeting where all high-risk domestic abuse cases are discussed and actions to increase safety are agreed by multi agency partners. At the start of the first lockdown, the MARAC had to undergo a rapid transformation into a virtual format, resulting in a significant increase in workload.
- At the start of the first lockdown, the refuges provided by Solace (15 spaces) were already full. The Ministry for Housing, Local Communities and Government (MHCLG) provided additional resources such as hotel accommodation and the London Black Women's Project was commissioned to provide 4 single BME refuge spaces, which were due to open soon. Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) was provided to refuges and weekly food/essential supplies packages were provided to families in refuges as part of the Council's emergency food delivery scheme.
- The VAWG team increased communications to make clear that VAWG services were still operating in the borough and provided details of how to get support via the Haringey Domestic Abuse Helpline. Communications information also included an email address which survivors could access in case speaking on the phone could put them at risk in the home and details of the '55 Silent Method' which survivors could use in the event they needed to phone the police but were unable to speak. Communications information was sent out with the food parcels being delivered to thousands of homes across the borough.
- Other measures have included a two-hour Coordinated Community Response (CCR) webinar on recognising the signs of abuse which had been delivered to over 130 local practitioners and community members and the organisation of a VAWG BAME Community Forum to discuss barriers and solutions facing BAME women experiencing VAWG.

The Panel welcomed the detailed report that had been provided and asked questions to the officers:

- Cllr Connor noted that on page 33 of the agenda pack it was stated that the total number of substantive offences from March to September 2020 was 4,361 in the Met Police North area and asked whether it has been possible to reduce the risk for women and girls in these situations. Catherine Giammarresi said that this figure came from Police data but said that a high level of Police reports may also reflect that the messaging that encourages people to report incidents was working. Manju Lukhman added that contacts to local services had been going up steadily but not drastically and that there was a piece of work to be done to reach other people who want to report but have not done so. A new commissioning response was planned to try to remove some of those barriers.

- Cllr Brabazon asked about the current situation with court proceedings. Catherine Clark confirmed that some delays to cases were occurring. She added that there are other options available to victims of domestic abuse that don't involve going through a criminal court, such as civil orders which the IDVA service provides assistance to apply for. The Police also has powers that are being used including Domestic Violence Prevention Orders that don't require extensive court involvement. Manju Likhman added that there were currently significant delays in the Family Courts which had implications for domestic abuse cases, especially where children are involved.
- Cllr Brabazon asked about the implications of children having been out of schools. Manju Likhman said that schools were a significant gap in referrals during lockdown. However, now that schools had reopened, a project called Operation Encompass was being used where schools are notified of Police cases. The Council had also commissioned a training programme for schools called POW (Protecting Our Women). Caterina Giammarresi added that, even before the lockdown, schools had been a priority for the VAWG team with a strand of work involving engaging with young people. The POW programme goes into schools to provide direct one-to-one support and areas of concern can be fed back to the VAWG team.
- Cllr Stone asked the new duties and funding that would come with the Domestic Abuse Bill currently going through Parliament as outlined in the report. Manju Likhman said that the Second Reading of the Bill was still being awaited and the £50,000 of funding expected for Haringey, while useful, still fell short of what was needed given the shortage of refuge spaces in the Borough.
- Cllr da Costa asked about the Domestic Violence Intervention Project (DVIP) which, according to the report, ended on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2020 with interim arrangements put in place. Manju Likhman explained that this related to a perpetrator project and she was confident that the service would be just as effective under the interim arrangements. A funding bid had recently been made with another partner to continue the project with a new model that would improve the service by including facilitators with language skills in key communities such as Turkish. The outcome of the funding bid was expected to be known in December.
- Cllr da Costa asked about support for the LGBT+ community as part of the team's work. Manju Likhman said that the team works closely with agencies that engage with this community. Future options include some joint commissioning work with other boroughs and also some community work to remove barriers and ensure that the community feels confident to approach services. This would be built into the VAWG commissioning strategy with new contracts expected to start in April 2022.
- Asked by Cllr Connor about engagement with community groups, Manju Likhman said that there was likely to be unreported domestic abuse within some communities so it would be important to work with them to remove

barriers to reporting. Caterina Giammarresi added that recommendations had emerged from the VAWG BAME forum, some of which were about community capacity building and peer to peer support. These measures would help people to feel more comfortable to make disclosures through individuals from within their community rather than directly to the Police or other local statutory services.

- Cllr Connor expressed concern about the shortage of refuge spaces and suggested that the Panel take this matter up with the Cabinet Member. Manju Lukhman said that a new building for refuge space had been secured but capital funding would be required and it was likely to be around three years before the spaces would be available. Additional capacity would therefore be required in the meantime.

## **20. HARINGEY ADULT SAFEGUARDING BOARD - ANNUAL REPORT 2019/20**

Dr Adi Cooper, Independent Chair of the Haringey Adult Safeguarding Board, introduced the Board's Annual Report for 2019/20 which is one of the Board statutory duties. Dr Cooper said that the Board uses this report as an opportunity to promote awareness of safeguarding adults. The core purpose of the report was to demonstrate the progress that had been made against the plans that had been set by the Board the previous year through the work of the sub-groups and partnerships. The report also provided details of the Board's statutory responsibility for Adult Safeguarding Reviews and, although no reviews were published in 2019/20, there was still significant activity in this area with cases and thematic areas being put forward to be examined.

Due to the Covid pandemic, the report was slightly scaled down compared to previous years because some agency partners were responding to the pandemic and were unable to contribute to the report in the way that they normally would. The Board had set up a Covid task and finish group which had been meeting monthly and monitoring the impact of Covid and the response of partner agencies to ensure that core safeguarding duties have been met.

Dr Cooper then responded to questions from the Panel:

- Cllr da Costa asked about the increase in Section 42 Enquiries by 17% overall with a significant rise in the home as an abuse type as set out in the report. Dr Cooper said that the increase in Section 42s was good news as Haringey had been low compared to the average so her interpretation of this was an improvement in practice. The increase in the proportion of abuse in the home this was reflected nationally, including because more people were being cared for in their own homes, more abuse in the home was now being reported and also there was potentially improved care standards in institutional settings.
- Cllr Brabazon asked about the processes used to monitor systemic change following the recommendations of a Safeguarding Adults Review (SAR). Dr Cooper said that the learning from the SARs aim to shift practice. All of the



recommendations from the SARs have actions against them, some of which are for individual agencies and others for multiple agencies. These actions are all monitored, though it can be difficult to demonstrate long term impact. The recommendations from the SAR into the death of “Ms Taylor” in a fire had been responded to on aspects such as training and fire safety. There were certain areas of poor practice, including poor communication, that come up regularly in SARs so there was a significant challenge in ensuring that the recommendations do lead to real change in the interface between agencies. A workshop had been held earlier in the year to bring various agencies together to discuss this. However, a suitable mechanism which assesses whether improvements have been successfully embedded had not yet been established so this remained an ongoing objective though progress towards this had unfortunately been impacted by Covid.

- In response to a point from Cllr Connor about ensuring that the Making Safeguarding Personal initiative was fully embedded, Dr Cooper pointed to page 28 of the report which showed a significant improvement in the proportion of people who are asked what their outcomes are and whether these were then met.
- Cllr Connor asked about an action on joint Children’s and Adults Social Services partnership working, Dr Cooper said that this cross-cutting work had been continuing with a joint meeting earlier in the year and an extensive report back. It had been affected by Covid, but progress had been made and further details would be provided in the following year’s report.
- Cllr Connor asked for further details on why partner agencies had not contributed towards the report and whether this meant that some safeguarding actions had not been taken. Dr Cooper said that she was confident that partners were meeting safeguarding responsibilities and that the issue had been more that the reports for the annual review were required in April /May at a time when agencies were fully occupied with responding to Covid.

## **21. CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS**

Cllr Sarah James, Cabinet Member for Adults and Health provided a short update to the Panel on developments within her portfolio. She said that the major preoccupation of services was obviously on the Covid outbreak and the second lockdown. Although case numbers did not seem to be as severe this time round so far, there was potential for infection rates to rise rapidly. There had been small numbers of cases in care homes this time so far but no major outbreak.

Cllr James said there had also been a lot of work on improving discharge from hospitals, getting autism services up and running again, supporting care homes, the launch of a new Carers Strategy, work on a Modern Slavery Strategy and also work on VAWG as discussed earlier in the meeting. The Connected Communities programme had been shortlisted for a pan-European award for the second year

running, a mark of the ongoing work to support the community and keep people safe and healthy during difficult times.

Cllr James then responded to questions from the Panel:

- Asked by Helena Kania about the Joint Partnership Board's 'Living Through Lockdown' report and when the Council's response to this was expected, Cllr James said that the report was very helpful and was being discussed in meetings on a regular basis in terms of the response to the needs of the community caused by lockdown. Charlotte Pomery, AD for Commissioning, echoed this point, saying that the report was being used to help with the planning of services including on the themes such as communications. She and Rachel Lissauer had recently attended a meeting of the Joint Partnerships Board with next steps being shaped on working together with a number of people there. Charlotte Pomery indicated that they would be happy to return to a future meeting of the Board at their invitation. Cllr Connor suggested that after officers had met with the Joint Partnerships Board, they could then report back to the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel as is currently pencilled in for February 2021. **(ACTION)**
- Asked by Cllr Stone about progress towards the opening of services at Walthoef Gardens, Cllr James said that she had visited the site a couple of weeks previously and builders were on site to redevelop the interior of the site. The opening of new services was expected in the New Year, dependent on the situation with Covid. There are two buildings on the site, one of which would be used for a complex learning disability and autism service to be known as the Haringey Opportunities Project. The commissioning process had already been concluded with Centre 404 providing the services. The second building would be used for an autism hub which would focus on residents who are autistic but without a learning difficulty. The service had already been staffed and was already working as a virtual service.
- Cllr Brabazon asked about intergenerational housing projects, specifically two sheltered housing blocks in Tottenham. There had reportedly been some recent difficulties including a police raid and the arrest of a gang member but there were also some vulnerable elderly people living there. Cllr James said that this area was not within her portfolio though she had taken an interest in it. In general, she said that she saw it as a positive initiative, though there may inevitably be difficulties at times. Charlotte Pomery added that while she was not able to respond to the specific case raised, the service had been commissioned by the Council and delivered jointly by Centre Point and Homes for Haringey (HfH). It was a two-year pilot scheme that was currently one year in. There had recently been a review, they were aware of some recent challenges in bringing such an innovative scheme forward and there was a significant amount of scrutiny on the project. Cllr Peacock noted that she had been closely involved in the scheme when it was being set up. She said that

the premise of the scheme was a good idea and was confident that the recent issues mentioned were being addressed. Cllr Brabazon agreed that inter-generational communities were a good idea but said that schemes like this needed careful managing and monitoring. Charlotte Pomery said that there was a lot of collaborative work ongoing with feedback from any complaints, a detailed review, regular meetings with the two providers and helpful feedback from residents. Cllr Connor asked if the written review could be shared with the Panel and Charlotte Pomery said that at least a summary of the review could be provided. **(ACTION)**

- Cllr Brabazon asked about the new commissioning arrangements referred to earlier in the meeting during the mental health item, and whether there could be an overreliance on volunteers. Cllr James said that this was an important initiative, bringing people together cooperatively to achieve particular ends. She said that mental health services had sometimes been fragmented in the past so this would help to ring them together through strategic aims. She added that this was not a way of getting free volunteer labour - groups such as MIND were leading the Haringey Volunteer Network, a large number of community groups were involved in wellbeing work and a network of social prescribers were commissioned through the NHS. These groups could reach people that the Council or the NHS alone could not reach so this kind of approach would help towards making communities more resilient. Charlotte Pomery added that the voluntary and community sector had an important role to play in the work coordinated through the Borough Partnership and this approach would not only highlight that but ensure that they get funded and reimbursed for that work. The voluntary and community sector had reach into the community, trust and the ability to work flexibly. Cllr Brabazon and Cllr Connor suggested that further scrutiny of this approach should take place at a future meeting. Cllr Connor suggested that this could be most beneficial early in the process, potentially as early as Feb/Mar 2021. **(ACTION)**
- Asked by Cllr Connor about the shortage of refuge spaces referred to earlier under the VAWG item. Cllr James acknowledged that this was a huge issue, made more challenging by the shortage of housing in the Borough. A new 4-bed BAME space would be coming on stream soon but overall this remained a difficult problem. Charlotte Pomery added that the Council was actively looking at expanding refuge provision and was working closely with the GLA on the funding for that. Cllr Connor recommended that the Panel keeps a watching brief on this issue. **(ACTION)**

## 22. WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

Cllr Connor introduced this item noting that the Panel's budget scrutiny meeting would be held on 10<sup>th</sup> December. There had been discussions on holding an additional informal briefing on finance in early December to ensure that Members had all the

information required ahead of the main meeting, including information on the capital programme.

Items currently scheduled for the Panel meeting in early 2021 including the CQC overview, the Living Through Lockdown report and locality working in North Tottenham. The community commissioning model on mental health earlier in the meeting would now be added to the list. **(ACTION)**

Helena Kania suggested that the Panel could also look at the impact of the new expanded CCG which now covered the NCL area. Cllr Connor suggested that this could be added to the following year's work programme. **(ACTION)**

On the unfinished scrutiny review on commissioning, Cllr Connor reported that she had been in discussions with senior officers who had said that, in the current circumstances, they did not have the capacity to help provide the evidence required to finish the review.

Cllr Connor reported that she had discussed with Cllr Ruth Gordon, Chair of the Housing & Regeneration scrutiny panel, the possibility of a joint meeting between the two Panels on the subject of supported housing.

**23. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Thurs 10<sup>th</sup> Dec 2020
- Tues 23<sup>rd</sup> Feb 2021

CHAIR: Councillor Pippa Connor

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

**Report for:** Overview & Scrutiny Committee, 12<sup>th</sup> January 2021

**Title:** Scrutiny of the 2021/22 Draft Budget / 5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2021/22-2025/26)

**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 2021/22 Draft Budget / 5-year Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/22 – 2025/26 proposals relating to Your Council.

**2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That the Committee consider and provide recommendations on the 2021/22 Draft Budget/MTFS 2021/22-2025/26 and proposals relating to Your Council.

**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. 2021/22 Draft Budget & Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/26**

- 5.1 The MTFS agreed by Council in February 2020 assumed two years of relatively low budget gap (£1.9m & £3.1m) for 2021-2023; this was before the pandemic. The pandemic continues to have a significant adverse effect on the wider economy and public finances, reducing demand and supply in the short and medium term, presenting individuals, businesses and organisations with unprecedented challenges. The medium to long-term impact is unknown, though the OBR has forecast a return to pre-pandemic levels will not take place until late 2022.
- 5.2 The impact of Covid-19, has been such that the Council has fundamentally reconsidered its corporate planning including its change programmes and, reviewing the outputs and learning from the Recovery and Renewal work to understand the changed context in which it now works.
- 5.3 This Draft 2021/22 Budget and 2021/26 MTFS has sought to respond to this shift in Borough Plan via its General Fund (GF) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) financial strategies and capital investments, including a more holistic approach to achieving organisational transformation and associated revenue savings, via work that spans across the organisation's departments. It also incorporates our best understanding of the ongoing implications of the COVID-19 pandemic on our services and plans. It has been clear all the way through what have been many months of financial planning that this would be an extremely difficult budget for the Council. Before making any additional savings and the recent SR20 announcements, the Council's forecast budget gap for 21/22 had increased to £17m, an increase of £15m on the February forecast.
- 5.4 The recent SR 20 provides some level of financial improvement to this and other authorities for next year's budget, including additional social care grants. However, the main opportunity it provides for local authorities, including this

council, is to generate funding to protect services at this key moment by increasing its council tax income. This draft budget therefore includes an assumption of additional income from a general council tax increase of 1.99% (the threshold set by government is 2%) and a further Adults Social Care Precept of 3% (the maximum allowed by Government), which give a total council tax charge increase of 4.99%. This proposed increase forms part of the budget consultation.

- 5.5 As it stands (and before any late adjustments), the Council is able set out a balanced draft budget for 2021/22, but only with a significant one-off use of £5.4m of reserves.
- 5.6 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 18th January 2021 for discussion, prior to approval and referral to Cabinet for consideration in advance of the Full Council meeting on 22nd February 2021. 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
- 5.7 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.
- 5.8 **Appendix B** is the Draft 2021/22 Budget & 2021/26 MTFS considered by Cabinet on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020. This report sets out details of the draft Budget for 2021/22 and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/26, including budget reductions, growth and capital proposals. This includes details of estimated funding for 2021/22 and the remainder of the planning period and highlights areas of risk.
- 5.9 **Appendix C** provides details of the new revenue and capital budget proposals relevant to each Panel/Committee. 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.
- 5.10 **Appendix D** lists the pre-agreed savings relevant to each Panel/Committee. This document provides additional context and background to enable a more robust scrutiny of the draft proposals. Attention is also drawn to the 2020/21 Quarter 2 Finance Update Report presented to Cabinet on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020 which provides a summary of the in year budget implications facing the authority which has informed the 2021/22 Draft Budget proposals now presented. The

Council's 2020/21 Budget Book provides details of service budgets for the current year.

**6. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

6.1 The Budget Scrutiny process for 2021/22 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 9<sup>th</sup> February 2021.



**8. Use of Appendices**

Appendix A – Key lines of enquiry for budget setting

Appendix B – 2021/22 Draft Budget & 2021/26 Medium Term Financial Strategy Report (presented to Cabinet 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020)

Appendix C – 2020 New Budget Proposals

Appendix D - Pre-agreed savings

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

Background papers: 2020/21 Quarter 2 Finance Update Report - Cabinet 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020

<https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s119987/Q2%20Finance%20Update%20Report%20ver2.0%20Cabinet%20FINAL.pdf>

2020/21 Budget Book

[https://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/haringey\\_2020-21\\_budget\\_book.pdf](https://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/haringey_2020-21_budget_book.pdf)

### **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?

This page is intentionally left blank

Report for: Cabinet 08 December 2020

Item number: **To be added by the Committee Section**

Title: **2021-22 Budget and 2021-2026 Medium Term Financial Strategy**

Report authorised by : Jon Warlow, Director of Finance

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

Ward(s) affected: All

Report for Key/ Non Key Decision: Key

1. Describe the issue under consideration
  - 1.1 This report sets out details of the draft Budget for 2021/22 and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/26, including budget reductions, growth and capital proposals. This includes details of estimated funding for 2021/22 and the remainder of the planning period and highlights areas of risk. The report recommends that budget proposals are released for public consultation and Scrutiny consideration. The report addresses the impact that the Covid-19 pandemic has had on the financial planning process this year and the steps that the Council has taken to respond to this challenge. It also incorporates the Council's present best estimate of the implications of the Spending Review 2020 (SR20). The implications of expected further details from Government yet to be received, including the Local Government Funding Settlement, will be taken into consideration before the Final Budget for 2021/22 and Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2021/26 are considered by Cabinet – to include its response to the consultation - and Full Council for ratification in February 2021.
  - 1.2 The current MTFS 2020/25 that Full Council approved in February this year assumed two years of relatively low budget gap (£1.9m & £3.1m) for 2021-2023, was before the pandemic. The pandemic continues to have a significant adverse effect on the wider economy and public finances, reducing demand and supply in the short and medium term, presenting individuals, businesses and organisations with unprecedented challenges. The medium to long-term impact is unknown, though the OBR has forecast a return to pre-pandemic levels will not take place until late 2022.
  - 1.3 Covid-19 affects everything local authorities do – as community leaders, public health authorities, education authorities, employers, partners and service deliverers. The Council is continuing to focus on responding to the crisis while ensuring normal critical services are provided. The proposals within this report

address the financial implications of the Council's response to its community's needs.

- 1.4 The pandemic has had a profound impact on all areas of the Council's finances. In the 2020/21 financial year the gross variation from budget is anticipated to be around £40m in the general fund alone. At the current time of writing not all of this is covered by confirmed government funding. The Council's Quarter 2 in-year budget monitoring reporting shows that the net pressure arising from Covid-19, taking into account government funding announced to date is around £4m (over and above other base budget pressures that need to be managed). This of course remains under constant review, as there are a large number of uncertainties around how the pandemic will impact the Council's finances going through the winter of 2020/21. The pandemic will also have a legacy impact on the Council's finances, the larger implications relating to growth pressures, income collection and the Council's savings programme.
- 1.5 While the budgetary impact of the pandemic is unprecedented, the Council also continues to focus on the implications of the UK's impending exit from the EU (Brexit) and its potential to significantly impact on budget plans and available resources. It is not possible to quantify the impact that this may have, which is further reason that the Council maintains sufficient financial resilience.
- 1.6 As is this Council's practice, it sets out here a budget which is intended to recognise and respond to forecast demands upon the Council and taking a realistic view of its circumstances. A detailed challenge to the growth and savings assumptions in the existing MTFs was undertaken alongside base budget pressures highlighted as part of the in year budget monitoring. As in previous years the Council's budget also reflects unavoidable demand led growth for services in its annual budgeting to ensure all budgets which are set are realistic and reflect the reality of demand that exists for certain services. As a consequence, the Council is proposing here to invest a further £8.6m, primarily into its Adults and Children's services to meet care needs (before savings).
- 1.7 The impact of Covid-19, has been such that the Council has fundamentally reconsidered its corporate planning including its change programmes and, reviewing the outputs and learning from the Recovery and Renewal work to understand the changed context in which it now works.
- 1.8 The Recovery and Renewal planning focussed on:
  - Looking again at the Borough Plan priorities and principles and reflecting on what needs to change as a result of Covid-19, including as part of conversations with partners, to understand systems-wide perspective

- Reviewing our service delivery, to meet the challenge of delivering services in a new world of living with Covid-19 and doing so in a smaller budget envelope
- Working with partners to understand the systems-wide impact

1.9 The 2019 Borough Plan already focuses on tackling inequality and unfairness and the impact of Covid-19 has highlighted the increased urgency of some of our priorities. The Council is now increasingly focussing on intervening early and preventing issues from escalating, building wealth back into Haringey communities, sustaining the positive impact that we have seen on the environment during the crisis period, and helping people to use digital methods of communication to interact with us and each other. Going forward, the refreshed Borough Plan will prioritise delivering economic recovery, health and wellbeing and strengthening our communities through the five Borough Plan priorities:-

- Housing - a safe, stable and affordable home for everyone, whatever their circumstances
- People - our vision is a Haringey where strong families, strong networks and strong communities nurture all residents to live well and achieve their potential
- Place - a place with strong, resilient and connected communities where people can lead active and healthy lives in an environment that is safe, clean and green
- Economy - a growing economy which provides opportunities for all our residents and supports our businesses to thrive
- Your Council - the way the council works

1.10 This Draft 2021/22 Budget and 2021/26 MTFS has sought to respond to this shift in Borough Plan via its General Fund (GF) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) financial strategies and capital investments, including a more holistic approach to achieving organisational transformation and associated revenue savings, via work that spans across the organisation's departments. It also incorporates our best understanding of the ongoing implications of the covid pandemic on our services and plans. It has been clear all the way through what have been many months of financial planning that this would be an extremely difficult budget for the Council. Before making any additional savings and the recent SR20 announcements, the Council's forecast budget gap for 21/22 had increased to £17m, an increase of £15m on the February forecast.

1.11 The recent SR 20 provides some level of financial improvement to this and other authorities for next year's budget, including additional social care grants. However, the main opportunity it provides for local authorities, including this council, is to generate funding to protect services at this key moment by increasing its council tax income. This draft budget therefore includes an assumption of additional income from a general council tax increase of 1.99%

(the threshold set by government is 2%) and a further Adults Social Care Precept of 3% (the maximum allowed by Government), which give a total council tax charge increase of 4.99%. This proposed increase forms part of the budget consultation.

