

## Appendix C

### Additional Information

#### Priority 1

PC2: Further details of the proposed budget reductions arising from the rationalisation of the management of Children's Centres:

Post affected	FTE	Grade	Affected number of Employees	Number of Posts Created	FTE	Grade	
Management	√	PO 4/6	3	3	√	PO5 (1)/ 7 (2)	
Nursery Practitioner	√	SO 1	11	11	√	PO1(1) / Scale 6 (10)	
Total			14	Total			14

#### Priority 2

- Charging for managed account: EqIA circulated separately. Further information to be provided on the proposed annual charges compared to the equivalent annual charges levied by broadly comparable local authorities. This should include any known evidence about whether charges by other local authorities have caused any financial harm to individuals:
  - There is very limited information available on charging by comparable local authorities. Despite requesting information from neighbouring authorities, this has not been forthcoming to date. We are aware that some local authorities will convert appointee cases to the Court of Protection, where there are high balances on the account. This enables them to apply the deputyship guidance in charging for administration. In terms of hardship, the proposal is to mirror the charging regime used for Court of Protection clients (and therefore based on a Court directive). This approach maintains a clear protection for clients – to date no Court of Protection clients have experienced hardship. Additional safeguards will be built into the policy to minimise the risk of any hardship being experienced as a direct result of the proposed charges. For example, where we hold no savings for a client and simply collect their DWP benefits to pay bills then the charge would not be applied.
- In-house negotiator: Figures on the projected savings from this proposal to be clarified in writing plus information on potential risks to this proposal, including modelling of potential savings and the number of clients to be provided:
  - 2019/20 = £116k
  - 2020/21 = £344k
  - Total = £460kThe risks to this proposal are related to non-achievement of savings: In negotiation, the levels of care commissioned and delivered are found to be in balance. Needs are found to have changed, with additional

costs being identified to meet these needs. Savings made are marginal rather than fundamentally addressing the cost of the package

- Transfer of High Cost Day Opportunities:
  - Any re-design process is complex and the possibility of delay or slippage has been built in by not assuming any savings until 2020/2021 at the earliest. The co-design group being set up for this project will include users, carers and staff. This group will have the opportunity to raise and challenge the perception that the main driver for this project is cost. Historically, some out of borough packages are high cost and without local competition may remain higher than necessary. The redesign will focus on ensuring that services commissioned locally will meet identified levels of need.

The co-design process will consider issues in the round including: value for money, reduced travel time, increasing the number of local day opportunity places in borough, increasing choice, improving outcomes, increasing variety. Engaging with users and carers early on should mitigate the potential risk of the proposal especially given that anxiety in carers has in the past unnecessarily been raised by other persons/groups not directly involved.

- Canning Crescent Assisted Living:
  - NHS England are providing £950k capital grant towards the project
- Osborne Grove Nursing Home:
  - Financial modelling, based on benchmarking of similar projects, was carried out. This projected in the entire cost of the project (including construction and feasibility). £200k is estimated cost of the feasibility study.
- Hornsey Town Hall:
  - There is an assumption of 11 units, which the current model presumes they will be managed by Homes for Haringey

### **Priorities 3 & 4**

- More details on how much is spent on consultants altogether, including through capital costs:
  - There has been £612k of revenue spend allocated to the categories that form consultancy to P9 across over 50 suppliers. £215k of this was for professional, expert advice on sites/development – financial modelling, valuations, development appraisals. £150k on architect studies, £16k on cost consultants, £27k on an Independent Tenant and Leasehold Advisor. Wherever possible expenditure is being capitalised or reallocated, for example the ITLA will be HRA funded but its initial coding is to revenue and then recharged to the HRA. The remainder (£204k) is for small suppliers covering events such as community voting days, the Tottenham Green market, the Tottenham Winter Festival, the Wood Green BID.
  - There has been £3.7m of capital spend allocated to the categories that form consultancy to P8. The vast majority of this is contractor expenditure on project delivery: £2.86m of this was on the White Hart Lane public realm

scheme to the contractor, £208k to the Gasworks site contractor in Wood Green, and £186k to the North Tottenham Townscape Heritage Initiative contractor. All of these projects have significant external funding. £304k of spend was for home loss and disturbance payments and acquisition costs for High Road West, which should not be counted as consultancy spend. The remainder (£136k) is for architect, legal and other contractor fees on capital projects.

- It should be noted that as part of the review of 18/19 spend, incorrect codings have been flagged and will be rectified with further training given to staff responsible for coding, as the majority of the spend above has been on areas that do not constitute consultancy spend.
- More details on the cost of the consultancy work that has been carried out on this proposal & information on how much other boroughs had been able to raise through similar outdoor advertising initiatives. The consultants have been carrying out a benchmarking study on this with findings expected to be available in January: Circulated separately
- More details on the overall Housing, Regeneration & Planning staffing budget; Circulated separately
- Wood Green Capital Budget: Circulated separately
- Strategic Investment Pot – Capital Budget: Circulated separately

### **Priority X**

- Clarification on whether the capital spend on the IT and buildings upgrade was for buildings or for IT:
  - The Libraries IT and Building upgrade budget is specific to the library service and used to fund both building and IT infrastructure for that service. Hornsey Library is recorded as a separate line due to the substantial nature of that specific refurbishment project.
- Further information to be provided on raising revenues through libraries, and the radical ways of working programme:
  - These proposals are in development and final detail will be presented as future transformation business cases.