

## Appendix A

### Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

<b>Environment and Community Safety Panel – Place Priority</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Comments/Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)</b>
N/A	N/B - This savings is not included in the MTFS Savings Proposals for 2021/22 - 2023/24.		<p>That Cabinet urgently consider how it can support the retention of the Neighbourhood Watch Coordinator and Parks Link Officer post, following its proposed deletion and a redundancy notice issued to the post holder.</p> <p>This post was part funded by the Council and part funded by the Police. If the Police are unable to fund 75% of this post, the Panel would like to see the Council explore all options, including contributing additional funding to support the continuation of this role.</p>	Yes
<b>Revenue Savings</b>				
N/A	General point of clarity on the MTFS	That further clarity is provided on the exact figure for the current budget gap.		
N/A	General point of clarity	Further information is requested about the budget allocated to those who have lost their job due to Covid. What impact has this finding had so far? How many people will this pot of funding affect?		

PL20/17	Garden Waste Subscription Fees		That Cabinet provide further assurance about the business modelling used in calculating the new net additional savings. How realistic is projecting year on year increased subscriptions from a diminishing pool of available customers?	Yes
PL20/20	Fuel Savings from Electrical Vehicles		That reassurance be provided on whether the Council could make additional savings in this area and in particular, whether investment in this area can be expedited so that savings can realised earlier.	Yes
PL20/28	Introducing Sunday charging in car parks		<p>That this saving is paused until further assessment can be undertaken about the likely impact on businesses from the introduction of additional car parking charges.</p> <p>The impact of the Covid crisis on businesses is unprecedented and the Council should be doing all it can to support local businesses at this time.</p> <p>Cabinet to provide assurance that the cost to local businesses does not outweigh the additional revenue received.</p>	Yes
PL20/29	Introduce Sunday charges in Stop and Shop parking facilities.		<p>That this saving is paused until further assessment can be undertaken about the likely impact on businesses from the introduction of additional car parking charges.</p> <p>The impact of the Covid crisis on businesses is unprecedented and the Council should be doing all it can to support local businesses at this time.</p> <p>Cabinet to provide assurance that the cost to local businesses does not outweigh the additional revenue received.</p>	Yes

<b>Capital Budget</b>				
302	Principal Road Maintenance	Further information requested about what kind of impact a failure to secure funding from TfL would have and how this could be mitigated.	<p>The Panel notes with concern that failure to secure sufficient funding from TFL for the principal road network would result in the need to divert essential funding from other programmes and may impact on the ability to meet walking and cycling aspirations.</p> <p>It is recommended that Cabinet give firm assurances that they will protect walking and cycling schemes as a priority.</p>	Yes
311	Parks Asset Management.  Parks Depot Reconfiguration		<p>That the disposal of Keston Road parks depot should be re-examined. The Council should not be disposing of its most valuable asset - land - to the private sector for development, in order to fund services.</p> <p>Instead, Cabinet should be exploring other options; including whether it could be incorporated into a site for the Housing Delivery Programme.</p>	Yes
311	Parks Asset Management.  Park funding.		<p>The year-on-year allocation of capital funding over the 5 year period of the MTFS is a flat figure (£300k). It is recommended that funding levels for this area be re-examined to offset the significant cuts that have been made to this area over the last ten years</p>	Yes
322	Finsbury Park		<p>That Cabinet give assurances that the proposed package of funding for Finsbury Park explicitly includes funding for the Changing Places scheme.</p> <p>That Cabinet also provide an update on when this scheme will be rolled out.</p>	Yes

447	Alexandra Palace – Maintenance.	<p>Further information is requested about what this funding is for.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This budget is for the capital maintenance of the palace. This budget would cover, roof, electrics, mechanical &amp; electrical, window replacement etc. type works. It is an annual allocation.</p>		
-----	---------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

**Children and Young People’s Panel – Children’s Services**

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req’d (Yes/No)
N/A		None	<p>Ann Graham, the Director of Children’s Services, reported that the financial position of her service had seen a recent improvement. Whilst savings had been identified in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), there were no proposed reductions in services or personnel. There were two savings proposals though. As part of these, a mother and baby residential centre would be established with an external provider. However, Council social work staff would be based in the centre and undertake assessments. The intention was to ensure that assessments that were consistently of a high quality were produced. Weekend places at the centre would be sold through the private law sector.</p> <p>There were also growth proposals in the MTFS. These included £1.5 million to respond to the</p>	No