- 1.12 As it stands (and before any late adjustments), the Council is able set out here a balanced draft budget for 2021/22, but only with a significant one-off use of £5.4m of reserves. It has not been possible at this time to fully address the forecast financial impact of Covid on next year without such a use of reserves.
- 1.13 The Council always maintains a five year future forecast of its finances via its MTFS. After the above assumptions and taking account of planned greater future years savings, it is still forecasting a gap of circa £8m for 2022/23 and more in subsequent years. This points towards a difficult budget round again next year and this underlines the significance of the Council's proposal's for council tax increases this year.
- 1.14 How this gap will be closed will need to be addressed by this time next year. Given the extent of changes already factored into our plan, this will be very challenging to the Council.
- 1.15 Despite the financial pressure on the Council, it continues to look to respond in new ways to the most pressing demands upon it. The proposed budget for next year now includes additional funding for the following:
- Free Schools Meals - £0.300m funding in 2021/22 and 2022/23 (on top of the £0.050m pa put in place in 2019/20)
  - Welfare Assistance Scheme - £0.3m funding in 2021/22 and 2022/23
  - Voluntary and Community Sector – £0.25m in 2021/22
  - Youth Services – £0.25m in 2021/22
  - Haringey University Bursary Scheme - £0.12m over 3 years
  - Recruit Local People - £0.10m over 2 years
- 1.16 While like all Councils our revenue budget remains tightly constrained, our capital programme also provides important opportunities to address our communities' needs. The report also sets out substantial proposed additions to the current General Fund Capital Programme including funding for:
- the creation on the Wood Green Youth Hub: £1m
  - further school conditions work: £33m
  - increased investment in our roads, pavements and other public realm: £18m
  - expansion of the strategy to tackle empty homes: £5m
  - the completion of the Pendarren refurbishment: £4.6m
  - replacement of the Adults Social Care system: £2.5m



- the Good Economy Plan £2m, and a number of additional workspace creation schemes: £3.4m
  - implementing the Alternative Provision Strategy: £12m
  - the complete refurbishment of the Civic Centre £14.25m (additional to existing budget of £9.75m).
- 1.17 For schools, the indicative Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB) funding, which is ring fenced for the delivery of education services, is also outlined. This includes the concerning implications of the on-going budget pressure on the High Needs Block (HNB) from legislative changes to service provision responsibilities introduced in the 2014 Children and Families Act. While this is, to an extent, addressed by the increase in High Needs DSG grant announced for 2021/22 and onwards, the council has a significant annual deficit and a difficult legacy position to be addressed in the form of a negative carried forward DSG reserve. The Government is considering what if any additional assistance will be provided to local authorities to address this position.
- 1.18 The report includes the draft Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue budget and HRA Capital programme, incorporating the work on updating the HRA Business Plan. This is a complex plan and Members should be aware that there may be further changes before the final budget package is presented in February, though this will not affect the rent proposals for 2021/22 included here.
- 1.19 The 2021/22 Budget and 2021/26 MTFs will continue to be refined between now and mid-February when the final plans will be presented to Cabinet for consideration before presenting to Full Council on 22 February 2021 for ratification. This will include the detailed implications of SR20, the local government funding settlement figures and the Cabinet's response to consultation. As part of this further work, additional opportunities for reducing the reliance on reserves to balance the 2021/22 budget will continue to be explored.
- 1.20 The developments most likely to impact on the 2021/22 Budget plans presented in this report before February are:
- Further clarity on the funding announcements contained within SR20
  - funding changes in the provisional & final Local Government Finance settlement
  - the outcome of public consultation, equalities impact assessments and any recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny committee
  - further refinement of the HRA business plan and consequent changes to the capital programme
  - any further significant change in assumptions around Covid-19 or Brexit

2. Cabinet Member Introduction

2.1 This is a progressive budget at a time of hardship.

2.2 The last 6 months has been unprecedented. The impact of the global coronavirus pandemic has been felt in every home, business and community in our borough. What began as a public health crisis swiftly became a food crisis, a housing crisis, an education crisis and an economic crisis. This has demanded unprecedented action from Haringey Council. In particular we have had a relentless focus on the most vulnerable people in our community – taking action to protect and support our people.

2.3 This has taken a toll on our finances. In the current year the gross financial impact of the pandemic is around £40million compared to our planned budget. Due to the sound management of our finances, the authority was able to do what was necessary knowing that we were not at risk as an organisation. This was particularly important given lack of clarity from central Government about whether they would fulfil their commitment to meet the costs of Covid.

2.4 The budget monitoring reports I have presented this year not only highlight the scale of the impact of Covid on the organisation's finances, but also highlight that progress that has been made on stabilising our business as usual budgets, and delivering on our planned MTFs savings programme. The budget reductions proposed in this report focus as much as possible on delivering efficiencies, service re-design, programmes which cut across departmental boundaries or increasing income instead of service level cuts.

2.5 The Council remains alive to reviewing all budget risks and savings programmes annually, and underlying pressures such as base budget issues which have arisen, demographic growth that is unavoidable and savings that will be delayed or no longer achievable, are all addressed as part of the 2021/22 Budget now proposed, though this report shows that it will not be possible to set a balanced budget for the 2021/22 financial year without utilising Council reserves of £5.4m. This budget has clearly been much more challenging when compared to the £0.6m gap presented at this time last year, however this reflects the effects of the pandemic on our organisational financial resilience.

2.6 The November Spending Review has made things clearer and we welcome the additional resources that have now been confirmed. However, Covid and the resulting recession will have a continuing impact on our finances, made worse by the chronic underfunding from 10 years of austerity. So, we will continue to call on Government to properly fund local councils so that we can serve our communities and build a fairer society.

2.7 Despite this hugely challenging situation we are proud that we have developed a budget in line with our values. It invests in young people, supports the most vulnerable and those impacted hardest by the pandemic, and seeks to build our local economy.

2.8 This budget includes real additional resources in 2021/22 for:

- Free Schools Meals: £300k
- A Welfare Assistance Scheme: £300k
- Our local Voluntary and Community Sector: £250k
- Youth Services: £250k
- Haringey Fairer Education Fund (University bursary scheme): £120k
- Recruitment of local people: £100k over the next two years

2.9 In addition, our capital programme will invest more than £90m of additional investment to address our communities' needs and invest for the long term. This includes:

- creation of the Wood Green Youth Hub: £1m
- further school building improvements work: £33m
- increased investment in our roads and pavements: £19m
- expansion of the strategy to tackle empty homes: £5m
- completion of the Pendarren refurbishment: £4.6m
- the Good Economy Recovery Plan: £2m. Additional workspace creation schemes: £3.4m
- implementing the Alternative (school) Provision Strategy: £12m
- the complete refurbishment of the Civic Centre £14.25m (additional to existing budget of £9.75m) creating a public building we can all be proud of.

2.10 This budget also maintains measures implemented in previous years such as the Council Tax Reduction Scheme (CTRS), and London Living Wage (LLW) rates. These vital commitments, alongside our continued investment in public services, are only possible through an increase in council tax income. This draft budget proposes a general council tax increase of 1.99% and a further Adults Social Care Precept of 3% (the maximum allowed by Government), which give a total council tax charge increase of 4.99%.

2.11 The increase for a Band D property (excluding GLA element) is £1.32 per household per week and we continue to have a comprehensive Council Tax Reduction Scheme that means that over 15,000 pay no Council Tax at all.

2.12 We recognise that raising council tax at this time will be an additional ask at a challenging time for some. However, without these resources we would have to cut back the support and services for the most vulnerable in our borough. We do not believe that this is the right thing to do.

2.13 The new 10 year HRA financial plan supports the delivery of increased number of new homes in the borough, with greater proportion of these new homes

being developed for social rents. The proposed increase in spend on existing homes further highlights the Council's commitment to improving the quality of life of residents, ensuring homeless households are provided a safe place to live, and maintaining the overall safety of our dwellings.

- 2.14 Haringey was characterised by unacceptable inequalities before this pandemic and it has got worse. The financial challenge we face does not diminish our commitment to build a more equal borough – as you can see from this budget.
- 2.15 Indeed, we will redouble our efforts to build the houses we need, create opportunities for our young people; and ensure a cleaner, greener Haringey.

### 3. Recommendations

#### 3.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:

- a) Note the initial General Fund revenue and capital budget proposals and financial planning assumptions set out in this report and note that they will be refined and updated after the final Local Government Finance Settlement is received in January 2021 and also to incorporate further budget changes as required;
- b) Note the Draft General Fund 2021/22 Budget and MTFs (2021/22 to 2025/26) detailed in this report and Appendix 1;
- c) Note the Draft budget reduction proposals summarised in Section 7 and Appendix 2;
- d) Note the Draft General Fund Capital Programme for 2021/22 to 2025/26 as set out in Appendix 4;
- e) Note the Draft Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue and Capital Programme proposals and HRA Business Plan as set out in Section 9;
- f) Note the 2021/22 Draft Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB) and update on the DSG reserve position set out in Section 10;
- g) Note that the detailed proposals will be submitted to Overview and Scrutiny Committee / Panels in December 2020 and January 2021 for scrutiny and comments;
- h) Agree to commence consultation with residents, businesses, partners, staff and other groups on the 2021/22 Budget and MTFs.
- i) Note that an updated budget 2021/22 Budget and MTFs (2021/22 – 2025/26) will be put to Cabinet on 9th February 2021 to be recommended for approval to the Full Council meeting taking place on 22nd February 2021.

4. Reasons for decision

4.1 The Council has a statutory requirement to set a balanced budget for 2021/22 and this report forms a key part of the budget setting process by setting out the forecast funding and expenditure for that year. Additionally, in order to ensure the Council's finances for the medium term are maintained on a sound basis, this report also sets out the funding and expenditure assumptions for the following four years in the form of a Medium Term Financial Strategy.

5. Alternative options considered

5.1 The Cabinet must consider how to deliver a balanced 2021/22 Budget and sustainable MTFS over the five-year period 2021/26, to be reviewed and ultimately adopted at the meeting of Full Council on 22nd February 2021.

5.2 Clearly there are options available to achieve a balanced budget and the Council has developed the proposals contained in this report after determining levels of both income and service provision. These take account of the Council's priorities, the extent of the estimated funding shortfall, estimated impact of Covid-19, Brexit and the Council's overall financial position.

5.3 These proposals are subject to consultation both externally and through the Overview & Scrutiny process and the outcomes of these will inform the final budget proposals.

6. General Fund Revenue Funding Assumptions

6.1 The Council has access to five main sources of funding:

- Business Rates
- Grants
- Council Tax
- Fees & Charges
- Reserves

Business Rates and Grants are largely driven by the outcome of Spending Rounds and the Local Government Finance settlement.

The following paragraph provides an update on the Spending Round 2020 (SR20) and the Local Government Finance Settlement. This is then followed by a section on each of the main sources of funding and sets out the assumptions made in this draft 2021/22 Budget & MTFS 2021/2026 about each of them.

SR20 and Local Government Finance Settlement 2021/22

6.2 On 20 October 2020 government announced that, in order to prioritise the response to Covid-19, the Chancellor and the Prime Minister have decided to conduct a one-year Spending Review, setting department's resource and capital budgets for 2021-22, and Devolved Administration's block grants for the same period. This replaces the planned 3 year Spending Round.

- 6.3 The Spending Review 2020 (SR20) was announced on 25 November 2020 and comprised of three themes:-
- Tackling Covid-19 next year
  - Stronger public services
  - Capital spending, including infrastructure to drive UK's recovery and support jobs
- 6.4 The SR20 is set in the context of the OBR report that was also published on 25 November. This forecast a 11.3% fall in GDP in 2020 and, despite expected growth in 2021, it is unlikely that the economy will return to pre-C19 levels before the end of 2022.
- 6.5 The funding allocations to Local Government are summarised in the table below. This shows a 4.5% increase in Core Spending Power nationally. This includes core grants, business rate income and council tax.

**Table 6.16: Local Government**

	£ billion		
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Resource DEL excluding depreciation <sup>(1)</sup>	7.5	8.6	9.1
Covid-19 resource DEL excluding depreciation	1.6	3.5 <sup>2</sup>	3.0
Total DEL <sup>3</sup>	9.1	12.1	12.0
<b>Core Spending Power (CSP)</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>51.2</b>

- 6.6 The Government has announced funding of £1.55bn to support local authorities with Covid-19 pressures next year and it remains to be seen as to whether it is sufficient to cover the pressures faced by local authorities, including any further responsibilities they might be given. Government also confirmed the extension of the existing Covid-19 sales, fees and charges reimbursement scheme for a further 3 months until the end of June 2021.
- 6.7 Also announced was £670 million of additional grant funding nationally to help local authorities support the more than 4 million households that are least able to afford council tax payments – this points to an extension of the current Hardship Fund which is providing additional assistance of up to £150 for those on the CTRS scheme. It should be noted that the Council continues to maintain and budget for its comprehensive council tax reduction scheme, as amended in 2019/20.
- 6.8 The announcements in the SR20 which are more pertinent to setting the 2021/22 Budget are described in the following paragraphs along with the estimated impact for Haringey. Up to the point that the draft Local Government Finance Settlement is published, which is not expected before early-mid December, the final detail will not be known and the figures must be treated as best estimates.
- 6.9 There will be £300 million of new grant funding for adult and children's social care, in addition to the £1 billion announced at SR19 that is being maintained in 2021-22 in line with the government's previous commitment. Haringey's share of the new funding is estimated to be £1.25m and has now been built in.

- 6.10 The New Homes Bonus (NHB) scheme will continue in 2021/22, with no new legacy payments, but consultation will commence shortly on reforms to this scheme with effect from 2022/23. In the light of this uncertainty, the draft MTFS now removes any expectations for NHB funding beyond 2021/22.
- 6.11 The referendum threshold for increases in council tax will remain at 2% for 2021/22 which is in line with the existing MTFS. Additionally, the SR20 announced that local authorities will be able to levy a 3 per cent adult social care precept which can be the spread across two years. Given the forecast use of reserves to balance the 2021/22 budget coupled with the level of growth required in the Adult social care budget, this draft assumes the full 3% is levied from 2021/22; this is estimated to deliver £3.2m for Haringey next year with an ongoing benefit into subsequent years. MHCLG will set out full details of the council tax referendum principles and adult social care precept flexibility as part of the consultation on the detailed methodology for the Local Government Finance Settlement for 2021-22.
- 6.12 The SR20 announced an estimated £762 million to compensate local authorities for 75 per cent of irrecoverable loss of council tax and business rates revenues in 2020-21 that would otherwise need to be funded through local authority budgets in 2021-22 and later years. However, the lack of detail available at the present time doesn't allow any budget adjustments to be proposed.
- 6.13 The SR20 confirmed that government expects to publish a final report setting out the full conclusions of the review of the business rates system in Spring 2021. To support businesses in the near-term, the government has decided to freeze the business rates multiplier in 2021-22, saving businesses in England an estimated £575 million over the next five years. Local authorities will be fully compensated for this decision via Section 31 grants.
- 6.14 Earlier this year, the government announced that it would delay the move to 75 per cent Business Rates Retention and the implementation of the fair funding review. This decision allowed local authorities to focus on meeting the public health challenge posed by the pandemic.
- 6.15 In order to provide further stability to the sector, the SR20 confirmed that government has decided not to proceed with a reset of business rates baselines in 2021-22. The draft budget and MTFS have been amended to reflect this.
- 6.16 The SR20 also announced a reform to the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) lending terms, ending the use of the PWLB for investment property bought primarily for yield, which presents a risk for both national and local taxpayers. The government will cut PWLB lending rates to gilts + 100bps for Standard Rate and gilts + 80bps for Certainty Rate. It is unclear at this time what impact this will have for Haringey but it is not expected to be large and therefore the current budget assumptions have not been amended at this time.

6.17 The SR20 made announcements for all government departments and the following are those thought likely to have the greatest impact for local authorities. At this point, it is not possible to make any assumptions about the financial impact for Haringey and any changes arising from these will need to be reflected in the February 2021 report:

- £16m to support modernisation of local authorities' cyber security systems;
- £15bn for NHS test and Trace;
- £2.1bn for PPE next year;
- £254m of additional resource funding to support rough sleepers and those at risk of homelessness during COVID-19, including £103m announced earlier this year for accommodation and substance misuse support;
- £98m of additional resource funding, bringing total funding to £125m, to enable local authorities to deliver support to victims of domestic abuse and their children in safe accommodation in England;
- £165m for Troubled Families;
- Over £70m for additional school transport capacity;
- £24m in capital funding to start a new programme to maintain and expand provision in secure children's homes;
- £60m for Social Housing Decarbonisation;
- £1.7bn in 2021-22 for local roads maintenance and upgrades to tackle potholes, relieve congestion and boost connectivity. This includes £500m for the Potholes Fund and £310m for upgrades to larger local roads;
- £257m for cycling, which will fund thousands of miles of safe, continuous and direct cycling routes;
- £621m to regenerate high streets, town centres and communities through the Towns Fund; and
- The £4bn levelling up fund, which will invest in local infrastructure that has a visible impact on people and their communities and will support economic recovery.

#### Covid-19 Impact on the Collection Fund

6.18 As the Covid-19 Pandemic has had a negative impact on the collection of local taxation, authorities due to record deficits on their Council Tax and NNDR collections for 2020/21 will be able to spread these evenly over the next three financial years in order to smooth out the impact. There will not be discretion for authorities to opt out of spreading and the rules apply exclusively to deficits occurring in 2020/21.

6.19 At the moment, Haringey is forecasting a general fund impact of £2.7m due to the reduction in NNDR collection for 2020/21. This is included in the new budget assumptions. In line with government guidance, a deficit of £0.9m is estimated for the first three years of the MTF5 period.

6.20 The Authority has received £46.2m in additional funding in order to accommodate a 100 per cent business rates discount for eligible hereditaments occupied by businesses that are classified as in retail, leisure and hospitality sectors, regardless of rateable value and which are subject to business rates in the year 2020-21. This funding has been applied to the



collection fund and has been taken into account when calculating the estimated deficit.

- 6.21 Council Tax Collection has not been impacted to the same extent as NNDR and the Authority is still forecasting a surplus for each year of the MTFS period. Part of the reason for this is due to the broad CTRS scheme in place in Haringey coupled with the Hardship funding which has enabled us to support taxpayers through this difficult time. However, for the first three years, this is expected to reduce by £0.5m pa which is the spreading of the estimated 2020/21 collection shortfall over the next three years, in line with government guidance.
- 6.22 The number of working age claimants on the authority's Council Tax Reduction scheme has increased by 1122 since March 2020, when the first Lockdown was announced. This currently impacts on the expected receipts for 2020/21 and on the budgeted figure for 2021/22. Additional support for residents on the Authority's Council Tax Reduction Scheme is being provided via the Council's £3.7m share of a £500m Covid-19 Hardship Fund.

#### Business Rates

- 6.23 A number of changes were introduced to business rates in April 2017 including a revaluation of the business rates base. Although, the revaluation was revenue neutral nationally, some businesses in Haringey would have seen increases in their business rates charges. For small businesses in this position, relief was provided in the form of a three-year transitional grant that is administered and distributed to affected businesses in each year during the transition period.
- 6.24 When the new localised business rates system was introduced in 2013, it set a 'baseline' for each local authority against which growth could be measured. It was recognised that the baseline would need to be re-visited after a number of years to ensure that the incentive to grow businesses in local areas was maintained.
- 6.25 The intention was for Business Rates Baselines to be reset from April 2020, however in SR19 Government announced that this would be delayed until April 2021. The recent SR20 has confirmed a further delay to April 2022 and the impact of this on 2021/22 has been modelled into this draft budget. This provides a benefit to the council in 2021/22 as the reliefs described above, paid to the Council as Section 31 grants, will continue for a further year.
- 6.26 The Council has been part of the London Pool since 2018/19. In that year, London retained 100% of business rates locally, generating a significant additional benefit to the Council (£6.4m). The estimated financial benefit to Haringey in 2020/21 pre-pandemic was £2.7m - £3m due to a lower percentage (75%) being retained in London. The latest in-year monitoring exercise suggests that, despite the impact of the pandemic, there will still be a net financial benefit from pooling in 2020-21, totalling approximately £30 million across the Capital.

- 6.27 Haringey, along with the rest of the existing members of the London Pool, has provisionally expressed an interest to MHCLG in continuing the arrangement in 2021/22 not least because of the operational, administrative and strategic benefits. As with last year, each authority will have until 28 days after the provisional settlement (i.e. likely by mid-January) to decide formally whether it wishes to continue to pool. By that time, the Government will have confirmed the position on the reset and the level of any extension to emergency reliefs and grants to businesses as a response to the pandemic. Because of the uncertainty around financial benefits of pooling, no share of pool growth has been assumed in next year's budget or any future years of the current MTFs. This position will be kept under review and any required update included in the next report.
- 6.28 A decrease in the collection rate for 2020/21 is forecast, due to the impact of the pandemic and this will impact on the General Fund in 2021/22. The Government has announced that collection fund deficits which arise due to reduced collections in 2020/21 and would normally hit general fund budgets in 2021/22 will be spread across a 3 year period. The SR20 announced an estimated £762 million to compensate local authorities for 75 per cent of irrecoverable loss of council tax and business rates revenues in 2020-21 that would otherwise need to be funded through local authority budgets in 2021-22 and later years. However, the lack of detail available at the present time doesn't allow any budget adjustments to be proposed.
- 6.29 Currently, the MTFs assumes a 0.9% increase in business rates income in 2021/22 and a 1.5% increase in 2022/23 – both are lower than the 2% yearly increase previously assumed, reflecting the current inflation environment.
- 6.30 The planning assumption across the MTFs period is that there will be no net growth in the business rates taxbase / hereditaments. This is in line with previous assumptions.
- 6.31 In terms of Revenue Support Grant (RSG), current estimates are that approximately £22.1m will be paid in 2021/22 with this grant increasing in line with CPI across the remainder of the MTFs period.
- 6.32 The estimated mandatory reliefs applied to Haringey businesses are £6.7m in 2021/22. These reliefs cover, among others, discounts for small businesses and will be fully reimbursed via Section 31 Grants by Central Government. From 2022/23, it is expected that the Section 31 Grants will be rolled into the SFA and the Council's Top Up grant will be increased partially but not fully compensating the loss in Section 31 Grant on the back of the expected Reset. The impact of the Reset can be seen in the estimated dip in business rates related income overall in 2022/23.
- 6.33 SR20 announced a freeze to the business rates multiplier in 2021/22. The Council will be fully reimbursed for this via a Section 31 grant. The impact will be reflected in the February report.
- 6.34 The forecast income across the MTFs period from business rates related income, including revenue support grant is shown in table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1 – Business Rates Related Income Forecast

Business Rates Related income Forecast	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000	2024/25 £'000
Revenue Support Grant	21,993	22,169	22,502	22,952	23,411	23,645
Business Rates Top Up	58,412	58,880	62,305	63,524	64,743	65,391
Retained Business Rates	22,100	20,642	21,656	22,080	22,504	22,729
NNDR Surplus/(Deficit)	(1,654)	(900)	(900)	(900)	0	0
S31 Grants	6,019	6,675	-	-	-	-
Share of Pool Growth	400	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>107,270</b>	<b>107,467</b>	<b>105,563</b>	<b>107,656</b>	<b>110,658</b>	<b>111,765</b>

6.35 There are considerable planned and potential changes to the business rates regime beyond 2021/22. These are set out below:

- Business rate baselines are expected to be reset in 2022/23.
- The Government have been consulting on a simplification of the Business Rates Retention scheme including how growth can be incentivised and how it can be measured. SR20 confirmed government intention to publish a final report in Spring 2021
- The outcome of the Fair Funding Review is still awaited. This will impact on business rates as it derives each authority's baseline funding against which growth is measured.

6.36 Because of the uncertainty beyond 2021/22, the assumptions in Table 6.1 and their impact on the MTFS are open to significant risk.

#### Council Tax

6.37 The following assumptions have been made about Council Tax:-

- A 1.99% increase in Council Tax in 2021/22 and for each subsequent year is assumed (subject to the referendum limits set by Government)
- A 3% increase in ASC Precept for 2021/22 only, as announced in the SR20
- The tax base is forecast to grow by 1% per annum throughout the MTFS planning period
- The collection rate will be at least 95.50% throughout the planning period. This has been reduced by 1% compared to the previous year for 2021/22 and 2022/23 and is projected to increase to 96% in 2023/24, before reverting back to the pre-Covid 19 level of 96.5% in the subsequent years.
- The Council Tax Collection Fund account has had surpluses over the past few years. The forecasting has been refined in order to include the impact of Covid-19 and is reflected in a reduced forecast surplus across the MTFS period (£1.68m for the first three years, increasing to £2.15m for each subsequent year).

- 6.38 The resulting projections for Council Tax income and Band D Rates are set out below. These figures are subject to confirmation of the council tax base, which is due to be finalised in January 2021 and formal Council ratification of Council Tax Rates in February 2021.

Table 6.2 Council Tax Assumptions

COUNCIL TAX ASSUMPTIONS						
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
Taxbase before collection rate	80,067	81,392	82,206	83,028	83,858	84,697
Taxbase change	1.7%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Taxbase for year	81,392	82,206	83,028	83,858	84,697	85,544
Collection Rate	96.50%	95.50%	95.50%	96.00%	96.50%	96.50%
<b>Taxbase after collection rate</b>	<b>78,543</b>	<b>78,507</b>	<b>79,292</b>	<b>80,504</b>	<b>81,732</b>	<b>82,550</b>
Council Tax increase	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%	1.99%
Social Care precept	2.00%	3.00%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Band D rate	£1,372.55	£1,441.04	£1,469.72	£1,498.97	£1,528.80	£1,559.22
<b>Council Tax Before Surplus (£000)</b>	<b>£107,805</b>	<b>£113,131</b>	<b>£116,537</b>	<b>£120,673</b>	<b>£124,952</b>	<b>£128,713</b>
Previous Year (Estimated) Surplus	£2,175	£1,675	£1,675	£1,675	£2,175	£2,175
CIPFA Counter Fraud Income	£0	£25	£25	£25	£25	£25
<b>Council Tax Yield (£000)</b>	<b>£109,980</b>	<b>£114,831</b>	<b>£118,237</b>	<b>£122,373</b>	<b>£127,152</b>	<b>£130,913</b>

## Grants

- 6.39 The Council receives a number of grants in addition to its main funding allocation. The Council is mostly allowed to use these grants to fund any council services, but some are ring-fenced, which means they can only be spent on specific services.

## Social Care Grants

- 6.40 Estimated inflationary increases of 0.9% in 2021/22, 1.5% in 2022/23 and 2% in 2023/24 are applied to the values in Table 6.3 below, however the SR 20 announced that specific grants would remain 'cash flat' for 2021/22; this is subject to confirmation at the Draft Local Government Finance Settlement in December. This will need to be kept under review and the February 21 MTFS will be updated when further details emerge. Forecast figures for 2022/23 onwards remain uncertain and should these assumptions not materialise, it could have a significant impact on the current forecast gap across those years.
- 6.41 It should also be noted that all these social care grants have been netted against the service budget expenditure heads rather than being shown separately.

Table 6.3 – Social Care Grants

Grant Name	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000	2025/26 £'000
Better Care Fund (BCF) - (CCG Contribution)	6,017	6,047	6,077	6,108	6,108	6,108
Improved Better Care Fund (iBCF)	9,518	9,566	9,613	9,661	9,661	9,661
Social Care Support Grant	6,960	6,995	7,030	7,065	7,065	7,065
Additional Social Care Funding *	0	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,250
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,495</b>	<b>23,857</b>	<b>23,971</b>	<b>24,084</b>	<b>24,084</b>	<b>24,084</b>

\* Announced at SR20. Estimated amount based on previous allocations, actual amount to be confirmed

## Core Grants

6.42 Following the outcome of the SR20, the current MTFS assumptions for the Core Grants received by Haringey are as follows:

- Public Health Grant will continue to be received by Haringey. The MTFS prudently assumes no increases to the amount over the five year period.
- New Homes Bonus – SR20 confirmed that the New Homes Bonus (NHB) scheme will continue in 2021/22, with no new legacy payments, but consultation will commence shortly on reforms to this scheme with effect from 2022/23. In the light of this uncertainty, the draft MTFS now removes any expectations for NHB funding beyond 2021/22.
- The Council Tax Support and Housing Benefit Admin Grants are expected to continue at 2020/21 levels in 2021/22 (£2m) and remain at this level across the remainder of the MTFS.
- Section 31 (S31) grants in relation to mandatory business rate reliefs are expected to continue for 2021/22 but beyond that it is expected that these will be rolled in to the baseline figures and come through as part of the SFA (as outlined in the Business Rates section above).
- The Flexible Housing Support Grant (FHSG) was originally established in 2017 for three years but was extended by one year again in 2020/21. As a consequence of its renewal, the current 2020/21 budget and 2020/25 MTFS built this grant into base budgets. With an annual value of £7.7m it poses a significant risk to the authority if it is withdrawn or reduced. The draft plan therefore now assumes a £1m reduction in funding. This grant has been allocated directly to the Housing service so is not included in Table 6.4 below.

6.43 The table below shows assumptions about these grants over the 5-year MTFS period.

Table 6.4 – Core Grants

Grant Name	2020/21 £'000	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000	2025/26 £'000
Council Tax Support Grant	457	457	457	457	457	457
Housing Benefit Admin Grant	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491
Public Health Grant	20,228	20,228	20,228	20,228	20,228	20,228
New Homes Bonus	2,199	2,089	- 0	0	0	0
Business Rates - Section 31 Grants	6,019	6,678	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>30,393</b>	<b>30,942</b>	<b>22,175</b>	<b>22,176</b>	<b>22,176</b>	<b>22,176</b>

### Fees and Charges

- 6.44 The Council's policy in relation to varying external income requires service managers to review the level of fees and charges annually as part of budget setting and that charges should generally increase by the rate of inflation to maximise allowable income.
- 6.45 The setting of fees and charges, along with raising essential financial resources, can contribute to meeting the Council's objectives. Through the pricing mechanism and wider market forces, outcomes can be achieved, and services can be promoted through variable charging policies and proactive use of fees to promote or dissuade certain behaviours.
- 6.46 In the main, fees and charges are set at a level where the full cost of provision is recovered through the price structure. However, in many circumstances those charges are reduced through subsidy to meet broader Council priorities.
- 6.47 Each year the Council reviews the level of its fees and charges through consideration of a report by the Cabinet and its Regulatory Committee where it is a requirement that they are considered and approved outside of the Executive.
- 6.48 The impact of fees and charges increases have been included in the revenue income projections in the MTFS.

### Use of Reserves

- 6.49 The Council's (Non-Earmarked) General Fund Balance is held to cover the net impact of risks and opportunities and other unforeseen emergencies. The funds held in the General Fund Reserve can only be used once and therefore are not a recurring source of income that can meet permanent budget gaps.
- 6.50 As it stands the Council is able to set a balanced budget, only with a significant one-off use of £5.4m of reserves in 2021/22.
- 6.51 The February 2021 Cabinet and Full Council reports will provide a more comprehensive review of the overall sufficiency of Council reserves as part of the S151 statement. However, it should be recognised here that the need to maintain sufficient levels of reserves to help the authority cope with unforeseen changes in circumstances must be more important now than ever before.

### Summary of Corporate General Funding Assumptions

6.52 A summary of the of the funding assumptions and breakdown of funding sources is set out in the table.

Table 6.5 – Funding Assumptions

	Source of Funding	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Table 6.1	Revenue Support Grant	21,993	22,169	22,502	22,952	23,411	23,645
	Top up Business Rates	58,412	58,880	62,305	63,524	64,743	65,391
	Retained Business Rates	22,100	20,642	21,656	22,080	22,504	22,729
	NNDR Growth	400	-	-	-	-	-
	NNDR Surplus/(Deficit)	(1,654)	(900)	(900)	(900)	0	0
Table 6.2	Council Tax	107,805	113,132	116,536	120,673	124,952	128,713
	Council Tax Surplus	2,175	1,700	1,675	1,675	2,175	2,175
Tables 6.3 and 6.4	New Homes Bonus	2,199	2,089	- 0	0	0	0
	Public Health	20,228	20,228	20,228	20,228	20,228	20,228
	Other Core Grants	8,634	8,626	1,951	1,951	1,951	1,951
	<b>Total (External) Funding</b>	<b>242,292</b>	<b>246,566</b>	<b>245,953</b>	<b>252,183</b>	<b>259,964</b>	<b>264,832</b>
	Contribution from Reserves	-	5,440	-	-	-	-

7. General Fund Revenue Assumptions

7.1 2020/21 Financial Performance – General Fund Revenue

- 7.1.1 The 2020/21 Budget Update report, also part of this Cabinet agenda, provides an update on the Quarter 2 budget position. Since the budget was agreed, the lock-down and associated Government directed actions in response to the Covid-19 pandemic has significantly impacted on the Council's agreed budget and Borough Plan delivery. The forecasts provided in that report are as up to date as possible and based on the most recent return to central government (i.e. at month 7 of the financial year). However, there remains great uncertainty, not least associated with the impact of the second wave of the virus and the current and further local or national lockdowns.
- 7.1.2 The Budget Update report separates the General Fund (GF) impact of Covid-19 and base budget related pressures. Some of the latter can be mitigated however, some will need to be resolved by permanent budget adjustments and as such are now built into the draft 2021/22 Budget as growth items. In any large organisations it must be accepted that some plans will require change as the result of internal and/or external factors, and the growth built into the draft budget is a reflection of both of these.
- 7.1.3 At this stage, the biggest impact of Covid-19 on future budgets is slippage in delivery of some planned MTFS savings which has been built into the Budget and MTFS now presented.
- 7.1.4 Covid-19 is also expected to impact significantly on Business Rates and Council Tax (Collection Fund) income and the forecast impact has been built into the draft proposals presented in this report. The latest guidance from Government is that any Collection Fund deficits must be spread over three years, which is how it has been modelled. SR20 announced an estimated £762 million to compensate local authorities for 75 per cent of irrecoverable loss of council tax and business rates revenues in 2020-21 that would otherwise need to be funded through local authority budgets in 2021-22 and later years. However, the lack of detail available at the present time doesn't allow any budget adjustments to be proposed.
- 7.1.5 The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) year-end forecast has worsened this quarter and now stands at £5.3m (£4.6m Qtr1). This is due to the on-going pressures in the High Needs Block (HNB) which Members will be aware is a national issue facing the entire local government sector mainly as a consequence of the expansion of age ranges for EHCP eligibility. Over the course of the year more clarity has been received over the ultimate responsibility for this overspend and the brought forward balances from prior years, and authorities may not now use general fund balances to contribute to DSG deficits without approval from the government. The Government is considering what if any additional assistance will be provided to local authorities to address this position.
- 7.1.6 In summary, the key underlying budget pressures that have manifested during this financial year which services cannot mitigate will be resolved as part of the



2021/22 budget setting process. In terms of the in year GF forecast of non-Covid 19 related overspend (£5.9m) officers will continue to work on reducing this to bring it to a balanced position by March 2021 to avoid having to draw on reserves which will be much needed in 2021/22 to offset on-going pandemic pressures and any wider economic impacts.

## 7.2 Budget Growth / Pressures

7.2.1 As clearly outlined above, the 2021/22 financial planning process has sought to identify, and where possible address, budget pressures and necessary growth in order that the 2021/22 Budget in particular, but also the MTFS 2021-2026, are set as realistically as possible – matching forecast expenditure against forecast income and deliverability of newly proposed savings.

7.2.2 Some growth for the period to 2025 was already built into last year's MTFS and the financial planning work undertaken this year has reviewed the assumptions driving those figures, updated them where appropriate and has also assessed new pressures or identified growth.

7.2.3 The main corporate assumptions across the forthcoming 2021-2026 period are outlined below followed by a paragraph which focusses on the policy priorities and service specific items.

## 7.3 Pay Inflation

7.3.1 The pay deal for 2020/21, was agreed at 2.75%. Negotiations are underway over the next agreement and firmer information might be available for the February report but the current planning assumptions are c. 3% increase for the next 2 years. Beyond that, it reduces to around 2.5% for the remainder of the MTFS period.

## 7.4 Non-Pay Inflation

7.4.1 The assumption continues that the services will broadly have to manage within existing budgets, thus absorbing any inflationary pressures. However, in recognition that (a) some contracts include inflation-linked increases (b) utility costs continue to be volatile and difficult to predict and (c) legislative changes can impact on cost of services. An increase of £2m pa has been built into the following two years to recognise potential volatility from Brexit and Covid legacy. Thereafter it returns to £1m pa.

## 7.5 Employer Pension Contributions

7.5.1 The outcome of the last triennial valuation, which covered the period 2021/22 – 2022/23, confirmed that the Pension Fund performance allowed for a decrease in the Council's contribution rate of 0.5% each year for three years, equating to a saving of c. £0.5m per annum each year. No assumptions have been made about the next triennial valuation.

## 7.6 Treasury & Capital Financing

7.6.1 The MTFFS has been updated to reflect the capital financing costs associated with the new capital schemes that are proposed. These are reflected in the Capital Strategy at section 8 of this report.

7.6.2 These figures may require revision depending on the outcome of consultation and scrutiny of the capital investment proposals between now and the final Cabinet report in February 2021 & the final Treasury Management Strategy Statement presented to Full Council later that month.

## 7.7 Levies

7.7.1 The current assumption is that all Levy costs except the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) levy will remain broadly in line with the 2020/21 figures across the period.

7.7.2 The NLWA's North London Heat and Power Project will replace the existing Energy from Waste plant at the Edmonton EcoPark with an Energy Recovery Facility and includes a new Resource Recovery Facility. This major project will have financial implications for each of the 7 London boroughs involved, representing 2 million people. The existing MTFFS assumed a £0.5m p.a. levy increase to commence from 2021/22, due the impact of increased borrowing costs which must be met by the levy.

7.7.3 The 2020/21 Levy was lower than the budgeted figure and, as this increase was no longer applicable, it was agreed for this amount to be transferred to a reserve in order to smooth the future financial pressure. This will be drawn on when required. The budget assumptions across the MTFFS period will be revisited before February, when the intended Levy levels will be announced for 2021/22.

## 7.8 Policy Priorities

7.8.1 Since the start of this Administration, the following policy priorities have received additional funding through the annual budget setting cycles:

- Council Tax Reduction Scheme - £1.6m
- Youth Services programme - £0.25m
- Apprenticeship support - £0.134m
- School meals pilot - £0.05m
- London Living Wage – pump priming to deliver

7.8.2 Despite the significant challenges to set a legal, balanced budget for 2021/22, a number of policy growth proposals have been incorporated into the draft budget and MTFFS. These are set out in the table below:-

- Free Schools Meals £0.3m funding in 2021/22 and 2022/23
- Welfare Assistance Scheme £0.3m funding in 2021/22 and 2022/23

- Voluntary and Community Sector – £0.25m in 2021/22 only
- Youth Services – £0.25m in 2021/22 only
- Haringey University Bursary Scheme - £0.12m over 3 years
- Recruit Local People - £0.10m over 2 years

## 7.9 Service Budget Adjustments Required

### Service Growth Budget Adjustments

7.9.1 The table below shows the service specific growth proposals made necessary by base budget or demand pressures and built into the draft MTFS.

Table 7.1 – Service Growth Budget Adjustment Proposals

Priority	2021/22 £'000	2022/23 £'000	2023/24 £'000	2024/25 £'000	2025/26 £'000	Total £'000
People - Adults	2,300	0	0	0	0	2,300
People - Children's	3,046	(459)	(264)	0	0	2,323
Your Council	367	66	(300)	0	0	133
Place	2,721	(355)	0	0	0	2,366
Economy	175	0	0	0	0	175
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,609</b>	<b>(748)</b>	<b>(564)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,297</b>

7.9.2 The biggest service areas requiring growth in this budget continue to be in the People Priorities. As in the last couple of years, the Council has recognised the growing pressure in these critical services which cannot be fully contained through service transformation alone. Clear action has therefore been taken once again to address these forecast budget issues in order that the Services are provided with realistic budgets to work within. This has been a key feature of recent years' budget process where robust action is taken to address clearly evidenced budget pressures.

7.9.3 It is forecast that the Adults service will need to address both demographic and inflationary pressures coupled with an expected growth in Mental Health and Learning Disabilities support required as a legacy of the Covid-19 pandemic. The figures have been generated by detailed modelling and trend analysis.

7.9.4 Children's services are now seeing growth above that provided in the last MTFS (£0.5m) and therefore £2.2m has been built into the relevant budgets for next year. The key pressure points are SEND, both service demand and transport pressure but more significantly placement costs due to an increase in children with more complex needs.

7.9.5 The growth provided in the Place priority is required to address a recognised shortfall in the facilities management budgets, for both soft and hard services, as well as to resolve a number of areas where budgeted and actual income have become mis-aligned over time including CCTV, Pay by Phone, Residential Permit Parking income, plus reactive maintenance and the clamping contract.

7.9.6 The remaining growth proposals look to address historic or forecast base budget pressures across a number of service heads.

#### Impact of Delayed and Undeliverable Savings Proposals

7.9.7 The table below shows the delayed and undeliverable savings proposals now built into the draft MTFs.

Table 7.2 – Delayed and Undeliverable Savings

Priority	2021/22		2022/23		2023/24		2024/25		2025/26		Total	
	Delayed Savings	Undeliverable Savings	Delayed Savings	Undeliverable Savings	Delayed Savings	Undeliverable Savings	Delayed Savings	Undeliverable Savings	Delayed Savings	Undeliverable Savings	Delayed Savings	Undeliverable Savings
	£'000		£'000		£'000		£'000		£'000		£'000	
Adults	1,621	0	(710)	0	(911)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children	1,066	390	(1,066)	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	515
Place	0	200	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	250
Economy	120	100	30	0	20	0	(100)	0	(70)	0	0	100
Housing	(136)	0	(136)	0	136	0	136	0	0	0	0	0
Your Council	252	318	(252)	250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	568
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,923</b>	<b>1,008</b>	<b>(2,134)</b>	<b>425</b>	<b>(755)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(70)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,433</b>

7.9.8 The majority of the delayed savings have occurred as a consequence of the Covid-19 Pandemic and are forecast to be realised in future years, after rigorous review and challenge.

#### 7.10 Budget Reduction Proposals / Savings

##### Pre-Agreed Budget Reduction Proposals

7.10.1 The 2020 Budget and MTFs 2020/2025 agreed a total of £29.4m budget reductions to be delivered across that period. Whilst the Council was able to set a balanced budget for 2020/21, the MTFs acknowledged that a forecast of £15.6m as at yet unidentified additional savings would be required over the years from 2021/22 to match the assumed funding and expenditure plans at that point.

7.10.2 The table below summarises the position included in the February 2020 Budget/MTFS report.

Table 7.3 – Agreed Savings and Forecast Unidentified Savings at February 2020

Priority	Total					
	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	Total Savings
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Housing	1,176	709	136	136	136	2,293
People - Adults	5,073	3,245	3,270	(376)	-	11,212
People - Children	2,261	909	419	100	200	3,889
Place	3,368	2,073	1,162	70	-	6,673
Economy	830	120	130	120	-	1,200
Your Council	2,934	536	687	6	-	4,163
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>15,642</b>	<b>7,592</b>	<b>5,804</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>29,430</b>
Unidentified Savings	0	1,954	3,178	6,684	3,743	15,559
<b>Total Savings Requirement</b>	<b>15,642</b>	<b>9,546</b>	<b>8,982</b>	<b>6,740</b>	<b>4,079</b>	<b>44,989</b>

Approach to Budget Reduction Proposals / Savings 2021-2026

7.10.3 The financial planning process this year had looked to build on the progress made last year where the budgets adjustments agreed were more realistic and understood and owned by the wider organisation; the forecast budget gap for 2021/22 in last year's MTFS was £1.954m and this would have allowed the organisation to develop larger scale, transformational programmes to address the widening gap beyond 2021/22.

7.10.4 The subsequent impact of the global pandemic (Covid-19) has led to a significant shift in the MTFS assumptions in place when the last budget and MTFS were agreed. This, in particular, led to a downwards assessment of local tax revenues as set out in more detail in Section 6 of this report. It also impacted on the ability for the Council to deliver agreed savings to the set timeframes. A detailed challenge to the growth assumptions in the existing MTFS was also undertaken alongside base budget pressures highlighted as part of the in year budget monitoring. The impact on the revised forecast gap for 2021/22 was significant with an estimated shortfall of £17m, an increase of £15m to the forecast in February.

7.10.5 This highlighted the need for change to take place at a faster pace. Furthermore, with the forecast level of budget reductions required for 2021/22, it became apparent that a focus purely on a directorate led basis would be unable to achieve the magnitude required. This would also have been a barrier to progressing the more transformational, council-wide changes which emerged as a key output from the Recovery and Renewal activity which:-

- Looked at our borough plan priorities and principles and reflected on what needed to change as a result of Covid-19, including as part of conversations with partners, to understand systems-wide perspective
- Reviewed our service delivery, to meet the challenge of delivering services in a new world of living with Covid-19 and doing so in a smaller budget envelope
- Worked with partners to understand the systems-wide impact

7.10.6 This led to the formulation of cross-cutting programmes described briefly below which have identified forecast budget reductions albeit requiring a longer lead in time, so not delivering fully until 2022/23+:-

- Digital Together - An empowered, energised and enabled resident community engaging with us through increased digital channels that quickly direct them to the right resources through anticipation of their needs.  
A more digitally aware and confident council, embracing digital technologies to maximise our opportunities  
These actions will enable the removal of duplication and non-standard processes and consolidation of activities and processes delivering a reduced cost base.

- Property – initial focus on the generation of capital receipts for 2021/22 to provide investment to support transformational activity. Longer term, opportunities are being pursued for the Council’s property portfolio to enable and deliver general fund revenue savings e.g. Savings from operational property / progress with the Accommodation Strategy; support for the Localities strategy; asset rationalisation and the commercial portfolio.

7.10.7 Through the Covid-19 pandemic, we have learned more about the day to day impacts of inequalities and about how we could change as an organisation. We need to connect with local residents to support them with the wide range of issues they may be facing at the very earliest opportunity, using a range of methods including access to digital.

7.10.8 In addition to the above cross-cutting programmes we will focus more on three areas of activity:

- Being close to residents – by working out in localities and improving our digital offer, ensuring that we can shape what best suits local neighbourhoods, making use of local strengths
- Intervening earlier – proactively building confidence and skills and not waiting until a crisis point is reached before we and partners step in
- Extending our reach – building trust by working in partnership with local community organisations

7.10.9 The total new budget reduction proposals arising from both the Directorate led and cross-cutting programmes are set out in Table 7.4 below.

Table 7.4 – New Budget Reduction Proposals by Priority

Priority	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	Total Proposals
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Housing	483	68	51	12	1	615
People - Adults	1,537	0	0	0	0	1,537
People - Children	321	319	30	30	0	700
Place	2,361	1,575	(1,380)	1,300	160	4,016
Economy	550	0	0	0	0	250
Your Council	846	138	0	0	0	984
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>6,098</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>(1,299)</b>	<b>1,342</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>8,102</b>
Cross-Cutting Proposals	750	2,250	0	0	0	3,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,848</b>	<b>4,350</b>	<b>(1,299)</b>	<b>1,342</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>11,102</b>

7.10.10 When added to the pre-agreed reductions for next year (£7.6m initially – revised down to £3.7m largely as a consequence of the Covid-19 Pandemic – as presented in Table 7.2), the total to be delivered is £10.5m in 2021/22. A summary of the future years’ total savings position across the MTFS, including those agreed in previous budget rounds, is provided in Appendix 3.

7.10.11 To help de-risk the budget in future years, officers have assessed delivery confidence of all the new proposals and have re-profiled agreed

savings that have been impacted by the pandemic. Whilst the new proposals have yet to be agreed, as they are subject to scrutiny and consultation, work will continue by officers to look to identifying means of amending the status of risk and a final update will be provided in the February report. All proposals have been reviewed by the Policy and Equalities team and have been subject to initial equalities screening. Where these have indicated that full EqIA's will or might be required, work is progressing on completing these.