			<p>increase in demand for residential places. In addition, £300k had been provided to fund free school meals in the next two years. This had been a manifesto commitment and would ensure that no child went to school hungry. There would also be additional staff to complete Education, Health and Care plans and a Leader's bursary of £120k to assist ten young people from low income families through higher education.</p> <p>The Panel noted that the budget gap for 2021-22 was £1.9m and this had been included as unidentified savings. Due to the pandemic, there were budget pressures of £17m across the Council and a vigorous recovery and renewal process had been put in place to address this. This had looked at what services should be expanded, end or be re-started as well as what was still deliverable. Consideration was being given to which of the savings that had been agreed last year and subject to slippage could be delivered next year. The further savings proposals were intended to improve services as well as reducing expenditure. In addition, there were also growth proposals to relieve existing pressures and some new initiatives, as well as significant capital investment.</p> <p>The Panel queried the amount quoted in the budget papers for investment in the Wood Green Youth Hub, which was quoted as £1m and £790k. It was noted that overall investment was £1m. Some of the spend would be in the current financial year with the majority of spend in 2021/22.</p>	
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

			<p>In answer to a question, Ms Graham reported that the overspend had been accrued due to spending on Covid and budgetary pressures related to cost and demand. In particular, there were now more children in residential care than four years ago and costs had gone up significantly. The service was working hard to ensure that value for money was achieved. Beverly Hendricks, Assistant Director for Safeguarding and Social Care, reported that 39 assessments had been undertaken since April and none of them had been subject to challenge. They were being undertaken in a professional way that allowed little scope for challenge. In terms of budgeting, it only took a small number of additional young people requiring support to add significant additional pressures.</p> <p>In answer to a question, Ms Graham reported that savings from last year that had not been achieved would be rolled forward to next year. It was not yet known how much this would be as the year had not yet ended. Savings continued to be made. Only £600k had been achieved by the time of the first lockdown but this had now gone up to £1m. The pandemic had prevented some savings being made and work had needed to be put on hold. Work to achieve the savings would continue, subject to there being no further lockdowns. One proposal had involved the extension of the homes of foster parents. This had not happened as quickly as had been hoped but it was hoped that progress would be made shortly.</p>	
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<b>Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No)</b>
HO101	Housing Team Salaries – Increase HRA contribution		<p>The Panel expressed concerns about the decision to increase charges to the HRA for officer salaries, and about the potential impact on the long-term viability of the HRA of loaded extra costs. The Panel highlighted issues of tenants' rents being used to subsidise posts through the General Fund and requests confirmation that there are sufficient funds available within the HRA budget for maintaining Haringey housing estates in the future.</p> <p>The Panel recommends that Cabinet clarifies how HRA funds are to be apportioned in relation to officer time, especially when Council developments may include homes for market sale.</p>	Yes
EC101	Additional Recharge to Housing Services			
HO102	HfH taking over the lease of PSL properties on their expiry	To provide a written response explaining why additional incentives for landlords are necessary. (As stated in the pro forma on page 90 of the Panel's agenda pack and in the savings tracker on page 118)	The Panel reiterated their concerns raised in previous years about the need to reduce the amount spent on consultancy staff and noted that senior staff administering this scheme are interim posts.	Yes

			<p>The Panel questioned why the issue of expenditure on consultancy staff had not been included in the budget proposals and wished to flag their concerns about this with the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee.</p> <p>The Panel recommended that a review be initiated immediately into the number of consultants and interims employed in the Housing, Regeneration and Planning Directorate including and itemising all associated costs. The review should include details of the consultancy expenditure projected for 2021/22 compared with the previous three years and proposals as to how a reduction of dependency on consultancies and interims will be achieved within the next municipal year.</p>	
Housing (509)	CPO – Empty Homes	Further written information be provided to show the breakdown of the empty homes (in terms of new-build and existing housing stock) and what kind of remedial action (such as increased Council Tax rates) was possible and had been taking place before reaching the CPO stage.		
Economy (453)	New workspace scheme at Stoneleigh Road car park		The Panel expressed reservations about this proposal and suggested that it required further examination, noting that it related to several car parks and that parking would be necessary to support any future improvements to Tottenham High Road.	No



			The Panel noted its intention to monitor this issue going forward.	
PL1 (from 2019/20 budget)	Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO	A Panel Member asked why the proportion of HMOs brought under licence was still low (as stated in the savings tracker of page 117 of the Panel's agenda pack). The Panel was advised that this query would need to be referred to Environment and Neighbourhoods team for a written response.		
N/A	Unachieved savings	<p>The Panel commented that more clarity was needed on the impact of the unachieved savings from 2020/21 on the budget for 2021/22 and beyond, specifically by providing details on the shortfalls and the plans to mitigate these.</p> <p>The Panel made particular reference to the Temporary Accommodation Reduction Plan (Item HO1) which had a reported shortfall of £326k (according to page 242 of the Cabinet) and requested an update on this point.</p>	The Panel recommended that for budget scrutiny reports in future years, the impact of the unachieved savings from the current year on the budget for subsequent years should be clearly set out and made transparent. The provision of mitigation plans should also be included in the papers to the Panel.	No

**Adults and Health Panel and Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Your Council); to follow**