7.10.12 The monitoring of savings delivery in 2020/21 has, notwithstanding the impact of Covid-19 on plans, provided a growing assurance that services have a greater understanding of, and capacity to deliver, budget reduction proposals.

## 7.11 Summary Revenue Budget Position 2021/22 – 2025/26

The summary revenue budget position, including current projected gaps is identified below.

Table 7.5 – Summary Revenue Budget Position

	2020/21 Budget	2021/22 Draft Budget	2022/23 Projected	2023/24 Projected	2024/25 Projected	2025/26 Projected
Priority Area	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Housing	16,382	16,102	15,762	15,711	15,699	15,698
People - Children	55,189	58,721	57,083	57,189	57,459	57,459
People - Adults	83,784	83,375	80,827	82,977	86,079	86,079
Place	24,915	22,372	19,255	20,571	19,277	19,117
Economy	1,006	7,642	7,542	7,442	7,342	7,272
Your Council	35,999	32,893	30,063	29,757	29,757	29,757
Non-Service Revenue	25,017	30,902	45,487	56,687	62,953	66,153
<b>Council Cash Limit</b>	<b>242,292</b>	<b>252,006</b>	<b>256,019</b>	<b>270,333</b>	<b>278,565</b>	<b>281,534</b>
Planned Contributions from Reserves	-	(5,440)	-	-	-	-
Further Savings to be Identified	-	-	(10,041)	(18,125)	(18,576)	(16,677)
<b>Total General Fund Budget</b>	<b>242,292</b>	<b>246,566</b>	<b>245,978</b>	<b>252,208</b>	<b>259,989</b>	<b>264,857</b>
Council Tax	107,805	113,132	116,536	120,673	124,952	128,713
Council Tax Surplus	2,175	1,700	1,700	1,700	2,200	2,200
RSG	21,993	22,169	22,502	22,952	23,411	23,645
Top up Business Rates	58,412	58,880	62,305	63,524	64,743	65,391
Retained Business Rates	22,100	20,642	21,656	22,080	22,504	22,729
NNDR Surplus/(Deficit)	(1,654)	(900)	(900)	(900)	0	0
NNDR Growth	400	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total (Main Funding)</b>	<b>211,231</b>	<b>215,623</b>	<b>223,799</b>	<b>230,029</b>	<b>237,810</b>	<b>242,678</b>
<b>Core/Other External Grants</b>						
New Homes Bonus	2,199	2,089	0	0	0	0
Public Health	20,228	20,228	20,228	20,228	20,228	20,228
Other core grants	8,634	8,626	1,951	1,951	1,951	1,951
<b>TOTAL (Core/Other External Grants)</b>	<b>31,061</b>	<b>30,943</b>	<b>22,178</b>	<b>22,179</b>	<b>22,179</b>	<b>22,179</b>
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>242,292</b>	<b>246,566</b>	<b>245,978</b>	<b>252,208</b>	<b>259,989</b>	<b>264,857</b>

7.11.1 The draft General Fund Budget 2021/22 presently has a budget gap of £5.4m, which is expected to be covered from reserves.

7.11.2 In undertaking this multi-year financial planning, the levels of uncertainty and risk increase substantially beyond the immediate budget for next year. Reference has been made above to the scale of the assumption made in regard to current and future years grants. This report elsewhere highlights the many other risks that may impact and increase the size of the gaps forecasted above for years 2 and beyond. This authority, like all other social care councils, must be particularly concerned about the risks regarding its care services finances. While the year-on-year cash limit profiles for our care services detailed above have been prepared with reference to best intelligence on future years grants, demographics, savings and other pressures, these need to be kept under closest review.

## 7.12 Review of assumptions and risks 2021/22 – 2025/26

7.12.1 The Council's Section 151 Officer has a statutory responsibility to assess the robustness of the Council's budget and to ensure that the Council has sufficient contingency/reserves to provide against known risks in respect of both expenditure and income. This formal assessment will be made as part of the final report on the Council's budget in February 2021 and will draw on independent assessments of the Council's financial resilience where available however, it is critical that this report outlines the assumptions and approach to risk taken when arriving at the budget proposals included in the draft Budget & MTFS.

7.12.2 Given the increased financial pressure that is falling upon this council's budget and the uncertain national political picture, this statutory role is acquiring more and more significance. The number and breadth of potential risks and level of uncertainty, particularly around the Covid-19 pandemic and Government funding, underlines the need to maintain both a budgeted resilience contingency and keep general and earmarked reserves at current levels.

7.12.3 The main uncertainties and risks identified to date which may impact on the Council's budget for 2021/22 and over the period of the MTFS are:

- Funding assumptions for 2021/22 are subject to the final local government settlement expected in January 2021 and therefore there may be changes; at this point we have yet to receive the provisional figures which places more risk on the assumptions.
- On-going uncertainty about the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on 2020/21 budget and also future years. It is likely that Covid-19 will also impact on the level of Government resources for future years of the MTFS
- Brexit, with or without a trade deal with the EU, could put pressure on costs and increase inflation; staffing in critical social care & health services, on local tax income levels and potentially numbers presenting as No Recourse To Public Funds (NRPF)
- The shift to a one-year spending review with no announcements about funding beyond 2021/22. Therefore, professional judgement has had to be



used in forecasting funding for the later years of the MTF5. These assume that Government funding generally increases at an inflationary level, and that specific grants are not discontinued by the government. Should this assumed funding not be realised it will have a significant impact on the current forecast gap across those years. This will be kept under close review.

- The implications arising from the next Spending Round and the period that will be covered are not known
- Uncertainty over whether the London business rates pool will continue into 2021/22 and lack of clarity of the financial implications if it does
- The continued pressure on High Needs Block Dedicated Schools Block (DSG) resources, lack of a clear strategy for resolution from the DfE, although it is now confirmed that deficits are not currently to be funded by general fund resources
- The expected Fair Funding Review and redesign of the Business Rates Retention scheme did not complete during 2020/21 as expected. The impact on funding for the Council on the eventual outcomes of both are not known at this time
- Increases in London Living Wage in future years.
- The impact of pay and general inflation pressures above current assumptions
- General population increases that are expected over the next 5 years and any associated growth in demand - other than specifically allowed for - may lead to financial pressure.
- Planned actions to increase Council managed temporary accommodation options do not progress at the pace expected and/or are potentially exacerbated by Covid-19
- The Council's Transformational Programmes do not deliver the required savings, do not deliver savings quickly enough, or are impacted by demographic trends particularly in critical areas such as Children's and Adults Social Care and Temporary Accommodation.
- Any further deterioration in the forecast 2020/21 position including non-delivery of in year savings
- Business rates base negatively impacted by the impact of Covid-19, permanent shifts to on-line services and any economic slowdown

8. Council's Capital Strategy and Capital Programme 2021/22 – 2025/26

8.1 Introduction

- 8.1.1 This is the third capital strategy report that has been prepared since it became a mandatory requirement of local authorities to produce one. It gives a high-level overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing, and treasury management activities contribute to the provision of public services. It also provides an overview of how the risks of the capital programme are managed and the implications for future financial sustainability.
- 8.1.2 The Covid-19 pandemic has affected the Council's capital strategy as it responds to the ravages wrought by Covid-19. In particular the capital programme for 2020/21 has been redirected to provide for an acceleration of the school streets programme, revisions to the public realm works to create Covid-19 safe public spaces through widening pavements, works around school streets to make them safe and an early start to the capital works required for the Good Economy Recovery Plan. In addition, resources have been directed to providing emergency temporary accommodation for rough sleepers.
- 8.1.3 Looking forward, the Council's capital proposals include provision for a new youth hub in Wood Green £1m, a significant increase in investment in education with a further £33m allocated for condition works in schools, £12m into the Alternative Provision strategy and an £4.6m additional funding for Pendarren.
- 8.1.4 The proposals also include for overall investment of £5.5m in the Good Economy Recovery Plan, further investment in the economic future of the borough through its workspace creation programme and investment in Haringey Adults Learning Service (HALS).
- 8.1.5 The Council is also investing in the public realm through the Streetsplan scheme as well as further investment in pavements and the wider public realm all of which link to the Good Economy Recovery Plan through making high streets safe and welcoming places.
- 8.1.6 The Council continues to invest in housing through its new homes programme. This expenditure is contained within the housing revenue account (HRA) and is reported here in summary form and elsewhere on the agenda in detail.
- 8.1.7 There is additional investment in the empty homes scheme of £5m. This scheme aims to bring back into use homes that have been left empty for various reasons. Ultimately this may require the Council to exercise its compulsory purchase order powers (CPO) but to do so the Council must show that it has the resources available to complete the purchase. This budget supplies that evidence.
- 8.1.8 Finally, the proposals provide for significant investment in the Civic Centre to provide a place of civic pride for the borough.

### 8.1.9 Background

8.1.10 Capital expenditure in local government is defined in statute and accounting practices/codes and as such must be complied with. Within these rules, capital budgets and capital expenditure decisions offer the opportunity for the Council to profoundly affect the lives of its residents, businesses, and visitors in both the immediate and the longer term.

8.1.11 Capital programmes can shape the local environment (e.g. through the provision of new housing, traffic schemes or regeneration schemes); positively impact people's lives (e.g. through creating appropriate housing for adults with learning difficulties or investment in parks and open spaces); transform the way the Council interacts with local residents (e.g. through the libraries investment programme or proposals for a new customer service centre); and deliver fit for purpose schools. The advent of Covid-19 has highlighted how capital expenditure can be used to positively impact people's lives.

8.1.12 The key objectives for the Council's capital programme are to deliver the borough plan and assist the Council in meeting the financial challenges that it continues to face.

## 8.2 Capital expenditure and financing

8.2.1 Capital expenditure is where the Council spends money on a project, with the view to derive economic benefit from the outcome of the expenditure, for a period longer than twelve months. This also includes spending on assets owned by other bodies, loans and grants to other bodies enabling them to buy assets.

8.2.2 The table below shows a high-level summary of the Council's outline capital spending in the medium-term i.e. for the financial years 2021/22-205/26 which shows the continued and growing capital investment that is being undertaken to support the achievement of the borough plan objectives.

Table 8.1: Capital expenditure plans overview 2021/22 - 2025/26

	2020/21 Budget (£'000)	2021/22 Budget (£'000)	2022/23 Budget (£'000)	2023/24 Budget (£'000)	2024/25 Budget (£'000)	2025/26 Budget (£'000)	Total (£'000)
<b>Previously Agreed</b>							
General Fund Account (GF)	217,762	213,535	170,420	139,435	96,888		<b>838,040</b>
Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	236,331	214,146	204,392	165,200	194,501		<b>1,014,570</b>
<b>Total =</b>	<b>454,093</b>	<b>427,681</b>	<b>374,812</b>	<b>304,635</b>	<b>291,389</b>		<b>1,852,610</b>
<b>Proposed</b>							
General Fund Account (GF)		287,504	188,713	150,613	120,687	62,869	<b>810,385</b>
Housing Revenue Account (HRA)		246,071	307,941	303,515	198,722	159,846	<b>1,216,095</b>
<b>Total =</b>		<b>533,575</b>	<b>496,654</b>	<b>454,128</b>	<b>319,409</b>	<b>222,715</b>	<b>2,026,480</b>

8.2.3 The capital programme is composed of individual priority programmes. Within these priority totals there are schemes and within most schemes there are individual projects. For instance, Scheme 302, Borough Roads, will contain individual projects on individual roads.

8.2.4 Where additional funding is proposed for an existing scheme this has been added to the project rather than creating a new scheme.

8.2.5 About a third of the capital programme is composed of schemes that are wholly funded by Council borrowing and that are not self-financing. These schemes largely reflect the statutory duties of the council. In large part these schemes are not able to garner external resources to either supplement or supplant Council borrowing.

8.2.6 The Children's Services capital programme is largely reliant on Council borrowing. For the period 2021/22-2025/26 the Council is planning to spend £105m on schools, of which approximately £27m is funded through government grant leaving a borrowing requirement of £78m. The majority of the cost of the increased investment in schools falls on the Council through increased borrowing costs.

8.2.7 Within the Place priority the proposed capital programme for the period 2021/22-2025/26 is broadly estimated at £74.8m of which approximately £14.6m is externally funded, leaving a borrowing requirement of £60.2m.

8.2.8 The Economy capital programme has an estimated value of £433m. The majority of the programme is either funded through contributions from

developers or are self-financing. The level of Council borrowing in this part of the capital programme is proportionately lower than in others at £55m. The majority of this borrowing is to match fund to the Tottenham Hale Regeneration project, the Tottenham High Road Strategy and the Wood Green Regeneration Strategy.

- 8.2.9 The basic premise for the economy programme is to provide a funding envelope within the budget and policy framework which enables the council to respond to opportunities in a timely way. This means that this capital programme is both front loaded and prone to reporting slippage.
- 8.2.10 The General Fund housing programme has no schemes that rely on borrowing as they are all self-financing.
- 8.2.11 The Your Council capital programme is estimated at £83.6m with the majority, £53.8m funded through borrowing. £40m of this borrowing relates to the asset management function of the Council and to the Civic Centre refurbishment. The balance of the investment relates to the Responsiveness Fund, £2m and the approved capital programme contingency, £6m.
- 8.2.12 The inclusion of a scheme within the capital programme is not necessarily permission to spend. Most schemes will be subject to the completion of an approved business case that validates the high-level cost and time estimates contained within the programme. An integral part of the business case will be an assessment of the risks that a project faces and once a project is agreed, the review of the risk register is a standing item on the agenda for the project's governance arrangements.
- 8.2.13 There are a range of schemes within the General Fund capital programme that will only proceed, if they are estimated to result in a net reduction in expenditure. That reduction will include the cost of financing the capital expenditure and contribute to the MTFS through making savings or increasing income. These schemes are known as self-financing schemes. The decision to proceed with these schemes will follow the production of a detailed business case that supports the investment and identifies reductions in expenditure.
- 8.2.14 Service managers bid annually as part of the Council's budget setting process. The bids are assessed against their "fit" in relation to the Borough Plan, the asset management plan and meeting the objectives of the medium-term financial strategy (MTFS). In addition, schemes have been considered for their contribution to economic recovery, to growth, to jobs, and to creating a Covid-19 safe public realm.
- 8.2.15 The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is a ring-fenced account, which ensures that the Council's housing activities are not subsidised by the Council's non-housing activities. It also ensures that the Council's non-housing activities are not subsidised by its HRA. HRA capital expenditure is recorded separately.

The table below details the proposed capital expenditure plans by priority.

**Table 8.2: Capital expenditure plans by priority**

	2021/22 Budget (£'000)	2022/23 Budget (£'000)	2023/24 Budget (£'000)	2024/25 Budget (£'000)	2025/26 Budget (£'000)	Total (£'000)
<b>People - Children's</b>	26,471	23,909	24,006	20,101	10,731	<b>105,218</b>
<b>People - Adults</b>	26,220	26,970	12,400	4,470	2,377	<b>72,437</b>
<b>Place</b>	25,809	13,382	13,360	11,495	10,795	<b>74,841</b>
<b>Economy</b>	177,498	105,171	84,316	66,971	32,316	<b>466,271</b>
<b>Housing (GF)</b>	6,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	<b>8,000</b>
<b>Your Council</b>	25,506	18,281	15,531	17,650	6,650	<b>83,618</b>
<b>Total General Fund (GF)</b>	<b>287,504</b>	<b>188,713</b>	<b>150,613</b>	<b>120,687</b>	<b>62,869</b>	<b>810,385</b>
<b>Housing (HRA)</b>	<b>246,071</b>	<b>307,941</b>	<b>303,515</b>	<b>198,722</b>	<b>159,846</b>	<b>1,216,095</b>
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>533,575</b>	<b>496,654</b>	<b>454,128</b>	<b>319,409</b>	<b>222,715</b>	<b>2,026,480</b>

8.2.16 Appendix 4 includes the previously agreed schemes plus any changes since the last budget (up to and including the December 2020 Cabinet), plus the new schemes proposed. Additionally, Appendix 5 provides details of the new schemes. The following paragraphs provide a high-level description of each priority's new capital proposals.

#### 8.2.17 Children's Services

Extensive work has been undertaken during 2019/20 and 2020/21 to understand the extent of the investment required in the Children's Services estate. This work has provided comprehensive information on the condition of the estate and has provided the foundation of the Children's Services asset management plan. The asset management plan provides a framework for the decisions on where and when the investment in the estate best serves the needs of our young people so that they are educated in facilities that are fit for today and the future.

The proposed capital programme has further, significant investment in the school estate. An additional £33m is proposed over the next five years. This additional funding will bring the Council's investment in the condition of the Children's Services to £105.5m over the period 2021/22-2025/26.

In addition, the proposed capital programme has provision for the delivery of a new Youth Hub in Wood Green as well as investment in the Alternative Provision Strategy and Pendarren.



### 8.2.18 Adult Services

The continued focus of the Adults Services capital programme is to enhance the lives of disabled and older adults. The 2020/21 capital programme delivery has been severely affected by Covid-19 and is therefore delayed. Accordingly, the aim for the coming period is to deliver those schemes that are delayed. There is one new proposal for capital expenditure, the renewal of the Mosaic ICT system, which is the Adult social care case work system. Currently a procurement exercise is underway which could result in the upgrading of the current system or its total replacement. The proposed bid is based on the complete replacement of the current system. Should the procurement exercise result in an upgrade to the existing system then there will be an overall cost which will result in a lower level of capital spend.

### 8.2.19 Place

The existing Place priority capital programme is designed to make the borough a cleaner and safer place where residents can lead active and healthy lives. The proposed new capital schemes build on these priorities with additional investment.

A previously significant source of funding for the borough's infrastructure were grants received from Transport for London (TfL). Due to the financial situation of TfL these grants have largely ceased. Even though these grants have ceased the works still need to be undertaken.

Part of the new investment is to offset the TfL reductions but there is additional investment in the borough's pavements, and additional funding for the Parkland Walk Bridges programme as well as investment in our depots to provide greener and more comfortable spaces. The programme also allows for the continuation of investment in street lighting and borough roads.

### 8.2.20 Economy

The existing Economy capital programme directly supports wealth creation, regeneration and community aspirations in the borough. The considerable investment in the Council's own commercial property, along with the potential acquisition of other properties, will allow for the expansion of industrial, commercial and office space. Once invested in or acquired, these can be used to expand existing businesses or to attract new businesses.

The new proposals build on this existing programme through the funding of the Good Economy Recovery Plan, further investment in creating workspaces and investment in HALS.

### 8.2.21 Your Council

The Communities First initiative will help transform the way in which the Council engages with its residents. The investment in the library stock sits beside the Connected Communities initiative and will improve the accessibility of libraries and the range of services that they offer.



There are three new capital proposals. The first relates to the approved capital programme contingency that is being replenished with £4m. The second is the responsiveness fund which is being topped up with £2m and the third is for additional funding for the Civic Centre works.

### 8.2.22 Financing

All capital expenditure must be financed from either external sources (government grant and other contributions), the Council's own resources (revenue, reserves or capital receipts) or debt (borrowing, leasing, Private Finance Initiative). The Council's capital programme has moved to a financing strategy that seeks to ensure that investment via the capital programme is self-financing or funded from external resources. The new schemes proposed to be added to the programme for 2020/21-2024/25 are analysed in the table below and show that the majority of schemes being proposed (77%) are either self-financing or funded via external resources:

**Table 8.3: Financing Strategy**

	General Fund Borrowing		External (£'000)	Total (£'000)
	Met from General Fund (£'000)	Self Financing met from Savings (£'000)		
People - Children's	77,259	0	27,959	<b>105,218</b>
People - Adults	3,785	54,170	14,482	<b>72,437</b>
Place	55,863	4,400	14,578	<b>74,841</b>
Economy	73,225	143,916	249,131	<b>466,272</b>
Housing - GF	0	8,000	0	<b>8,000</b>
Your Council	52,863	30,755	0	<b>83,618</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>262,994</b>	<b>241,241</b>	<b>306,150</b>	<b>810,385</b>

8.2.23 The self-financing schemes will normally only proceed if they produce a reduction in expenditure that includes reductions enough to cover the cost of financing the investment. This is necessary to ensure that the investment contributes to meeting the financial challenges that the Council faces. It is noted however, that in some limited circumstances, that schemes may proceed even if they do not produce a reduction in expenditure enough to cover the cost of financing the investment.

8.2.24 As debt needs to be repaid the Council is required by statute to set aside from its revenue account an annual amount sufficient to repay borrowings. This is

known as the minimum revenue provision (MRP). The MRP for the period is set out below:

Table 8.4: Estimated MRP

	2020/21 Budget (£'000)	2021/22 Budget (£'000)	2022/23 Budget (£'000)	2023/24 Budget (£'000)	2024/25 Budget (£'000)	2025/26 Budget (£'000)
MRP	5,533	8,734	16,438	22,455	25,807	29,043

8.3.16 The Council's cumulative outstanding amount of debt is measured by the capital financing requirement (CFR). This increases when new debt financed expenditure is incurred and reduces when MRP is made. The increase in MRP in 2022/23 is due to the end of the MRP holiday and will be addressed in detail in the Treasury Management Strategy to be considered by Council in February 2021.

Table 8.5: Prudential Indicator: Estimates of Capital Financing Requirement

	2020/21 Budget (£'000)	2021/22 Budget (£'000)	2022/23 Budget (£'000)	2023/24 Budget (£'000)	2024/25 Budget (£'000)	2025/26 Budget (£'000)
CFR	1,073,041	1,300,885	1,590,485	1,836,902	1,999,393	2,016,930

### Asset Management

8.3.17 The Asset Management Plan is the subject of a separate report due to be considered by Cabinet in February 2021.

### Asset Disposals

8.3.18 When a capital asset is no longer needed, it may be sold and the proceeds (known as capital receipts) can be spent on new assets or can be used to repay debt. Repayments of grants, loans and non-treasury investments also generate capital receipts. The Council is currently permitted by legislation to spend capital receipts to deliver cost reductions and/or transformation until 2021/22. This is known as the flexible use of capital receipts and this flexibility is currently due to expire on the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022.

8.3.19 As stated above, capital receipts can be used to fund capital expenditure or repay debt. The budget assumption is that capital receipts will not fund capital expenditure or debt repayment. It is anticipated that the capital receipts received in the MTFs period covered by the flexibility (up to 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2022) will be used to deliver cost reductions and/or transformation. There is a separate policy statement and schedule of proposed initiatives to utilise capital receipts flexibly.

### Treasury Management

8.3.20 The Council has a separate Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) that deals in detail with treasury management matters. The Capital Strategy document repeats some of the information contained within the TMSS but places the information in the context of the capital programme and Borough Plan.

8.3.21 Treasury management is concerned with keeping enough but not excessive cash balances available to meet the Council's spending needs, while managing the risks involved. Surplus cash is invested until required, while a shortage of cash will be met by borrowing. This is to avoid excess credit balances or overdrafts at the bank. The Council is typically cash rich in the short term as cash revenue income is received before it is spent but cash poor in the long-term as capital expenditure is incurred before it is financed. The revenue cash surpluses are offset against capital cash shortfalls to reduce borrowing.

#### Borrowing Strategy

8.3.22 The council's main objectives when borrowing is to achieve a low but certain cost of finance while retaining flexibility should its plans change in the future. These objectives are often in conflict as the Council seeks to strike a balance between cheap short-term loans and long-term fixed loans where the future cost is known, but higher.

8.3.23 Projected levels of the Council's total outstanding debt (which comprises borrowing, PFI liabilities and leasing) are shown below and compared to the capital financing requirement.

**Table 8.6: Prudential Indicator: Gross Debt and the Capital Financing Requirement**

	<b>31/3/20 Actual (£'000)</b>	<b>31/3/21 Budget (£'000)</b>	<b>31/3/22 Budget (£'000)</b>	<b>31/3/23 Budget (£'000)</b>	<b>31/3/24 Budget (£'000)</b>	<b>31/3/25 Budget (£'000)</b>	<b>31/3/26 Budget (£'000)</b>
Borrowing Debt	531,693	811,902	1,076,962	1,370,737	1,621,512	1,786,520	1,804,057
PFI & Lease Debt	31,800	27,932	24,099	20,100	15,926	11,567	9,050
<b>Total Debt</b>	<b>563,493</b>	<b>839,834</b>	<b>1,101,061</b>	<b>1,390,837</b>	<b>1,637,438</b>	<b>1,798,088</b>	<b>1,813,108</b>
Capital Financing Requirement	<b>723,447</b>	<b>1,073,041</b>	<b>1,300,885</b>	<b>1,590,485</b>	<b>1,836,902</b>	<b>1,999,393</b>	<b>2,016,930</b>

8.3.24 Statutory guidance is that debt should remain below the capital financing requirement, except in the short-term. As can be seen from the above, the Council expects to comply with this requirement.

#### Affordable Borrowing Limit

8.3.25 The Council is legally obliged to set an affordable borrowing limit (also termed the authorised limit for external debt) each year. In line with statutory guidance, a lower operational boundary is also set as a warning level should debt approach the limit.

Table 8.7: Prudential Indicator: Authorised limit and operational boundary for external debt

	2020/21 limit (£'000)	2021/22 limit (£'000)	2022/23 limit (£'000)	2023/24 limit (£'000)	2024/25 limit (£'000)	2025/26 limit (£'000)
Authorised limit – borrowing	979,646	1,206,785	1,500,385	1,750,976	1,917,826	1,937,880
Authorised limit – PFI & leases	30,882	31,811	26,532	21,022	15,269	11,946
<b>Authorised limit – total external debt</b>	1,010,528	1,238,596	1,526,917	1,771,998	1,933,095	1,949,826
Operational boundary - borrowing	929,646	1,156,785	1,450,385	1,700,976	1,867,826	1,887,880
Operational boundary – PFI & leases	28,075	28,919	24,120	19,111	13,881	10,860
<b>Operational boundary – total external debt</b>	957,720	1,185,704	1,474,505	1,720,087	1,881,707	1,898,740

8.3.26 Although capital expenditure is not charged directly to the revenue account, interest payable on loans and MRP are charged to revenue, offset by any investment income receivable. The net annual charge is known as financing costs. This is compared to the net revenue stream i.e. the amount funded from Council Tax, business rates and general government grants.

Table 8.8: Proportion of financing costs to net revenue stream

	2020/21 Budget (£'000)	2021/22 Budget (£'000)	2022/23 Budget (£'000)	2023/24 Budget (£'000)	2024/25 Budget (£'000)	2025/26 Budget (£'000)
Financing Costs General Fund	9,343	12,653	16,677	20,076	22,343	27,299
Proportion of net revenue stream	3.87%	5.16%	6.65%	7.82%	8.51%	10.40%
Financing Costs HRA	16,426	18,591	23,287	28,823	33,001	35,825
Proportion of net revenue stream	15.44%	17.08%	20.60%	24.37%	26.39%	27.44%

8.3.27 It can be seen that over the MTFs period that the General Fund ratio increases. However, whilst costs of financing investment increases there will be offsetting revenue savings from those schemes which are self-financing, and these

savings will be reflected in reduced service area budgets. It is also possible that once business cases are prepared that some of the schemes within the capital programme may well not proceed. The ratio also increases for the HRA. This level of ratio has been modelled into the current version of the evolving HRA business plan and capital programme and is affordable.

## Governance

8.3.28 Decisions on treasury management investment and borrowing are made on a daily basis and are delegated to the Director of Finance. There is a further sub-delegation to members of the Director of Finance's staff to facilitate day-to-day operations. Whoever is making the decision(s) will need to act in line with the treasury management strategy as approved by full Council.

## Flexible use of capital receipts

8.3.29 This strategy sets out the Council's approach to the flexibility afforded by the government's change to the rules surrounding the use of capital receipts. Capital receipts can only be used for specified purposes and these are set out in Regulation 23 of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003, which is made under Section 11 of the Local Government Act 2003. The main permitted use of capital receipts is to fund capital expenditure and the use of capital receipts to support revenue expenditure is not permitted by the regulations.

8.3.30 The Secretary of State is empowered to issue directions allowing expenditure incurred by local authorities to be treated as capital expenditure. Were such a direction is made, the specified expenditure can be then be funded by utilising capital receipts.

8.3.31 The 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.”

8.3.32 In order to comply with this direction, the Council must consider the Statutory Guidance issued by the Secretary of State. The guidance requires authorities to prepare, publish and maintain a flexible use of capital receipts strategy with the initial strategy being effective from the 1 April 2016 with future strategies being included within future annual budget document.

8.3.33 The Statutory Guidance for the flexible use of capital receipts strategy states that the strategy should include a list of each project that is intended to be funded via this flexibility, together with the expected savings that the projects

will realise. The strategy should also include the impact that the flexibility has on the affordability of borrowing by including updated prudential indicators.

8.3.34 The Secretary of State for Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government issued revised directions for the flexible use of capital receipts which extended the period of the flexibility to the financial year 2021/22.

8.3.35 The Council's strategy for capital receipts will be focused on transformation of services and will be presented to Cabinet in early February 2021 and for decision by Council later that month.

## 9. Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

9.1 The HRA is the Council's record of the income and revenue expenditure relating to council housing and related services. Under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, the HRA is ring-fenced and cannot be subsidised by increases in council tax. Equally, any surplus in the HRA or balances held in reserves cannot be transferred to the General Fund. Since April 2012, the HRA has been self-financing. Under self-financing Councils retain all the money they receive from rent and use it to manage and maintain their homes.

### HRA 10 Year Financial Plan Overview

9.1.1. The HRA is made up of the Revenue account (Income and Expenditure) and Capital account (Investments and Financing). Following the abolition of HRA borrowing cap in October 2018, the Council embarked on expansion of its investment in its existing and new housing stock. This is laid out in its HRA Business Plan and HRA 10 Year Financial Plan, which is now in its third year.

9.1.2. In this revised plan, a more granular approach was taken in the costing of our new homes and acquisition programmes, drawing upon our increased knowledge from the first two years. The change in the PWLB borrowing rate and updated inflation (CPI) which informs the rent charges and affects cost have been incorporated.

9.1.3. This revised 10 Year Financial Plan, compared to the current one, supports the delivery of increased number of new homes in the borough, with greater proportion of these new homes being developed for social rents.

9.1.4. The proposed increase in spends on Major works (existing homes), Temporary accommodation and Fire Safety further highlights the Councils commitment to improving the quality of life of residents, ensuring homeless households are provided a safe place to live, and maintaining the overall safety of our dwellings.

9.1.5. These all-encompassing delivery and financial plans address the affordability of the entire HRA capital programmes, which includes the new homes build and homes acquisition programmes, and existing stock maintenance, carbon reduction programmes for both existing stocks and new stocks, fire safety programmes and the BWF estate renewal programme.

- 9.1.6. It includes a long-term assessment of maintenance, improvement, and management requirements, as well as forecasts on income streams such as rents, in line with rent standards, and other future developments. The impact of the current pandemic on rent collection and delay in capital programmes informed the update of the HRA financial plan.
- 9.1.7. The Revised Financial plan has highlighted a weakened revenue position in the early years of the plan because of the reduction in CPI from 1.7% to 0.5% and the impact of COVID 19 on rent collection. Alongside these, some heavy capital investment in the early years of the plan added to the pressures. It is expected that these pressures can be dealt with through better than expected rent collection and further Efficiencies through HfH Transformation programme, as built into the plan.

The main sources of income to the HRA: Rents and Service Charges.

## 9.2 Housing rents

- 9.2.1. Rent limits for council-owned housing are set by the government through the Rent Standard which prescribes the formula for calculating social housing rents. These rents are also called formula rents and excludes service charges.
- 9.2.2. The formula for setting social housing rents is complex but involves the value of the property and average regional earnings compared to the national averages for these and is increased/decreased according to the number of bedrooms.
- 9.2.3. From 2020/21, at least until 2024/25, the government has permitted Local Authorities in England to increase rents every year by no more than the Consumer Price Index (CPI) at September of the previous year plus 1%.
- 9.2.4. The current rent for 2020/21, approved by Cabinet on 11 February 2020, was set at the 2019/20 rent uplifted by 2.7%. The rent increase is due to the CPI inflation rate in September 2019 of 1.7% plus 1% allowed by the government.
- 9.2.5. Haringey Council must set the rents for 2021/22 using the formula set out in the Rent Standard. Given that the CPI at September 2020 was 0.5%, rents in council-owned housing will increase by no more than 1.5% (CPI plus 1%) from 5 April 2021 (the first Monday in April).
- 9.2.6. Applying the maximum rent increase of 1.5% will give £1.08m of additional rental income to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) from tenants. However, the HRA business plan had assumed annual rent increases of 3% (CPI of 2% plus 1%) which was expected to produce additional rental income of £3.78m in 2021/22 (a reduction of £2.7m).
- 9.2.7. The 10-year HRA financial plan has been revised to reflect the lower rent increase in 2021/22. An assumed annual rent increases of current CPI plus 1% in 2022/23 and reversion to CPI of 2% plus 1% for the remaining 2 years of this current rent regime (2024/25) has been built in. It also assumed annual rent increases of CPI only, for the remaining five years of the HRA financial plan.



General needs and sheltered / supported housing

- 9.2.8. Provisional rents for general needs and sheltered / supported housing for 2021/22 have been calculated so that the weekly rents paid by tenants increase by no more than 1.5% from 5 April 2021. On this basis, the average weekly rent will increase by £1.57 from £104.57 to £106.14.
- 9.2.9. There is a range of rents across different sizes of properties. Table 1 sets out the provisional average weekly rents for 2021/22 and the proposed rent increase by property size.

Table 9.1 - Average General needs and sheltered / supported housing rent

Number of Bedrooms	Number of Properties	Current average weekly rent 2020/21	New average weekly rent 2021/22	Proposed average rent increase	Percentage increase
Bedsit	130	£84.84	£86.11	£1.27	1.5%
1	5,236	£89.85	£91.20	£1.35	1.5%
2	5,129	£104.72	£106.29	£1.57	1.5%
3	3,663	£119.91	£121.71	£1.80	1.5%
4	597	£136.52	£138.57	£2.05	1.5%
5	105	£159.71	£162.10	£2.40	1.5%
6	15	£165.96	£168.45	£2.49	1.5%
7	2	£157.04	£159.39	£2.36	1.5%
8	1	£177.77	£180.44	£2.67	1.5%
All dwellings	14,878	£104.57	£106.14	£1.57	1.5%

9.2.10. As some properties have not reached the formula rent, the current policy of increasing rents to the formula rents on re-let to new secure tenants will continue.

#### Affordable rent housing

9.2.11. There are eighteen properties, built under the New Homes Infill Programme, currently let at affordable rents.

9.2.12. It is proposed that the rent on these properties will be changed to social rents from 5 April 2021. This is to bring these rents in line with the Council's new homes rent. On this basis, the current average weekly affordable rent of £253.31 will decrease by 34.3% to social rent levels at an average of £166.38 per week. There is a range of rents across different sizes of properties. Table 2 sets out the proposed average weekly social rents for 2021/22 by property size.

Table 9.2

## Conversion of affordable rents to social rents

Number of Bedrooms	Number of Properties	Current average weekly affordable rent 2020/21	Proposed average weekly social rent 2021/22	Proposed average rent increase	Percentage increase
1	1	£210.79	£148.88	-£61.91	-29.4%
2	5	£234.29	£157.62	-£76.67	-32.7%
3	7	£235.00	£166.38	-£68.62	-29.2%
4	3	£294.78	£175.12	-£119.66	-40.6%
5	2	£324.03	£183.89	-£140.14	-43.2%
All dwellings	18	£253.31	£166.38	-£86.94	-34.3%

## Temporary accommodation

- 9.2.13. All properties acquired since 1 April 2020 for housing homeless households held in the HRA are leased to Haringey Community Benefit Society (HCBS) and let by HCBS at Local Housing Allowance (LHA) rent levels.
- 9.2.14. The HRA financial plan includes these rental incomes from 2021/22 to 2027/28. From year eight, it recognises incomes from these properties at formula rent plus CPI as these properties will revert to the HRA.
- 9.2.15. From 5 April 2021, all other council-owned properties used as temporary accommodation but not leased to HCBS will have their rents increased by 1.5% from their current levels.

## 9.3 Tenants' service charges

- 9.3.1. In addition to rents, tenants pay charges for services they receive which are not covered by the rent. The Council's policy has been to set tenants' service charges at the start of each financial year to match budgeted expenditure.
- 9.3.2. Service charges must be set at a level that recovers the cost of the service, and no more than this. Charges are calculated by dividing the budgeted cost of providing the service to tenants by the number of tenants receiving the service.
- 9.3.3. Therefore, a flat rate is charged to tenants receiving each service and the weekly amount is fixed. The amount tenants pay increases where the cost of providing the service is anticipated to increase. Equally, charges are reduced when the cost of providing the service reduces or where there has been an over-recovery in the previous year.

9.3.4. Tenants currently pay for the following services:

- Concierge
- Grounds maintenance
- Caretaking
- Street sweeping (Waste collection)
- Light and power (Communal lighting)
- Heating
- Integrated reception service (Digital TV)
- Estates road maintenance
- Door entry system maintenance
- Sheltered housing cleaning service
- Good neighbour cleaning service
- Converted properties cleaning
- Window cleaning service.
- TV aerial maintenance

Tenants living in sheltered and supported housing also pay the following additional support charges:

- Sheltered Housing Charge
- Good Neighbour Charge
- Additional Good Neighbour Charge

The applicable charges for 2021/22 will be calculated and presented to Cabinet and Full Council for approval in February 2021.

Rent and Service charge consultation

9.3.5. There is no requirement for tenant consultation as Haringey council's rents are set in accordance with government rent standard and no new charges are being introduced for the tenants' service charges.

9.3.6. However, a four weeks' written notice will be served on all tenants prior to April 5, 2021. The Council must give written notice to tenants at least four weeks before the new rents for 2021/22 start on 5 April 2021. This will follow the consideration by Cabinet in February 2021 and will include:

- Council housing rent charges for 2021/22
- Proposed weekly tenants service charges for 2021/22
- HRA hostel rent charges for 2021/22

9.4 HRA Expenditure

9.4.1. The Council's Arms' Length Management Company (ALMO), Homes for Haringey (HfH) manages the dwellings stock and garages on behalf of the Council. The management fee the council pays for these services is budgeted at £41.2m for 2021/22. This includes £19.4m for repairs and about £1.9m for housing demand.

- 9.4.2. Other significant items of expenditure include the capital financing charge and depreciation. The capital financing charge is the interest on HRA loans and internal funding and is budgeted at a higher level than 2020/21 due to increase in the level of capital works programme and New build programme.

#### Draft Update of HRA 10 Year Financial Plan – Capital Programmes

- 9.4.3. The HRA long term financial plan has been updated in order to determine how the council might best use the new HRA borrowing capability (still of course constrained by the prudential borrowing code) to both fulfil its responsibilities in respect of its existing stock and deliver the council's objectives for its provision of additional housing.
- 9.4.4. The HRA financial plan recognises certain risks such as the impact of the current pandemic, COVID-19 on collection of rent, the impact of government policy changes in respect of types of tenancy, rent levels, right to buy, and treatment of voids.
- 9.4.5. The plan assumes a revenue contribution to capital outlay (RCCO) minimum of £8m. This means that the surplus after expenditure should not be below £8m. It also assumes a working balance of £14.2m.
- 9.4.6. The draft Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue budget and HRA Capital programme incorporates the work to date on updating the HRA Business Plan. This is a complex plan and Members should be aware that further changes are anticipated before the final budget package is presented in February, though this will not affect the rent proposals for 2021/22 included here.
- 9.4.7. A finalised version will be presented to Cabinet and Full Council for approval in February 2021. It should be noted that any changes in the final version will not affect the rent proposal contained in this draft report.

#### Draft HRA 5 Years MTFS (2021/22-2025/26)

- 9.4.8. The HRA budget for 2021/22 is a balanced budget maintaining a reasonable revenue contribution to capital of £8.1m. This report sets out the proposed HRA 5 years Budget/MTFS in the Table below. It accommodates the scale of development presently assumed within the business and financial planning in terms of its impact of the future years HRA revenue position. It also takes into consideration further cost savings measures in years 2 & 3, to ensure that the RCCO is kept at above £8m year on year.

**Table 9.3 - Draft HRA 5-Year Revenue Budget (2021/22 – 2025/26)**

Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Income & Expenditure	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	5 Years
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Income</b>						
Dwellings Rent Income	(85,647)	(89,630)	(95,213)	(102,374)	(108,166)	<b>(481,030)</b>
Void Loss	856	896	952	1,024	1,082	<b>4,810</b>
Hostel Rent Income	(2,263)	(2,292)	(2,331)	(2,371)	(2,412)	<b>(11,669)</b>
Service Charge Income	(11,539)	(11,808)	(12,237)	(12,801)	(13,363)	<b>(61,748)</b>
Leaseholder Income	(7,374)	(7,475)	(7,614)	(7,756)	(7,978)	<b>(38,197)</b>
Other Income (Garages /Aerials/Interest)	(2,255)	(2,266)	(2,289)	(2,312)	(2,358)	<b>(11,480)</b>
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>(108,222)</b>	<b>(112,575)</b>	<b>(118,732)</b>	<b>(126,590)</b>	<b>(133,195)</b>	<b>(599,314)</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>						
Repairs	19,410	19,507	19,702	20,610	21,515	<b>100,744</b>
Housing Management	19,861	19,960	20,160	20,362	21,256	<b>101,599</b>
Housing Demand	1,879	1,888	1,907	1,926	1,965	<b>9,565</b>
<b>Management Fee (HfH)</b>	<b>41,150</b>	<b>41,355</b>	<b>41,769</b>	<b>42,898</b>	<b>44,736</b>	<b>211,908</b>
Further Cost Reduction Measures in year 2 & 3	0	(1,150)	(1,450)	0	0	<b>(2,600)</b>
Estates Costs (Managed)	10,219	10,270	10,373	10,851	11,328	<b>53,041</b>
Provision for Bad Debts (Tenants)	2,625	1,948	1,220	927	956	<b>7,676</b>
Provision for Bad Debts (Leaseholders)	88	90	91	93	96	<b>458</b>
<b>Total Managed Expenditure</b>	<b>12,932</b>	<b>12,308</b>	<b>11,684</b>	<b>11,871</b>	<b>12,380</b>	<b>61,175</b>
Other Costs (GF Services)	4,357	4,379	4,423	4,467	4,556	<b>22,182</b>
Other Costs (Property/Insurance)	2,224	2,235	2,257	2,280	2,326	<b>11,322</b>
Capital Financing Costs	19,285	25,096	31,463	35,884	37,875	<b>149,603</b>
Contribution to Major Repairs (Depreciation)	20,197	20,298	20,501	20,706	21,120	<b>102,822</b>
<b>Revenue Contributions to Capital</b>	<b>8,077</b>	<b>8,054</b>	<b>8,085</b>	<b>8,484</b>	<b>10,202</b>	<b>42,902</b>
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>108,222</b>	<b>112,575</b>	<b>118,732</b>	<b>126,590</b>	<b>133,195</b>	<b>599,314</b>
<b>HRA (Surplus) / Deficit</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Draft HRA 5 Years Capital Programme (2021/22 – 2025/26)**

- 9.4.9. This represents the capital implications of the new HRA financial plan where the current pandemic has placed a strong emphasis on meeting the needs of homeless households while ensuring that the needs of the existing stock are met. It also focuses on the delivery of new homes, renewal of BWF estate, carbon reduction in existing stock, and fire safety of the entire stock.
- 9.4.10. The HRA MTFS is geared towards maximising the use of other available resources and use borrowing as last resort. The MTFS capital programme funding assumes a mix of grant funding, S106 monies, revenue contribution and prudential borrowing. The total capital investment in 2021/22 is £246.1m fully funded from revenue contribution, grants, RTB retained receipt, Major Repairs Reserve and borrowing.

Table 9.4 - Draft HRA 5 Year Capital Programme (2021/22 – 2025/26)

Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
Investment & Financing	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	5 Years
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<b>Capital Investment</b>						
Existing Stock Investment (Haringey Standard)	65,278	56,835	69,868	53,412	25,348	<b>270,741</b>
New Homes Build Programme	70,080	174,669	154,594	48,319	23,156	<b>470,818</b>
New Homes Acquisitions	41,760	6,337	15,405	27,705	44,202	<b>135,409</b>
TA Acquisitions	33,877	34,216	34,558	34,904	35,951	<b>173,506</b>
New Homes Zero Carbon	76	151	605	1,183	140	<b>2,155</b>
Existing Stock Carbon Reduction (Affordable Energy)	5,142	5,142	6,285	17,597	17,597	<b>51,763</b>
Fire Safety	15,329	13,771	11,000	4,400	4,500	<b>49,000</b>
Broadwater Farm	14,529	16,820	11,200	11,202	8,952	<b>62,703</b>
<b>Total Capital Investment</b>	<b>246,071</b>	<b>307,941</b>	<b>303,515</b>	<b>198,722</b>	<b>159,846</b>	<b>1,216,095</b>
<b>Capital Investment Financing</b>						
Grants (GLA Allocation)	35,124	1,204	0	0	0	<b>36,328</b>
Grants (Additional Bid)	0	26,896	55,524	22,510	7,600	<b>112,530</b>
Major Repairs Reserves	20,197	20,298	20,501	20,706	21,120	<b>102,822</b>
Revenue Contributions	8,077	8,054	8,085	8,484	10,202	<b>42,902</b>
RTB Capital Receipts	10,163	10,265	10,367	10,088	10,655	<b>51,538</b>
Leaseholder Contributions to Major Works	10,134	9,883	9,746	8,139	7,256	<b>45,158</b>
S.106 Contributions	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	<b>3,000</b>
Market Sales Receipts (at cost)	1,898	0	1,661	23,362	57,104	<b>84,025</b>
Market Sales Contributions	360	0	332	4,672	11,421	<b>16,785</b>
Borrowing	159,118	230,341	196,299	100,761	34,488	<b>721,007</b>
<b>Total Capital Financing</b>	<b>246,071</b>	<b>307,941</b>	<b>303,515</b>	<b>198,722</b>	<b>159,846</b>	<b>1,216,095</b>

The current business and financial plan highlight an improvement, over a 10-year period, in the number of new homes planned to be delivered and the ratio of social rent homes to market sales homes.

## 10 Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB)

- 10.1 The Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB) is substantially funded from the ring-fenced Dedicated Schools Grant and two other funding streams (Pupil Premium and Post 16 Grant) which are, in effect, passported to schools. Spending must be consistent with the requirements of the prevailing Schools and Early Years Funding Regulations. There are requirements for Schools Forum to act as a decision-making and/or a consultative role in determining budget levels for each year.
- 10.2 The financial position reported at Quarter 2 2020-21 set out the forecast year end position. This highlighted the budget pressures in the High Needs Block which is estimated to add an additional £5.3m to the existing deficit of £10.2m.
- 10.3 Table 10.1 below sets out Haringey's Dedicated Schools Grant allocations for 2019-20, the minimum rebased DSG baseline allocation for 2020-21 and Provisional National Funding Formula (NFF) allocation for 2021-22.

Table 10.1 Haringey's Dedicated Schools Grant Allocation Dedicated Schools Grant

Dedicated Schools Grant	2019-20 NFF £m	2020-21 NFF £m	2021-22 Provisional NFF £m
Schools Block	196.97	200.15	211.98**
Central School Services Block	3.02	2.95	2.87
Early Years Block	20.09	20.83	20.36
High Needs Block	36.14	40.99	44.46
<b>Total DSG</b>	<b>256.22</b>	<b>264.91</b>	<b>279.67</b>

\*\* Includes £6.193m Teachers Pay Grant and Teachers Pension and Employer Contribution Grant, both previously paid separately.

- 10.4 Overall, Haringey's provisional NFF allocation for 2021/22 is an increase of 3.23% equivalent to £8.57m and a further £6.19m teacher's pay and pension grants. This is based on 2019 October pupil census numbers and the final allocation will be based on the October 2020 pupil census numbers. Bearing in mind the pupil numbers will change from year to year, the cash impact of this provisional funding by block is:
- Schools Block - uplift of 2.82% equivalent to £5.64m.
  - Central School Services Block - has lost 2.7% equivalent to £0.08m.
  - Early Years Block – has lost 1.34% equivalent to £0.47m
  - High Needs Block – uplift of 8.47% equivalent to £3.47m.



- 10.4 The actual financial position for the Dedicated Schools Grant is dependent on the final school's finance settlement for 2021-22, which is due in December 2020.
- 10.5 The Schools Forum will consider these figures at their December 2020 and January 2021 meetings.

#### DSG Reserves

- 10.6 As at Quarter 2, the DSG Reserves is expected to close with a cumulative deficit of £15.49m at the end of 2020-21. The pressure is mainly in the High Needs Block and is mainly due to the general increase in pupil numbers with special educational needs within the borough.

Table 10.2 2020/21 Year End DSG reserves forecast

Blocks	Opening DSG at 01/04/2020	P06 Forecast Outturn Variance	Forecast Closing DSG Reserves Quarter 2 2020-21
Schools Block	0	0	0
Central Block	10,260	34	10,294
Early Years Block	107,530	48,857	156,387
High Needs Block	10,066,960	5,255,940	15,322,900
Total	£ 10,184,750	£ 5,304,830	£ 15,489,580

- 10.7 The pressure on the DSG budget is acknowledged by government as a national issue. The outcome of the Government's SEND Review will influence policy (and budgets) and will factor into any future deficit recovery plans. This still is awaiting publication. The School's Forum is aware of the need to produce a Deficit Recovery Plan as a matter of good financial practice and in preparation for the expected contact from the DfE.

#### 11 Consultation & Scrutiny

- 11.1 The Council, as part of the process by which it sets its budget, seeks the views and opinions of residents and service users which is used to inform the final decision of the Council when setting the budget.
- 11.2 As such a formal consultation is being planned, the result of which is expected in January, and will be shared with Cabinet to enable them to consider and reflect any amendments in the final February report.
- 11.3 Statutory consultation with businesses will also take place during this period and any feedback will be considered and, where agreed, incorporated into the final February report. A detailed consultation plan is attached at Appendix 6.
- 11.4 Additionally, the Council's budget proposals will be subject to a rigorous scrutiny review process which will be undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Panels and Committee during December/January on a priority themed basis. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will then meet in January 2021 to finalise its recommendations on the budget package. These will be reported to Cabinet for their consideration. Both the recommendations and Cabinet's

response will be included in the final Budget report recommended to Full Council in February.

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

Finance

- 12.1 As the MTFS report is primarily financial in its nature, comments of the Chief Financial Officer are essentially contained throughout the report.
- 12.2 Ensuring the robustness of the Council's 2021/22 budget and its MTFS 2021/22 – 2025/26 is a key function for the Council's Section 151 Officer. This includes ensuring that the budget proposals are realistic and deliverable and that they will be achieved in a number of ways including consideration of the budget setting process itself, the quality and extent of both statutory and non-statutory consultation, the assessment and management of risks, feedback and challenge via scrutiny processes, and the coherence of the working papers supporting budget proposals. The process this year has been made more challenging and complex due to the impact of the coronavirus pandemic.
- 12.3 The draft General Fund Budget 2021/22 requires the one-off draw down from reserves and this position will be reviewed and addressed in the February report.
- 12.4 The formal Section 151 Officer assessment of the robustness of the council's budget, including sufficiency of contingency and reserves to provide against future risks will be made as part of the final budget report to Council in February and will draw on independent assessments of the Council's financial resilience if available. This statutory role is acquiring more and more significance given the increased pressure falling upon this council's budget as a result of the C19 pandemic following years of austerity and the uncertainty surrounding the implications of Brexit.

Procurement

- 12.5 Strategic Procurement notes the contents of this report and will continue to work with services to enable cost reductions.

Assistant Director of Corporate Governance

- 12.6 The Assistant Director, Corporate Governance has been consulted in the preparation of this report and makes the following comments.
- 12.7 The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Regulations) 2001 and the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules at Part 4 Section E of the Constitution, set out the process that must be followed when the Council sets its budget. It is for the Cabinet to approve the proposals and submit the same to the Full Council for adoption in order to set the budget. However, the setting of rents and service charges for Council properties is an Executive function to be determined by the Cabinet.
- 12.8 The Council must ensure that it has due regard to its public Sector Equalities Duty under the Equalities Act 2010 in considering whether to adopt the recommendations set out in this report.

- 12.9 Where detailed savings proposals are yet to be developed, the Cabinet will need to ensure that where necessary, consultation is carried out and equalities impact assessments are undertaken, and the outcomes of these exercises inform any final decisions.
- 12.10 In view of the conclusion reached by the Director of Finance at paragraph 1.12 above on the ability to set a balanced budget for 2021/22, coupled with the assurance provided at paragraph 7.12.1 above, and the Equalities comments below in relation to the proposed use of EqlAs as appropriate, there is no reason why Cabinet cannot adopt the Recommendations in this report.

#### Equality

- 12.1 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard 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.
- 12.2 The three parts of the duty apply to the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/faith, sex and sexual orientation. Marriage and civil partnership status apply to the first part of the duty.
- 12.3 This report sets out details of the draft Budget for 2021/22 and MTFS to 2025/26, including budget reductions, growth and capital proposals. The details the impact of COVID-19 on the financial planning process and the Council's response. COVID-19 affects everything local authorities do. The Council is continuing to focus on responding to the pandemic and its concomitant impacts while ensuring normal critical services are resumed. As the virus remains prevalent in the community and public health restrictions remain in place, the future financial impacts of the virus in the short, medium and long-term remain uncertain. Further risks include the end of the transition period as the UK exits the European Union.
- 12.4 The proposed decision is for Cabinet note the budget proposals detailed and agree to commence consultation with residents, businesses, partners, staff and other groups on the 2021/22 Budget and MTFS. The decision is recommended in order to comply with the statutory requirement to set a balanced budget for 2021/22 and to ensure the Council's finances on a medium-term basis are secured through the four-year Medium-Term Financial Strategy.
- 12.5 The impact of COVID-19, along with budget pressures, has led the Council to reconsider its corporate planning through a 'Recovery and Renewal' process. Undertaken alongside key partners, this process surfaced renewed priorities, with impacts across the Council's functions. Three key themes emerged from the work: economic recovery; health and wellbeing; strengthening communities.

- 12.6 The Council's priorities are underpinned by a focus on tackling inequality. This was key principle emerging from the Recovery and Renewal work and aligns with the principles embedded within the Borough Plan equalities objectives. COVID-19 has served to widen existing inequalities with adverse impacts experienced by protected groups across a number of health and socioeconomic outcomes. The Council is committed to targeting its interventions to reduce inequality despite the financial constraints detailed in this report. This is evident through ongoing investment in policies that seek to improve outcomes for individuals with protected characteristics, such as Free School Meals, Local Welfare Assistance, Youth Services, and the Haringey University Bursary Scheme, despite financial constraints.
- 12.7 During the proposed consultation on Budget and MTFs proposals, there will be a specific focus on considering the implications of the proposals on individuals with protected characteristics, including any potential cumulative impact of these decisions. Responses to the consultation will inform the final package of savings proposals presented in February 2021.
- 12.8 Additionally, budget savings proposals are undergoing an equalities screening process to identify where negative impacts to protected groups may arise. Where such impacts are identified, a full Equalities Impact Assessment will take place to understand the impacts in full and describe action to mitigate those impacts. Haringey Council believes the Equality Impact Assessment process is an important way of informing our decision-making process. At this stage, the assessment of potential impact of decisions is high level and, in the case of many individual proposals, has not been subjected to detailed analysis. This is a live process and, as plans are developed further, each service area will assess the equality impacts and potential mitigating actions of their proposals in more details. Final EQIAs will be published alongside decisions on specific proposals.
- 12.9 Initial Equality Impact Assessments for relevant savings proposals will be published in February 2021 and will reflect feedback regarding potential equality impacts gathered during the consultation period. If a risk of disproportionate adverse impact for any protected group is identified, consideration will be given to measures that would prevent or mitigate that impact. Where there are existing proposals on which decisions have been taken, existing Equalities Impacts Assessments will be signposted.

13. Use of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Summary of Draft Revenue 2021/22 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan 2020-2025

Appendix 2 – Summary of new budget reduction proposals

Appendix 3 – Summary of total budget reduction proposals by year

Appendix 4 – Draft General Fund Capital Programme 2021/22 – 2025/26

Appendix 5 – Summary of new proposed capital investment

Appendix 6 – Budget Consultation Plan

14. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

2020/21 Qtr 1 and Qtr 2 Budget Reports

2020/21 Budget & MTFS 2020-2025

Detailed pro-formas for individual budget reduction proposals are available online at the following location:

This page is intentionally left blank

## Your Council

		2021/22 Budget	2022/23 Budget	2023/24 Budget	2024/25 Budget	2025/26 Budget	2021/22 - 25/26 Total
SCHEME REF	SCHEME NAME	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000	£,000
604	Continuous Improvement	950	950	950	950	950	4,750
607	Financial Management System Replacement	2,000	650	0	0	0	2,650
622	Customer First	500	0	0	0	0	500
639	Ways of Working	255	0	0	0	0	255
650	Connected Communities	700	0	0	0	0	700
653	Capital Support for IT Projects	450	450	450	450	450	2,250
698	Responsiveness Fund	2,000	0	0	0	0	2,000
316	Asset Management of Council Buildings	4,651	4,331	1,381	4,000	4,000	18,363
330	Civic Centre Works	5,000	5,500	4,500	5,000	1,250	21,250
470	Wood Green HQ, Library & Customer Service Centre	5,000	6,400	7,000	6,000	0	24,400
699	P6 - Approved Capital Programme Contingency	4,000	0	1,250	1,250	0	6,500
<b>Your Council</b>		<b>25,506</b>	<b>18,281</b>	<b>15,531</b>	<b>17,650</b>	<b>6,650</b>	<b>83,618</b>

**Civic Centre Refurbishment.** Additional funding to enable the refurbishment and improvement works at the Civic Centre. The project will provide modern, fit-for-purpose Civic and office accommodation, supporting a variety of strategic aims in the Borough Plan objective Your Council. It will renew a Listed Building in a Conservation Area, providing improved amenity value for the community. The project will address environmental issues with the existing building, supporting the Council's Zero Carbon objectives, reducing energy costs, and improving liveability for building users. The project will deal with a variety of H&S compliance issues. The effect of not proceeding would be to have a significant heritage building remaining vacant. The budget profile for the additional expenditure is £4m in 2022/23, £4m in 2023/24, £5m in 2024/25, and £1.25m in 2025/26.

**Approved Capital Programme Contingency.** It is prudent for a capital programme of Haringey's size that a contingency is included. The contingency will enable the Council to respond to pressures that the capital programme may experience. The budget allowance is £4.0m in 2021/22.

**Responsiveness Fund.** The proposed budget will enable the Council to respond to in year requests for match funding from external bodies. It is anticipated that the Government will respond to the Covid-19 pandemic with economic stimulus. An effective route is through capital spending. This budget would enable the Council to respond to such requests. Failure to have such a budget may risk opportunities for inward investment in the borough. The proposed budget is £2m in 2021/22.

This page is intentionally left blank



## 12 January 2021 - Your Council Overview and Scrutiny

### New Savings Proposals 2021/22 - 2025/26

REF	Priority	Description	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	2024/25 £000	2025/26 £000	Savings Total - (£'000)	Capital Investment - (£'000)
YC101	Your Council	Finance Savings	202	-	-	-	-	<b>202</b>	-
YC104	Your Council	Highway Searches	24	-	-	-	-	<b>24</b>	-
YC105	Your Council	Digital Services - Establishment Savings	250	-	-	-	-	<b>250</b>	-
YC109	Your Council	HR Savings	207	138	-	-	-	<b>345</b>	-
YC106	Your Council	Reduction in Legal Services Support	163	-	-	-	-	<b>163</b>	-
		<b>TOTAL - Your Council</b>	<b>846</b>	<b>138</b>	-	-	-	<b>984</b>	-
-	Cross-Cutting	Digital Together	750	2,250	-	-	-	<b>3,000</b>	-

**Business Planning / MTF5 Options  
2021/22 – 2025/26**

YC101
-------

Please fill this pro forma out fully. It is important that options brought forward from Stage 1 are worked up into fuller, more robust proposals that are fit for progression to the formal decision-making process.

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Finance Savings		
<b>Priority:</b>	Your Council	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Jon Warlow
<b>Affected Service(s) and AD:</b>	Finance, Jon Warlow	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Thomas Skeen

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

The proposal has several elements:

1. A repurposing of finance teams that support the Place and Economy priorities which will lead to them spending a proportion of their time on capital matters as opposed to revenue, which means that this element of the resourcing can be capitalised - £30k (calculated as approx 10% of the time of these two staffing teams which total 6 FTEs)
2. The treasury/pensions and banking teams will be reorganised to focus additional resource on income generating or cost avoiding work for the Council's treasury activity. This is anticipated to increase income and reduce costs by £112k in total.
3. Recharging the time for daily banking/treasury authorisations completed by senior staff across the finance team £10k
4. Now that the Community Benefits Society is up and running finance will recharge time spent on this initiative on a commercial basis, mirroring the approach of other support services (e.g. property, legal etc) - £50k

### Financial Benefits Summary

Please provide indicative financial benefits information, including any initial investment costs below. Where figures are speculative and require further detailed work to refine these, please indicate this in the text box below.

<b>Revenue Impacts</b> <i>All figures shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>2021/22</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2022/23</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2023/24</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2024/25</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2025/26</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>Total</b> <b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	- 202	-	-	-	-	- 202

Initial One-Off Investment Costs	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	2025/26 £000s	Total £000s
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-

#### 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?
- Please describe the nature of one off implementation costs (if applicable)

The second proposal which involves a reorganisation of the treasury team to generate additional income will require a regrading of some posts, and one new additional post to achieve the level of saving projected. It is anticipated that this will be deliverable.

There are no one off costs.

#### Delivery Confidence – Stage 1

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)	4
---	---

#### Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	01/09/2020	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2021
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2021? Y/N ; any constraints?	There is an opportunity of some of the elements to progress prior to the start of 2021 - this is not anticipated to be significant, and will be reflected in budget monitoring accordingly in coming months.		

**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 measures above all largely to be delivered via repurposing of existing resources in finance. The reorganisation of the treasury/Pensions and banking teams will increase headcount by 1 FTE on a permanent basis (with income being generated to offset this cost and generate a saving over and above this.

Successful implementation to be measured in a quantitative manner for some of the above measures by the level of income generated/costs avoided in treasury. Qualitative measurement would include customer satisfaction from service departments etc.

**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 proposals should be received positively by customers which include other service departments, the CBS and Haringey pension fund as it focuses additional resourcing in these areas (albeit at an agreed cost).

**Negative Impacts**

The various stakeholders mentioned above understand that the Council is not able to deliver additional resource to support them without there being a cost involved. High quality financial support adds value to our various stakeholders, and we believe that they support this principle.

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**

The proposal involves an increase in resource for pensions and treasury which will increase the resilience of these functions, and will generate an additional benefit to Haringey pension Fund, (not reflected here as non general fund).

**Negative Impacts**

The proposals involving capitalisation, and the Community Benefits Society are dependent on delivery which will have a degree of linkage to the wider economic recovery, hence there is a risk that these could be non achievable. However, prudent assumptions have been used for both, so it is felt that this risk is manageable.

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


The proposal around treasury and pensions strengthens resourcing and resilience in this high risk area which we have statutory responsibilities for.

**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
Lack of capital delivery	L	L	Prudent assumptions have been used for this proposal

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? The Screening Tool should be completed for all Options at Stage 1. <a href="#">EqIA Screening Tool</a>	Yes
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2	No

Reviewed by		
<b>Director / AD</b>		
<i>Jon Warlow</i>	Signature:	
	Date:	06/08/2020
<b>Finance Business Partner</b>		
		[Comments]
<i>Alex Altman</i>	Signature:	Alex Altman
	Date:	07/08/2020

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2021/22 – 2025/26**

YC104

Please fill this pro forma out fully. It is important that options brought forward from Stage 1 are worked up into fuller, more robust proposals that are fit for progression to the formal decision-making process.

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Highway Searches		
<b>Priority:</b>	Your Council	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Donna Watson
<b>Affected Service(s) and AD:</b>	Corporate & Customer Services	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Debbie Darling

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

To commence charging for the approximately 300 Highway Searches we currently receive in a financial year in line with other boroughs, to generate income to the council.

In scope is offer a 4 hour turn around charging £300 or a 3 to 4 day turnaround charging £80

If all choose the quick turnaround with the current volumes this would generate an income of £90,000

If all choose the 3 to 4 day turnaround with the current volumes this would generate an income of £24,000

It could be a mix of both so the income could fluctuate between the higher and lower predicted costings.

Customer experience would be better and it would bring us in line with Enfield, Hackney and Camden process and charging.

Impact is to support income generation for the council going forward

## How

- SME on the Business Support team to train SBSO's on how to do the searches
- We would update the website to advertise the service and the teams mailbox for requests to be received.
- We would set the customers up on SAP and raise invoices so that they can make payment online and once received we would then provide the info requested.

### Financial Benefits Summary

Please provide indicative financial benefits information, including any initial investment costs below. Where figures are speculative and require further detailed work to refine these, please indicate this in the text box below.

<b>Revenue Impacts</b> <i>All figures shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>2021/22</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2022/23</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2023/24</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2024/25</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2025/26</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>Total</b> <b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	<b>24,000</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>24,000</b>

Initial One-Off Investment Costs	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	2025/26 £000s	Total £000s
<b>Total</b>	<b>Zero</b>	-	-	-	-	-

#### 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?
- Please describe the nature of one off implementation costs (if applicable)

Savings are determined by what we know in regards to historic requests received this year with a prediction on how many we think may want the speedy service or the 3/4 day service.

We know that for the year 2019/2020 we received 300 requests for this service.

No additional investment is required to deliver the proposal

Time training is the only investment needed and that can be done within the team

The website will be updated to confirm the charges before progression and the customer will be asked to confirm which service they require at this point. Once the request is received we will contact the customer to take the payment details and these will be set up on SAP and all income will be applied to the relevant budget code.

#### Delivery Confidence – Stage 1

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 - We can definitely implement the change however the income generated may fluctuate which is why I have put it as this score
---	--

#### Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	01/09/2020	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	30/10/2020
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2021? Y/N ; any constraints?	Definitely yes		



<p><b>Implementation Details</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?</li> <li>•Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.</li> <li>•How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?</li> </ul>
<p>Webpages will be updated - commence in September</p> <p>Training will be undertaken on the team as soon as the school holidays are over and people have taken their annual leave booked.</p> <p>We currently have staff that can undertake the process however all staff will be trained by the end of October to cope with demand and ensure we can flex when staff are on leave or are absent from work.</p> <p>Successfully implementation will be measured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New income generated for this new service as currently we do not charge.</li> <li>Quality of training delivered to ensure a good customer experience</li> <li>Tracking of requests to ensure we meet the service level promised for the charge applied.</li> <li>Customer feedback</li> <li>Complaints received</li> </ul>

**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><b>Positive Impacts</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Income generation which was not previously utilised</li> <li>2. Brings us in line with other councils offering the same service - council reputation</li> <li>3. Improved customer experience</li> </ol>
<p><b>Negative Impacts</b></p> <p>None</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**

Staff - Opportunity to learn a new skill

**Negative Impacts**

None

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


No statutory requirement for this new 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
No risks to this option			

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? The Screening Tool should be completed for all Options at Stage 1. <a href="#">EqIA Screening Tool</a>	No
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2	No

Reviewed by	
<b>Director / AD</b>	[Comments]
Richard Grice	Signature: 
	Date:
<b>Finance Business Partner</b>	[Comments]
Alex Altman	Signature: Alex Altman
	Date: 07/08/2020

**Business Planning / MTFs Options**  
**2021/22 – 2025/26**

YC105
-------

*Please fill this pro forma out fully. It is important that options brought forward from Stage 1 are worked up into fuller, more robust proposals that are fit for progression to the formal decision-making process.*

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Digital Services - Establishment Savings		
<b>Priority:</b>	Your Council	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Paul Dooley
<b>Affected Service(s) and AD:</b>	CTR - Digital Services	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Paul Dooley

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

The service has existing plans to save money against contracts in order to grow into a structure required for the Council. Given the financial position of the Council, this proposal seeks to pause some of that growth (approx 4 posts) so that the service can offer £250K of savings towards the MTFs for the Council.

### Financial Benefits Summary

Please provide indicative financial benefits information, including any initial investment costs below. Where figures are speculative and require further detailed work to refine these, please indicate this in the text box below.

<b>Revenue Impacts</b> <i>All figures shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>2021/22</b> £000s	<b>2022/23</b> £000s	<b>2023/24</b> £000s	<b>2024/25</b> £000s	<b>2025/26</b> £000s	<b>Total</b> £000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>	250	-	-	-	-	250

Initial One-Off Investment Costs	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	2025/26 £000s	Total £000s
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-

#### 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?
- Please describe the nature of one off implementation costs (if applicable)

Through savings against contracts.  
No additional investment is required.  
N/A re income.  
No one-off costs applicable.

#### Delivery Confidence – Stage 1

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)	4
---	---

#### Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2021	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2021
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2021? Y/N ; any constraints?	N		

<p><b>Implementation Details</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•How will the proposal be implemented? Are any additional resources required?</li> <li>•Please provide a brief timeline of the implementation phase.</li> <li>•How will a successful implementation be measured? Which performance indicators are most relevant?</li> </ul>
<p>Through not filling vacant posts and using the revenue for this MTFS contribution.                  Immediate reduction to budget for 21/22.                  Immediate.</p>

**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><b>Positive Impacts</b></p> <p>There should be limited impact for customers. If there is need for the resources to be re-established then the appropriate use of Capital funds would be applied.</p>
<p><b>Negative Impacts</b></p> <p>N/A</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**

Maintain the existing staffing levels of the service with limited growth to support the cross cutting themes emerging from R&R work  
Allows for contribution to MTFS whilst ensuring the Council has the necessary support of a Digital Department with the agreed structure to realise transformational ambitions.

**Negative Impacts**

Delays the full planned growth into the new structure  
Reliance on Fixed Capital Receipt and Capital receipts - adds complexity  
Vision for the service is diluted slightly  
Some functionality and management is being shared around other posts in order to achieve the saving

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


N/A

**Risks and Mitigation**

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

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Inability to support all new areas of digital and data work	M	L	We have methods to flex the structure with appropriate Capital to fund project based staff based on business cases.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? The Screening Tool should be completed for all Options at Stage 1. <a href="#">EqIA Screening Tool</a>	N/A
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2	N/A

Reviewed by	
<b>Director / AD</b>	[Comments]
<i>Richard Grice</i>	Signature: 
	Date:
<b>Finance Business Partner</b>	[Comments]
<i>Alex Altman</i>	Signature: Alex Altman
	Date: 07/08/2020



**Business Planning / MTFS Options  
2021/22 – 2025/26**

YC106
-------

*Please fill this pro forma out fully. It is important that options brought forward from Stage 1 are worked up into fuller, more robust proposals that are fit for progression to the formal decision-making process.*

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Reduction in Legal Services Support		
<b>Priority:</b>	Your Council	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Raymond Prince / Stephen Lawrence-Orumwense
<b>Affected Service(s) and AD:</b>	Corporate Governance / Legal Services - Bernie Ryan	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Raymond Prince

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 will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

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

**Proposal:** A reduction in the Legal Services establishment of 4 posts in 2020/21.

**Impact:** The Legal Service is a demand led service, the size of which is driven and dictated by the level of support which business units within the Council – to include its partners – require in order to deliver on corporate objectives. Accordingly, any decision to reduce the size of the service needs to correlate with a reduction in client demand.

**Statutory work:** A lot of work carried out by the legal service is statutory work e.g. adult safeguarding legal advice and litigation, child protection legal work and right to buy. This work will be prioritised.

**Assumption:** That the corporate legal work can continue to be absorbed within the legal service as it has been during the pandemic period. Legal staff have become more self-servicing with extended homeworking and it is assumed that they can continue with reduced admin support going forward and admin support will be prioritised where it provides best value to the service. This assumption is based on analysis of work during the pandemic and assessment of how work will continue to be done in the future.

**Benefit:** A reduction in staffing cost to the authority.

### Financial Benefits Summary

Please provide indicative financial benefits information, including any initial investment costs below. Where figures are speculative and require further detailed work to refine these, please indicate this in the text box below.

<b>Revenue Impacts</b> <i>All figures shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>2021/22</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2022/23</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2023/24</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2024/25</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2025/26</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>Total</b> <b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	163	-	-	-	-	163

Initial One-Off Investment Costs	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	2025/26 £000s	Total £000s
<b>Total</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-

#### 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?
- Please describe the nature of one off implementation costs (if applicable)

There has been a reduction in admin support during the lockdown period and it is realistic to assume that this can continue going forward.

Where posts which have income targets are deleted the income target and allocated legal budget will need to be decreased too in order for the saving to be realised in the budget.

#### Delivery Confidence – Stage 1

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	01/10/2020	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2021
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2021? Y/N ; any constraints?	Partly		

**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?

**Implementation:** Will be achieved via a restructure following a full consultation exercise. Additional resources will be required from HR.

**Timelines:** For realisation of full savings, consultation needs to commence on time so notice periods can be worked out before the new financial year.

**Success:** Will be measured by there remaining a fully functioning, value for money Legal Service which can still assist in delivering the Council's Borough Plan objectives, priorities and outcomes.

**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**

There would be a reduction in the cost of providing a Legal Service.

**Negative Impacts**

The deletion of posts within the Legal Service could impact the current delivery and workload, resulting in some staff taking on more administrative duties, which would mean that there would be less internal resource available and the potential of more use being made of the London Boroughs' Legal Alliance Framework (a collaborative partnership of local authority legal teams which came together to procure best value service from private sector barristers who have been accepted on the Framework), if the in-house service is unable to provide a service at any point following the reduction.

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**

Reduced establishment costs generating required savings.

**Negative Impacts**

For corporate legal work there may be an increased reliance on the need to access the legal framework of solicitors and barristers in order to cater for peaks in demand / a loss of knowledge and experience.

Loss of support staff might lead to legal officers spending more time on non-legal matters and this could increase the cost to internal clients and increase workload to legal staff.

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

This proposal does not affect the discharge of the Council's statutory duties.

**Risks and Mitigation**

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

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Impact (H/M/L)</b>	<b>Probability (H/M/L)</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Work may not be managed in-house and advice will not be provided in the timeframe it is required	H	M	Use of the legal solicitor/barrister frameworks / recruit agency locum staff
Clients may not manage within the reduced legal budget	M	M	The current proposal will only have a small budgetary impact on clients as the support staff cuts will not affect client budgets, and much of the corporate work is not client specific.
Legal officers may not have the skills and capacity to undertake some administrative tasks.	L	M	Administrative staff will still be available to offer support and train legal officers when required. Processes will be reviewed and made less cumbersome where possible to reduce number and complexity of administrative processes.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? The Screening Tool should be completed for all Options at Stage 1. <a href="#">EqIA Screening Tool</a>	No
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2	Possibly if the proposal is implemented

<b>Reviewed by</b>		
<b>Director / AD</b>	<i>Have seen and commented on the proposal</i>	
<i>Bernie Ryan</i>	Signature:	<i>Bernie Ryan</i>
	Date:	<i>07/06/2020</i>
<b>Finance Business Partner</b>	<i>[Comments]</i>	
<i>Alex Altman</i>	Signature:	<i>Alex Altman</i>
	Date:	<i>07/06/2020</i>

**Business Planning / MTFS Options**  
**2021/22 – 2025/26**

YC109
-------

*Please fill this pro forma out fully. It is important that options brought forward from Stage 1 are worked up into fuller, more robust proposals that are fit for progression to the formal decision-making process.*

<b>Title of Option:</b>	HR Savings		
<b>Priority:</b>	Your Council	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Dan Paul
<b>Affected Service(s) and AD:</b>	Cross Council impact. Dan Paul	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Dan Paul

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

This proposed savings is as a result of changes made to the recruitment of staff. By changing the way recruitment services are delivered, we are confident that we can deliver better services for a lower cost. The recruitment of permanent employees will be internal and more accountable, have clear KPI's and will work hand in hand with services to recruit the right people into vacancies. The recruitment of temporary and agency workers will be transitioned to a new contract, delivering savings. Budgets for staff recruitment does not sit in HR, they sit in other services therefore delivery of these savings will require budgets in services to be reduced to match the new (lower) cost of services. This is not a service reduction, it is reduction in allocated budgets to match the new (lower) costs in order to ensure the savings are delivered.

### Financial Benefits Summary

Please provide indicative financial benefits information, including any initial investment costs below. Where figures are speculative and require further detailed work to refine these, please indicate this in the text box below.

<b>Revenue Impacts</b> <i>All figures shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>2021/22</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2022/23</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2023/24</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2024/25</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>2025/26</b> <b>£000s</b>	<b>Total</b> <b>£000s</b>
<b>New net additional savings</b>	345	-	-	-	-	345

Initial One-Off Investment Costs	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	2025/26 £000s	Total £000s
<b>Total</b>	400	-	-	-	-	400

#### 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?
- Please describe the nature of one off implementation costs (if applicable)

The assumptions for the proposed saving are that introducing new recruitment services will reduce the cost of recruitment, with some of the savings netted off against existing staffing pressures.

There is relatively high confidence in the level of savings that can be delivered, however the initial cost of investment is speculative. Delivering this proposal requires intensive work to ensure it can be live during the early part of 2021/22 and the investment cost is mainly made up of an estimate of additional interim staff that will be required to secure the delivery and the savings on time. Much of the initial investment will in fact be required in 2020/21 and not 21/22 in order to secure the new arrangements and achieve the savings for 2021/22.

#### Delivery Confidence – Stage 1

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)	4
---	---

#### Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	Nov 10 Cabine	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	01/04/2021
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2021? 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 permanent recruitment service will be brought in house. There is a detailed programme set and and running to deliver this, with appropriate additional resourcing as already agreed. There will be a phased delivery of the new service commencing in April 2021. The revised temporary recruitment service will go live in July 2021. This work is in the early phases of implementation. There is however a high confidence in terms of delivery of this as both the supplier and resources allocated to the project from the Council's side have considerable experience of this sort of work.

**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**

Improved recruitment services, improved learning and development services. Stronger link between recruitment and Learning and Development and supplier to deliver council employment priorities such as apprenticeships

**Negative Impacts**

Intangible costs of change - managers required to use new and different IT systems and processes to recruit employees and workers. Training needs in this regard. Disruption as changes and improvements are made. Directorate budgets will need to be top sliced to deliver the savings.

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**

The impact has been discussed internally with managers and members. There are a range of positive impacts as set out above.

**Negative Impacts**

As above - the main negative impact is the risk of non-delivery.

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

There is no differential impact on statutory requirements when compared to the way things are currently done other than the targeted service improvements set out above

**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
Failure to implement new service on time	H	M	Detailed project plan. Dedicated project and implementation resource
Failure to realise benefits	H	L	Detailed planning and setting out of new service standards. Appropriate resourcing
Service does not deliver planned savings	H	L	Clear analysis of current costs and new expected costs

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? The Screening Tool should be completed for all Options at Stage 1. <a href="#">EqIA Screening Tool</a>	Yes
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2	No

Reviewed by		
<b>Director / AD</b>		[Comments]
<i>Dan Paul</i>	Signature:	
	Date:	18/09/2020
<b>Finance Business Partner</b>		[Comments]
[name]	Signature:	
	Date:	

**Business Planning / MTFs Options  
2021/22 – 2025/26**

--

Please fill this pro forma out fully. It is important that options brought forward from Stage 1 are worked up into fuller, more robust proposals that are fit for progression to the formal decision-making process.

<b>Title of Option:</b>	Digital Together Programme		
<b>Priority:</b>	Corporate - High	<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Andy Briggs / Paul Dooley
<b>Affected Service(s) and AD:</b>	Council wide	<b>Contact / Lead:</b>	Melissa Kemp-Salt

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

The cost of meeting the demands of the coronavirus pandemic has been significant and is estimated to have cost Haringey Council in the region of £20m. Three corporate savings programmes have been initiated to begin the financial recovery work; Digital Services are leading on the Digital Together Programme which will focus on process efficiency, automation and standardisation and will deliver savings by:

- Simplifying our processes and improving compliance
- Reducing repetition, duplication and unnecessary contact
- Removing human interaction wherever possible and appropriate

The programme is targeting financial savings of £3m, initially using and progressing opportunities identified by Digital Services, individual service areas and the R&R work, as well as pursuing new strategic initiatives. Within the programme:

- Some projects will directly enable the ability to reduce FTEs
- Some projects will directly reduce other revenue costs

The opportunities are numerous and cross cutting and have yet to be explored in detail or fully validated. Initial reviews with services have identified 16 viable proposals which have been allocated delivery confidence levels based on some assumptions. Confidence levels may improve or decline during the detailed discovery.

In addition, there are 40 unassessed opportunities relating to a cross section of the council including Adults and Children's Social Care, Planning, Environment & Neighbourhoods, Legal Services and others. These will form part of the next phase of the programme discovery. The programme will also generate ideas for new strategic opportunities. The ideas will be linked to Digital and Data Strategies and will focus on strategic application and adoption rather than service level application and benefits. Emerging technology and innovative solutions will be explored to understand how the council can continue to meet current and future challenges within reduced budgets, and become a more modern and forward thinking council.

### Financial Benefits Summary

Please provide indicative financial benefits information, including any initial investment costs below. Where figures are speculative and require further detailed work to refine these, please indicate this in the text box below.

<b>Revenue Impacts</b> <i>All figures shown on an incremental basis</i>	<b>2021/22</b> £000s	<b>2022/23</b> £000s	<b>2023/24</b> £000s	<b>2024/25</b> £000s	<b>2025/26</b> £000s	<b>Total</b> £000s
<b>New net additional savings</b>	750	2250				3000

Initial One-Off Investment Costs	2021/22 £000s	2022/23 £000s	2023/24 £000s	2024/25 £000s	2025/26 £000s	Total £000s
<b>Total</b> (all in year and current known asset costs for yr 2 estimation from existing Digital Services Capital - this could reach £1m for 21/22)	320					320
<b>Total</b> (sought from Flexible Capital Receipts)	1,500	1,500	-	-	-	3,000

#### 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?
- Please describe the nature of one off implementation costs (if applicable)

In order to identify savings opportunities, services were requested to submit ideas and recommendations for their own areas and council wide opportunities. Digital Services also generated a list of opportunities identified through existing projects and initiatives, requests into Portfolio service and additional opportunities identified by our business relationship managers and current and recent work with consultants.

This process generated a total of 150 opportunities which have been reviewed and triaged based on: Cross over with other saving programmes and initiatives, savings value and cross referencing against existing opportunities list to identify duplicates.

The triaging process reduced the opportunities list from 150 to 56 potentially viable ideas to progress. Of these, 16 have been through an initial assessment and form part of this proposal with estimated savings of £1.542m.

The remaining 40 yet to be assessed, and new opportunities will form the remainder of the programme target, specifically £1.458m.

The detailed programme planning will target the savings profile of £750k in 21/23 – approximately £300k of which will be mid year staff reduction of circa 12 FTE and the remainder other revenue budget savings.

The one off investment costs relate to systems investment currently expected. This may grow and will be met from existing Digital Services Capital budgets. The revenue implications are as yet unknown but total cost of ownership will be fully considered for each project.

#### Delivery Confidence – Stage 1

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)	1) 16 Opportunities £1.542m - 4 confident 2) 40 ideas and new opportunities £1.458m - 3 quite confident Much relies on an overarching commitment to organisational change, and some projects could require work in subsequent years. More accurate confidence levels will be ascertained in the remaining discovery phase, and into delivery and detailed planning.
---	--

#### Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation DD/MM/YY	TBC	Est. completion date for implementation DD/MM/YY	31/03/2023
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2021? Y/N ; any constraints?	There may be some limited opportunities that can be delivered by April 2021 which will be explored further within the remainder of the programme Discovery phase.		

**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?

Further discovery work is required to produce reliable implementation and resource plans however due to the alignment with scope within the previous Digital Customer (aka FOBO), the funding for programme personnel within FY20/21 will be met from agreed unspent funding from that programme. This is expected to be circa 800k. In addition, the estimated £200k hardware, software and licencing one off costs for FY20/21 will be met from the Digital Services Capital fund.

Additional support is needed for programme resources from 21/22 and 22/23 and this is sought from Flexible Capital Receipts and is estimated to be up to £3m. During these years, investment in technology will continue to be sought from Digital Capital funds up to another circa £1m.

Should additional revenue be required for support of systems, or indeed resources for year 2 of the programme, this will be progressed at the earliest opportunity. We will seek to utilise available capital funds wisely, and fund systems support costs from savings delivered within the programme.

**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**

Whilst most of the programme reflects changes to the internal workings of the Council, there will be some activities that impact customers, however this is intended to be positive in recognition of the efficiencies we plan to bring to the organisation. Process design will be user centred, and utilise expertise within Digital Services around accessibility and user experience. In addition to this, Privacy Impact Assessments and Equalities Impact Assessments will be completed as required.

**Negative Impacts**

As per the above - to be confirmed following in depth analysis of opportunities and development of implementation plans.

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**

Most of the programme reflects changes to the internal workings of the Council and is intended to be positive change to how we do business; in recognition of the efficiencies we intend to bring to the organisation through this work. Process design will be user centred, and utilise expertise within Digital Services around accessibility and user experience. Necessarily, staff will be required to work in a different way, be open to digital processes, and some posts will be lost from within service structures. The exact quantities of posts affected will be determined over the course of the programme and relevant HR policies followed.

**Negative Impacts**

As per the above - to be confirmed following in depth analysis of opportunities and development of implementation plans.

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

The Council is required to make significant savings in order to reach a balanced budget and maintain essential services. This programme is one of the main initiatives being established to secure this position.

**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
If the programme cannot achieve the target £3m savings then the council will need to reduce service budgets in another way.	H	H	The programme will track the likelihood of achieving the savings and advise sponsors at the earliest opportunity. The programme and services will need support from HR in implementing any required restructures.
If adequate resources to support the programme are not available, in terms of capacity or overlapping demand, then programme timescales will be affected.	H	M	Establishing cross-programme steering group(s). Prioritisation of MTFS work, potentially slowing or stopping other work.
If services do not engage with the programme and/or present barriers then delivery of solutions and savings will be affected.	H	L	Clear corporate communications around the financial position and required activities will reduce the likelihood of this occurring. Overarching Change and Comms resource. Suggestion that My Conversation objectives to be set throughout the organisation.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? The Screening Tool should be completed for all Options at Stage 1. <a href="#">EqIA Screening Tool</a>	This will be completed later in the programme discovery phase.
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2	Likely

Reviewed by	
<b>Director / AD</b>	[Comments]
Andy Briggs and Paul Dooley	Signature: _____ Date: 02/10/2020
<b>Finance Business Partner</b>	[Comments]
[name]	Signature: _____ Date: _____



# MTFS Savings Tracker (2020/21 - 2024/25)

## Priority: Your Council

MTFS Savings Ref	Cabinet Decision Date	Saving proposal	Description	2020/21 £'000s	2021/22 £'000s	2022/23 £'000s	2023/24 £'000s	2024/25 £'000s	Total £'000
<b>Your Council (incl Council-Wide)</b>									
A6.4	13-Feb-18	FOBO - Customer Services	A series of individual service improvement / efficiency opportunities within Customer Services.	500	0	0	0	0	500
A6.3	13-Feb-18	FOBO - SSC	A series of individual service improvement / efficiency opportunities within the SSC.	1,260	0	0	0	0	1,260
A6.2	13-Feb-18	Audit and Risk Management	Reduction in the value of the externally procured internal audit contract; potentially changing the assurance model, or reducing the number of audits completed.	0	20	0	0	0	20
YC1	12-Feb-19	Out of home advertising income generation	The proposal is to recommission the street furnishing advertising contract. Moving to digital display to ensure communication messages can be updated quickly, and to remove printing costs.	5	5	6	6	0	22
20/25-YC01	11-Feb-20	The service will continue to reduce the amount of paper being used, stored and transported and this has lead to financial savings.	The service will continue to reduce the amount of paper being used, stored and transported and this has lead to financial savings.	13	0	0	0	0	13
20/25-YC02	11-Feb-20	Income from joining the London Counter Fraud Hub	The London Counter Fraud Hub, managed by CIPFA, is a counter fraud service developed to supply data analytics, investigations and recoveries service for London local authorities and the City of London Corporation. Unlike traditional data matching hubs, this project is an end-to-end service providing expert advice and operational support around sophisticated analytics. The overarching objective for the service is to increase fraud and corruption detection, and improve fraud prevention, share common risks across London, minimise losses and maximise recovery, so that fraud and corruption does not pay. Three data sources (Council Tax - Single Person Discount, Housing Tenancy and Non Domestic Rate records are entered into the analytics part of the Hub through a secure transfer. Using sophisticated technology, the Hub will analyse the data to identify frauds against the 32 London local authorities and the City of London Corporation.	25	25	0	0	0	50

MTFS Savings Ref	Cabinet Decision Date	Saving proposal	Description	2020/21 £'000s	2021/22 £'000s	2022/23 £'000s	2023/24 £'000s	2024/25 £'000s	Total £'000
20/25-YC03	11-Feb-20	The proposal is to increase the income target of providing legal services to Haringey Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) by £30K.	The proposal is to increase the income target of providing legal services to Haringey Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) by £30K. In December 2017, the Council's Legal Services entered into a Service Legal Agreement (SLA) with Haringey CCG to provide legal support with the CCG cases within the Haringey Learning Disability Partnership. These are cases relating to incapacitated patient that requires an application to the Court of Protection to safeguard their welfare. They include cases in the Transforming Care Programme.. Since the SLA, Haringey CCG has been referring cases to Legal Services and the feedback of the support has been positive. The arrangement has enabled the CCG to access the Council's in-house legal expertise which is more cost effective. The support and encouragement of Adult Social Care, Children Services, Commissioning and Public Health for the CCG to utilise our in-house provision is crucial. The proposal compliments the Borough Plan - Priority 2 - People The proposal is dependent on a slight increase in the level of new instructions from CCG to Legal Services.	30	0	0	0	0	30
20/25-YC04	11-Feb-20	Finance Savings	The proposal seeks to make efficiency savings across the Finance function from a combination of: * Increased income - from providing services to external bodies and further revisions to recharging to non-GF heads * Reductions to the staff establishment enabled by the embedding of the Business Partner model * Longer term staff savings arising from the planned update or replacement of the Council's current finance system. These savings are not expected to be realised until 2022/23	340	0	200	0	0	540

MTFS Savings Ref	Cabinet Decision Date	Saving proposal	Description	2020/21 £'000s	2021/22 £'000s	2022/23 £'000s	2023/24 £'000s	2024/25 £'000s	Total £'000
20/25-YC06	11-Feb-20	Libraries - Re-imaging our Libraries offer for a better future.	<p>It is proposed that a new Library Strategy will shape the direction of the service for the next 5 years. The proposal includes exploring the full use of the buildings/space, creating community hubs that will enable the locality-based approach to service delivery for other council departments and partner agencies, which can act as a key component to achieving our Borough Plan objectives.</p> <p>Revenue can be generated by either applying an internal recharge for the use of spaces or utilising the space in the libraries as part of the wider Community Asset vision to reduce costs elsewhere in the organisation.</p> <p>Changes to how services are delivered will generate savings, for example developing a coordinated opening hours timetable across all of the libraries, altering location for staff, coordinating joint services. Developing economy opportunities through job fairs, workspace, pop up events and volunteering opportunities.</p>	0	184	181	0	0	365
20/25-YC07	11-Feb-20	Extend Customer First approach to Wider Council	<p>Extend Customer First model to all Council services based on analysis made in preparation for the current Customer First programme. The objective is to ensure all residents in need of support can receive it because those requiring straightforward advice and information can have easy access 24/7. An improved digital offer would ensure that the customer journey was straightforward and simple to navigate and automation of back-office processes would both speed up and improve the quality and accuracy of service to residents and reduce cost.</p>	0	250	250	0	0	500
20/25-YC08	11-Feb-20	The proposal is to use Flexible Capital Receipts to fund ALL posts in the CPMO.	<p>The proposal is to use Flexible Capital Receipts to fund some posts in the CPMO. The justification is that, while it is difficult to estimate the proportion of time that each 'delivery' staff member will spend on individual projects in a year, most will by definition be working on change projects for the majority of their time.</p>	92	0	0	0	0	92
20/25-YC10	11-Feb-20	Additional sites for on street digital advertising	<p>The proposal is to generate an income from the advertising opportunities in the borough. While we have recently awarded contract for our digital on street advertising, we are now looking at other forms of advertising, which are sympathetic to the surroundings and maximise the councils commercial returns. This is in the form of street advertising, out of home advertising, and libraries/customer services advertising.</p>	110	52	50	0	0	212

MTFS Savings Ref	Cabinet Decision Date	Saving proposal	Description	2020/21 £'000s	2021/22 £'000s	2022/23 £'000s	2023/24 £'000s	2024/25 £'000s	Total £'000
20/25-YC11	11-Feb-20	Review of Corporate Centre	We are looking at ways to reconfigure the corporate centre in the light of the LGA Corporate Peer Review recommendations as set out in their final report published in February 2019. One aspect of this is the recommendation to bring together the teams with skills in policy and strategy, data analysis, and problem solving, which, the LGA peers argued, would in itself help to provide better support to the organisation. There are currently 5 senior posts leading these teams: Head of Policy and Cabinet Support at Head of Service level, and leads at PO7 and above in Policy, the Leader's office, the Corporate Delivery Unit (CDU), and Performance and Business Intelligence. The proposal is to reduce the number of senior posts to 4.	214	0	0	0	0	214
20/25-YC12	11-Feb-20	Digital Services - Proposed Contribution	The proposal is for the Capitalisation of infrastructure staff who support the delivery of programmes/projects. This will either be via Capital receipts used to pay for staff who work on transformative initiatives or Capital funds where staff produce a tangible asset in relation to the work undertaken.	345	0	0	0	0	345
<b>Total: Your Council</b>				<b>2,934</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>687</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,163</b>

**Report for:** Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 12 January 2021

**Title:** Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme/Memberships

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

**Lead Officer:** Rob Mack, Principal Scrutiny Support Officer  
Tel: 020 8489 2921, E-mail: [rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk)

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

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

## 1. Describe the issue under consideration

- 1.1 This report outlines the development of workplans for the Committee and its Panels for 2020-21 and beyond.

## 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 To note the current work programmes for the main Committee and Scrutiny Panels at Appendix A and agree any amendments, as appropriate.
- 2.2 That the Task and Finish Panel set up to respond to proposals from Whittington Health regarding their estates and services be comprised of:
- The Chair of the Committee;
  - The Chair plus two other Members from the Adults and Health and the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panels; and
  - Three non-voting co-opted Members.
- 2.3 That the Committee make the necessary appointments to the Task and Finish Panel.

## 3. Reasons for decision

- 3.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) is responsible for developing an overall work plan, including work for its standing scrutiny panels. In putting this together, the Committee will need to have regard to their capacity to deliver the programme and officers' capacity to support them in this task.

## 4. Background

- 4.1 Workplans for the remainder of 2020-21 have been developed for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and each of its Panels. These were approved by the Committee at its meeting on 15 October 2020 and are attached as **Appendix A**. The items within them comprise the following:
- Cabinet Member Questions;
  - Reports requested at previous meetings;

- Matters that are regularly and routinely reported to the Committee and Panels. For the Committee, this would include the Complaints Annual Report and the Treasury Management Statement; and
- Scrutiny of the budget.

*Review of Business Support – Procurement and the Supply Chain*

- 4.2 The Committee needs to finalise the review that it has been undertaking on Business Support – Procurement and the Local Supply Chain. Work on the review began in April 2019 but its progress has been delayed by the need for the Committee to finalise the review on the Wards Corner regeneration and, more recently, by the Covid-19 pandemic and lockdown. Some of the evidence that was received may therefore now be out of date or have been overtaken by events. In particular, the Council has recently published Haringey's Good Economy Recovery Plan and a High Streets Recovery Action Plan.

*Whittington Health Estates and Service Proposals*

- 4.3 The Committee held a special meeting on 21 December to consider proposals from Whittington Health regarding its estates and services in Haringey. These predominantly affect services for children, although there are also some proposals that affect adults. The meeting resolved to set up a task and finish panel of between 3 and 7 Members of the Adults and Health and the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panels. The function of the task and finish panel will be to consider the proposal from Whittington Health and prepare a draft response to them on behalf of the Committee. It is proposed that the decision made at the special meeting of the Committee on 21 December be varied through the addition of the Chair of the Committee to the task and finish panel and the appointments be made at this meeting.

*Virtual Meetings*

- 4.4 The need to continue to hold meetings virtually means there will be some limitations on what is possible. It can be challenging to maintain focus for an extended period when meeting virtually and meetings will should therefore be kept short and focussed. In addition, the Panel may wish to receive evidence from people who do not have access to the necessary IT or be able to operate it. Certain evidence gathering activities may also not be possible at the moment, such as visits.

*Consultative Event*

- 4.5 Before the Covid-19 pandemic, a new work plan was being developed for the Committee and its Panels. As part of this, an on-line survey was undertaken. A consultative event had been planned to take place in March but that was cancelled due to the pandemic. It is now proposed that a virtual consultative event be arranged to help inform the development of a work plan to cover 2021-22. Preliminary discussions are taking place regarding this and proposals arising from this will be reported at the meeting.

*Forward Plan*

4.6 Since the implementation of the Local Government Act and the introduction of the Council's Forward Plan, scrutiny members have found the Plan to be a useful tool in planning the overview and scrutiny work programme. The Forward Plan is updated each month but sets out key decisions for a 3-month period.

4.7 To ensure the information provided to the Committee is up to date, a copy of the most recent Forward Plan can be viewed via the link below:

<http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/mgListPlans.aspx?RP=110&RD=0&J=1>

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

## **5. Contribution to strategic outcomes**

5.1 The contribution of scrutiny to the corporate priorities will be considered routinely as part of the OSC's work.

## **6. Statutory Officers comments**

### **Finance and Procurement**

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

### **Legal**

6.2 There are no immediate legal implications arising from the report.

6.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the approval of the future scrutiny work programme falls within the remit of the OSC.

6.4 Under Section 21 (6) of the Local Government Act 2000, an OSC has the power to appoint one or more sub-committees to discharge any of its functions. In accordance with the Constitution, the appointment of Scrutiny Panels (to assist the scrutiny function) falls within the remit of the OSC.

6.5 Scrutiny Panels are non-decision making bodies and the work programme and any subsequent reports and recommendations that each scrutiny panel produces must be approved by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such reports can then be referred to Cabinet or Council under agreed protocols.

### **Equality**

6.6 The Council has a public sector equality duty under the Equalities Act (2010) to have due regard to:

- Tackle discrimination and victimisation of persons that share the characteristics protected under S4 of the Act. These include the characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil

partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex (formerly gender) and sexual orientation;

- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share those protected characteristics and people who do not;
- Foster good relations between people who share those characteristics and people who do not.

6.7 The Committee should ensure that it addresses these duties by considering them within its work plan and those of its panels, as well as individual pieces of work. This should include considering and clearly stating;

- How policy issues impact on different groups within the community, particularly those that share the nine protected characteristics;
- Whether the impact on particular groups is fair and proportionate;
- Whether there is equality of access to services and fair representation of all groups within Haringey;
- Whether any positive opportunities to advance equality of opportunity and/or good relations between people, are being realised.

6.8 The Committee should ensure that equalities comments are based on evidence. Wherever possible this should include demographic and service level data and evidence of residents/service-users views gathered through consultation.

## **7. Use of Appendices**

Appendix A: Work Plans for the Committee and the scrutiny panels.

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

N/A



**Appendix A**

**Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

**Work Plan 2020-21**

<p><b>1. Scrutiny review projects;</b> These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.</p>		
<b>Project</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Priority</b>
<p>Business Support (Procurement and the Supply Chain)</p>	<p>To consider how local businesses can be further encouraged and supported to bid and win contracts with the Council. In doing this it will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What goods and services the Council currently procures and the respective proportions of these are procured locally;</li> <li>• How local procurement can best deliver benefits to local people, for example by maximising benefits for local employees and sub-contractors as well as business owners;</li> <li>• How Haringey compares with other local authorities and what can be learned from their experiences;</li> <li>• Any gaps or opportunities that there might be;</li> <li>• What barriers or disincentives that there might for local businesses in bidding for contracts and how they can be overcome;</li> <li>• What actions might have the greatest impact in increasing the proportion of contracts held by local businesses.</li> </ul>	<p>1.</p>

	<p>It will seek to make recommendations to the Council’s Cabinet on how the 40% target for the proportion of contracts awarded to local businesses might be achieved most effectively as well as contributing to the development of the Council’s new procurement strategy the new Economic Development Plan for the borough.</p> <p>The review was started during 2019-20 and a number of meetings and visits have already taken place.</p>	
Communicating with the Council	Review to consider how to improve communication between residents and Council services	2.
Working with the voluntary and community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working together with local voluntary/community sector, strengthening their capacity and working with them to attract external investment in the borough;</li> <li>• Building on examples of good co-operation and joint working between Council services and volunteers, such as within parks, which could be replicated more widely;</li> <li>• Involving and supporting voluntary organisations to bid for services.</li> </ul>	3.
Child Poverty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues in schools highlight food poverty, poor housing and increasing mental health needs.</li> </ul>	4.
Fairness Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible outcomes</li> </ul>	5.

2. **“One-off” Items;** These will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Committee. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.

Date	Potential Items	Lead Officer/Witnesses
<b>2020-21</b>		
<b>May 26 2020 (Special)</b>	Cabinet Member Questions: Leader	Leader and Chief Executive
	Cabinet Member Questions: Housing and Estate Renewal	Cllr Ibrahim and officers
	Supporting Better Access to Parking for Disabled People and Blue Badges; Scope and Terms of Reference	Chair of E&CS Panel
<b>22 June 2020</b>	Cabinet Member Questions: Adults and Health	Cllr James and officers
	Cabinet Member Questions: Children and Families	Cllr Brabazon and officers
	Supporting Better Access to Parking for Disabled People and Blue Badges; Final Report	Chair of E&CS Panel
<b>20 July 2020</b>	Cabinet Member Questions: Climate Change and Sustainability	Cllr Hearn and officers

	Cabinet Member Questions: Local Investment and Economic Growth	Cllr Bull and officers
<b>15 October 2020</b>	Fire Safety – Update on Implementation of Recommendations from Scrutiny Review (deferred and updated from 12 March meeting)	Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning
	Brexit – Implications for Borough Update	Head of Policy and Cabinet Support
	Licensing Act 2003; Review of Licensing Policy 2021-2026	Assistant Director Stronger Communities & Waste
	Terms of Reference and Memberships	Scrutiny Support Officer
	Work Planning	Scrutiny Support Officer
<b>23 November 2020</b>	Cabinet Member Questions – The Leader	Leader and Chief Executive
	Cabinet Member Questions – Finance and Strategic Regeneration (N.B. Finance issues)	Cabinet Member – Finance and Strategic Regeneration and officers
	Budget Monitoring – Quarter 1	Director of Finance

	Complaints Annual Report. To include learning from complaints and LGO's annual review letter	Assistant Director (Corporate Governance)
	Brexit – Implications for Borough Update, including financial risk	Head of Policy
<b>12 January 2021</b>	Enabling Priority Budget Scrutiny; To undertake scrutiny of the “enabling” priority.	Cabinet Member for Communities and Equalities
	Cabinet Member Questions – Planning and Corporate Services	Cabinet Member Questions – Planning and Corporate Services
<b>18 January 2021 (Budget)</b>	Budget Scrutiny; Panel feedback and recommendations. To consider panel's draft recommendations and agree input into Cabinet's final budget proposal discussions (Deputy Chair in the Chair)	Deputy Chair (in the Chair)
	Treasury Management Statement	Head of Pensions
<b>15 March 2021</b>	Cabinet Member Questions – Communities	Cabinet Member - Communities

	Fire Safety in High Rise Blocks – Legislative Changes	Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning
	Development of a Community Impact Zone within an area of Haringey	Assistant Director Stronger Communities & Waste
	Overview and Scrutiny – Updated Protocol	Principal Scrutiny Support Officer
	Performance update; To monitor performance against priority targets	Performance Manager
<b>TBA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing funding for housing rough sleepers and how this will affect those with no recourse to public funds to be followed up going forwards. Further update to OSC once there is clarity on funding position.</li> </ul>	

## Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel

### Work Plan 2020 - 21

<p><b>1. Scrutiny review projects;</b> These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.</p>		
Project	Comments	Status
Adult Social Care commissioning	<p>This scrutiny review was established to examine the process behind commissioning decision-making including the overall strategic approach to commissioning, how decisions are tracked and measured, what key performance indicators are used, how return on investment is calculated and what criteria are used for tendering decisions.</p> <p>The Panel held an initial briefing session with Council officers in November 2019 followed by a number of evidence sessions with Council officers and external witnesses from January 2020 to March 2020.</p> <p>The Review was suspended in March 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic and is expected to resume shortly.</p>	In progress

2. **“One-off” Items; These** will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Panel. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.

Date	Agenda Items
<b>2020-21</b>	
<b>21 September 2020</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning Disabilities/Autism Centre &amp; Autism Hub               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Update on the opening of the new services at Waltheof Gardens in the changed circumstances resulting from Covid-19.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• ‘Stock take’ on current situation with Adult services               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Summary of how services have been affected during the Covid-19 pandemic and what has been learnt.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Care homes in Haringey               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Summary of the impact of Covid-19 on care homes in Haringey so far, including infection/fatality numbers and details, which care homes were most significantly affected.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Work Planning               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To discuss items for the work plan for the Panel for 2020/21.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>17 November 2020</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Domestic abuse               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Action being taken by the Council to support people affected by domestic abuse given the increased risk factors resulting from Covid-19 restrictions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Mental health</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Challenges with the co-ordination of mental health services during the Covid-19 pandemic and action being taken by the Council to support the mental health needs of people in isolation due to Covid-19 restrictions, particularly those who do not have support networks.</li> <li>● Haringey Safeguarding Adults Board – Annual Report 2019/20</li> <li>● Cabinet Member Questions – Adults &amp; Health</li> </ul>
<b>10 December 2020 (Budget Meeting)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Budget scrutiny</li> </ul>
<b>23 February 2021</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Locality working in North Tottenham</li> <li>● CQC overview</li> <li>● Living Through Lockdown report (Joint Partnerships Boards) – progress on proposals</li> <li>● Cabinet Member Questions – Adults &amp; Health</li> </ul>

Possible issues for 2021/22 Work Programme:

- Impact of NCL CCG merger
- New community mental health model
- VAWG progress (including number of refuge spaces)
- IAPT waiting times
- Community mental health model

This page is intentionally left blank

## Children and Young People’s Scrutiny Panel

### Work Plan 2020 - 21

<p><b>1. Scrutiny review projects;</b> These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.</p>		
Project	Comments	Priority
Schools	<p>There are now a range of different types of school within the borough. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community schools;</li> <li>• Foundation schools and voluntary schools;</li> <li>• Academies;</li> <li>• Free schools; and</li> <li>• Faith schools.</li> </ul> <p>The resulting fragmentation presents challenges for local authorities. These include ensuring that all schools are providing a good standard of education and the planning and co-ordination of school places. In addition, schools are subject to varying degrees of local democratic control.</p> <p>The review will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seek to identify the different categories of school that there are within Haringey and their characteristics as well as the diversity of curriculum and ethos offered by individual schools;</li> </ul>	In progress

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the ways that might be available to the Council to influence schools within the borough and, in particular, facilitate school improvement and co-ordination of school places most effectively; and</li> <li>• Look at practice in other local authority areas and what appears to have been most effective.</li> </ul> <p>The review will then focus on how the Council might best respond strategically to the significant surplus in school reception places that there is within Haringey. These have serious budgetary implications for many primary schools due to the way in which schools are funded. Demand for school places is subject to fluctuation and there will also be a need for sufficient places to be available to accommodate future any increases in demand for places. As part of this, the review will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role the Council has in working with schools to manage effectively the reductions in school rolls;</li> <li>• How a balanced range of school provision across the borough might best be maintained; and</li> <li>• What could be done to mitigate financial pressures on schools and ensure that any adverse effects on schools are minimised</li> </ul>	
Alternative Provision	<p>The review will look at Alternative Provision (AP) services provided to students who no longer attend mainstream education for reasons such as exclusion, behavioural issues, school refusal, short/long term illnesses as well as any other reasons. The main areas of focus will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the reasons why children in Haringey enter AP?</li> <li>• Once entering alternative provision, what are their outcomes and attainment levels when compared to mainstream schools?</li> <li>• How many children going through the AP route later enter the youth justice system?</li> <li>• How many children enter alternative provision as a result of SEND needs and how many have a statement or a EHCP plan?</li> <li>• The demographics of children entering AP including ethnicity, gender, areas of the borough where children in AP are drawn from and levels of children receiving free school meals prior to entering AP;</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the challenges schools and local authorities face and what can we do better to meet the needs of children so as to avoid AP altogether?</li> <li>• Are the outcomes from AP providers uniform within Haringey?</li> <li>• How cost effective is AP.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

<p>2. <b>“One-off” Items; These</b> will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Panel. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.</p>	
Date	Potential Items
<b>2020-21</b>	
<b>17 September 2020</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School estates and action being taken to address maintenance issues</li> <li>• Recovery plan for education within the borough, including action being taken to enable children and young people to catch up on missed schooling and targeted action for disadvantaged communities</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions - Communities</li> <li>• Work Planning; To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for year</li> </ul>
<b>9 November 2020</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terms of Reference</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Safeguarding Children’s Board Annual Report (April 2018 – September 2019)</li> <li>• Education Update, including the impact of Covid pandemic on tests and examinations, lost learning and action to address digital poverty</li> </ul>
<b>14 December 2020 (Budget Meeting)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget scrutiny</li> <li>• Scrutiny Review of SEND – Update on Implementation of Recommendations</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions - Communities</li> </ul>
<b>8 March 2021</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Children and Families</li> </ul>
<b>To be arranged</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. School exclusions data</li> <li>2. NRPF: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress with implementing improvements identified as required by the practice audit undertaken on the work of the NRPF team in 2017; and</li> <li>• How families with NRPF are assisted in accessing good quality immigration advice so that they are better able to resolve their status quickly.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Transitions – Further Update (to be considered jointly with the Adults and Health Panel)</li> <li>4. Haringey Community Gold – Evaluation and Further Update</li> <li>5. Nurseries and the Two and Three Year Old Offer</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>6. CAMHS – Evaluation of Trailblazer Project</li><li>7. Childhood Obesity - School Catering Contracts</li><li>8. Improved support offer for care leavers and pathways for low level mental health support services for children and young people</li><li>9. Social workers in schools – update on progress with scheme</li><li>10. Planned major works to maintained schools.</li><li>11. Effectiveness of new partnership arrangements for safeguarding – interim report.</li></ol>
--	--

This page is intentionally left blank



**Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel - Work Plan 2020-22**

▪ **Scrutiny review projects;** These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.

Project	Comments	Priority
Single Use Plastics Policy / Reducing the amount of plastic	<p>Examining the Council’s Single Use Plastics Policy as well as recycling performance around plastic waste and seeing what more could be done to reduce the use of plastics. What could the Council do to lead by example in this area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine the Council’s Single Use Plastics Policy (Cabinet in June) and what other boroughs are doing around this issue.</li> <li>• Examine the Council’s current position in relation to plastic waste; the Panel will look at the Council’s current recycling policy in relation to different types of plastic.</li> <li>• Examine how the Council could reduce plastic waste and increase its recycling performance, looking at innovative ideas from across the sector.</li> <li>• What could be done by the Council to lead by example and also to assist schools in reducing the amount of plastic waste? Is there scope for the Council to develop a plastic free pledge for schools to sign up to?</li> </ul>	

Date of meeting	Potential Items
3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership &amp; Terms of Reference.</li> <li>• Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member</li> <li>• Covid-19 Recovery update</li> <li>• Update on Youth at Risk Strategy</li> <li>• Gangs, Knife Crime &amp; Hotspot locations. (MOPAC Performance update?).               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transport hubs as hotspot locations for crime, especially Finsbury Park, Turnpike Lane, Seven Sisters and surrounding areas, particularly drug-dealing, knife crime.</li> <li>▪ Update on the Ducketts Common stakeholder Strategic Group</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Work Programme: To agree items for the work plan for the Panel for this year.</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions; Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).</li> </ul>
3 <sup>rd</sup> November 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions; Climate Change and Sustainability</li> <li>• Improving Air Quality &amp; reducing pollution</li> <li>• Street Trees &amp; Update on Queens Wood</li> <li>• Update on Single Use Plastics Policy</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recycling Rate</li> <li>• Update on Parks and Green Spaces Strategy</li> <li>• Parks Performance</li> <li>• Membership and Terms of Reference</li> <li>• Appointment of non-voting co-optee</li> <li>• Work Plan</li> </ul>
<p><b>Budget Scrutiny</b></p> <p>10<sup>th</sup> December 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Scrutiny</li> <li>• Police Priorities in Haringey &amp; Community Safety Partnership Update; To invite comments from the Panel on current performance issues and priorities for the borough’s Community Safety Partnership.</li> <li>• Update on Haringey &amp; Enfield BCU integration.</li> <li>• Additional Police numbers in Haringey</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions: Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).</li> </ul>
<p>4<sup>th</sup> March 2021</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Q&amp;A – Neighbourhoods: To question the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods on current issues and plans arising for her portfolio.</li> <li>• Waste, recycling and street cleansing data</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on Fly Tipping Strategy</li> <li>• Overview of Traffic Management including enforcement of 20mph speed limit (Improving traffic flow, Reduction in HGVs and preventing rat running)</li> <li>• Planned and Reactive Highways maintenance Performance</li> <li>• Work Plan update</li> </ul>
--	---

**2021-2021**

<p>Meeting 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Membership &amp; Terms of Reference.</li> <li>• Appointment of Non-Voting Co-opted Member.</li> <li>• Work Programme</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Q&amp;A – Cabinet Member Questions; Cabinet Member for Corporate and Civic Services</li> <li>• Strategic Transport update:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TfL funding (post Covid)</li> <li>▪ Smarter/Active Travel (improve walking and cycling infrastructure, including cycle paths).</li> <li>▪ Reducing Congestion (Better west to east transport links, Rat-running and unauthorised HGV use).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Liveable Neighbourhoods</li> </ul>
------------------	--

Appendix A

Meeting 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Q&amp;A – Cabinet Member Questions; Climate Change and Sustainability</li> </ul>
Meeting 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Q&amp;A – Communities, Safety and Engagement (to cover areas within the Panel’s terms of reference that are within that portfolio).</li> <li>• Police Priorities in Haringey &amp; Community Safety Partnership Update; To invite comments from the Panel on current performance issues and priorities for the borough’s Community Safety Partnership.</li> </ul>
Meeting 4 (Budget Scrutiny)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Scrutiny</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Q&amp;A – Cabinet Member Questions; Cabinet Member for Corporate and Civic Services.</li> </ul>
Meeting 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on CPZ coverage, Visitor permits and use of permits by staff</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions; Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods.</li> </ul>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel

### Work Plan 2020 - 21

<p><b>1. Scrutiny review projects;</b> These are dealt with through a combination of specific evidence gathering meetings that will be arranged as and when required and other activities, such as visits. Should there not be sufficient capacity to cover all of these issues through in-depth pieces of work, they could instead be addressed through a “one-off” item at a scheduled meeting of the Panel. These issues will be subject to further development and scoping. It is proposed that the Committee consider issues that are “cross cutting” in nature for review by itself i.e. ones that cover the terms of reference of more than one of the panels.</p>		
Project	Comments	Status
High Road West	<p>This scrutiny review was established to examine the proposals for the High Road West regeneration scheme in north Tottenham and to provide the Cabinet with evidence-based recommendations on ensuring a future development that meets the needs and aspirations of residents, businesses and the wider community.</p> <p>Site visits took place in Nov and Dec 2019 and the Panel held a number of evidence sessions in Feb &amp; Mar 2020 with Council officers and with local residents, businesses, community organisations and residents associations.</p> <p>The Review was suspended due to the Covid-19 pandemic and is expected to resume shortly.</p>	In progress
Noel Park Major Works	<p>An additional meeting of the Panel was held on 17<sup>th</sup> Dec 2020 to consider concerns that had been raised by Noel Park leaseholders about proposed major works at a deputation to the Panel in Nov 2020. A report on the matter is expected to be produced in early 2021.</p>	In progress

2. **“One-off” Items; These** will be dealt with at scheduled meetings of the Panel. The following are suggestions for when particular items may be scheduled.

Date	Agenda Items
<b>2020-21</b>	
<b>14 September 2020</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of Covid-19 on housing development, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the Housing Delivery Programme</li> <li>○ major redevelopment projects</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Homelessness, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ future plans for rough sleepers temporarily housed during the Covid-19 lockdown</li> <li>○ expected impact of the expiration of the ban on evictions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Housing &amp; Estate Renewal</li> <li>• Work Planning; To discuss items for the work plan for the Panel for 2020/21</li> </ul>
<b>19 November 2020</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Housing &amp; Estate Renewal</li> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Strategic Regeneration</li> <li>• Housing Delivery Plan update               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overview and list of sites</li> <li>○ Update on Community Benefit Society (CBS)</li> <li>○ Purchase of 104 &amp; 106 Woodside Avenue</li> </ul> </li> <li>• HfH Maintenance Service Level Agreements</li> </ul>



<p><b>15 December 2020 (Budget Meeting)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget scrutiny</li> </ul>
<p><b>2 March 2021</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet Member Questions – Planning</li> <li>• Community Infrastructure Levy</li> <li>• Woodside Avenue &amp; Cranwood Housing Development Site</li> </ul>
<p><b>Additional agenda items available to be allocated to future meetings</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Haringey Covid-19 Development Intelligence Group</li> <li>2. Housing procurement policies.</li> <li>3. Fire at Firs House in Wood Green in April 2020.</li> <li>4. Fire safety in HfH estates.</li> <li>5. Policy on demolition of existing council housing in order to build new properties through the housing delivery programme.</li> <li>6. Tottenham Hale District Centre Framework.</li> <li>7. Converted Properties cleaning service charge.</li> <li>8. Decent Homes Plus.</li> <li>9. Housing support services provided by local community organisations.</li> <li>10. Empty homes.</li> <li>11. Asset Management Strategy.</li> <li>12. Funding models relating to the General Fund and the Housing Revenue Account.</li> <li>13. Sheltered accommodation (Joint meeting with Adults &amp; Health Scrutiny Panel).</li> </ol>

This page is intentionally left blank