

Budget Scrutiny Recommendations 2021/22

Overview and Scrutiny Committee					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd	Draft Response
N/A	General Comment		The Committee were concerned about potential slippage in savings leading to additional pressure on the growth budgets. Cabinet is asked to provide additional assurances around the risk of additional savings being needed over the stated £12m and to also provide assurances around how this eventuality would be addressed.	Yes	The February budget report will provide additional recognition of the risk posed by potential delays in the delivery of the Council's agreed MTFS savings.
N/A			The Panel noted that the borrowing costs to the General Fund revenue budget were projected as £29.3m in 2027. The Committee requests that Cabinet comment on how the risk of additional borrowing costs would be managed. If additional money is needed to	Yes	The budget report to Council will describe how the overall budget risks are addressed in totality including the cost of debt.

			cover increased future borrowing costs, will this necessitate additional savings?		
N/A	Budget Briefings for panels		The Committee noted that the briefings in advance of the budget scrutiny meetings had included a lot of detail on Q2 of 2021/22 and on the performance indicators. The Panel recommended that in future years, briefings on these matters should be received separately and that the pre-budget briefings should concentrate on the following year's draft budget and the updated MTFS.	Yes	The need for a clear distinction in all discussions, between the in year budget position and future years' positions is noted.
N/A	Format of reports		The Committee noted that the reports in the budget scrutiny agenda packs included information about the budget areas for all Panels. To make the information easier to review, the Committee recommended that the main budget report provided to each Panel should be tailored to include only the main headline	Yes	The committee's comments are noted.

			<p>figures/tables for the overall budget/MTFS and then the detailed information specifically relevant to the policy area of that Panel. The Cabinet report should be included in the agenda packs separately as an appendix.</p> <p>The Committee also recommended that the capital section of the papers provided to Panels should broadly follow the same format as the revenue section and should include the capital expenditure plans and the financing costs relating to the capital spending.</p> <p>The Committee also recommended that risk factors associated with the budget should be highlighted in the budget report to the Panels.</p>		
N/A	Format of reports		Some of the language used can be quite technical at times.	Yes	The committee's comments are noted.

			Future reports should be written so that co-optees and members of the public can understand them. The Committee requested that the be written in plain English and that terms are explained in the report in brackets the first time they are used. An example given was what was meant by a budget gap?		
N/A	Format of reports		The Committee requested that future budget reports contain an executive summary of the whole budget (both revenue and capital). It was suggested that this should be no more than one or two pages in length.	Yes	Officers will review the style of the existing introduction to the report.
N/A	Format of reports		The Committee would also like to see the use of sub-indexes in the PDF versions of the budget report to make it easier to toggle through the different sections of the report during budget meetings.	Yes	The committee's comments are noted.

N/A	Format of reports		In future, where capital bids have multiple elements to them, the Committee requests that these be set out in more detail in the agenda papers.	Yes	Officer will look to ensure that capital programme statements contain the appropriate level of detail.
Housing and Regeneration Panel – Economy Priority					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd	
<u>Capital Budget</u>					
N/A	Appendix D - New Capital for 2022/23 MTFS Programme. Civic Centre Annex		That Cabinet provide further detail on how the Civic Centre project fits into the Council's wider accommodation strategy, including the future use of the Station Road estate.	Yes	<i>LBH's ambition is to move to be a more agile organisation, with staff working under a flexible 'hybrid' model, which will see working locations for staff split across some combination of office, community, and home. The ambition to move to this new working model will require LBH to provide a flexible and collaborative office working environment for its staff,</i>

					<p><i>which enhances the positive aspects of in-person interaction, enables work and activity that is harder to deliver remotely, and supports staff wellbeing. The cabinet report in January 22, whilst focusing on the Civic Centre the report, highlighted in the business case that that it was part a wider accommodation strategy. Further work is taking place as we look to increase the amount of area and locality-based working over the coming years to ensure that our front-facing services are delivered as close as possible to the community, in line with our objectives to build community resilience and work in partnership with our communities.</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<i>Any subsequent decisions on the future usage of buildings in Station Road, beyond those already agreed, will be subject to their own individual business cases, but in the context of a placemaking approach so that the area can reach its full potential at the heart of Wood Green.</i>
429	Site Acquisition (Tott & Wood Green). Wards Corner Market		That Cabinet provide clarity around what provision there is for any potential future contribution to this scheme regarding investment in the long term future of this site, following the withdrawal of Grainger. The Panel notes that this site will require significant investment and that TfL have, to date, only committed to invest enough funding to make the site safe. Further investment will be required to make the market site viable.	Yes	The financial responsibility for the Market resides with TFL. With regard to the market building (and adjacent TfL premises), TfL have signalled that they are to run a process to secure a community partner to take forward the development of their interests. It is understood that TFL will also undertake as yet unspecified works to the building.

429	Site Acquisition (Tott & Wood Green). CPO – Wards Corner		<p>The Panel recommends that if the funding earmarked for the CPO were to remain in the capital budget, and if the Council is minded to carry out the CPO without Grainger, then this allocation should be used for maximum provision of council homes at council rents.</p> <p>The Panel request assurances from Cabinet that this future outcome for the site will be fully considered.</p>	Yes	<p>Capital programme budget 430 (not scheme 429) makes provision for the CPO costs subsequently to be funded by Grainger which has not been utilised in this year.</p> <p>The Cabinet notes the committees views regarding provision of Council homes on this site.</p>
N/A	HRA Capital Budget	Further information/written clarification is requested around why borrowing constitutes such a significant proportion of the HRA, particularly in Years 1, 2 & 5. The Panel would like assurances that the		No	

		<p>borrowing costs are sustainable and that the Council is not at risk of being unduly impacted by any future rise in the cost of borrowing.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>Borrowing is one of several sources of funding capital investments in the HRA. The HRA financial plans have been developed to apply borrowing after all other sources of funding (such as grants, market sales receipts, etc) have been recognised. In the earlier years, where capital investments are significant, it is expected that the level of borrowing will be higher. Grants are recognised 50%</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>start-on-site and 50% on completion. Market sales receipts are recognised after completion. These all play a part in the profiling of the borrowing. This plan has been built with the assurance that year on year there is enough cover for the levels of borrowings proposed in the financial plan.</p> <p>Our future interest rates assumptions are based on information available at this time and information from our treasury advisers. The HRA financial Plan is constantly being reviewed (quarterly) – as is the interest rate environment more generally as part of the Council's</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		treasury strategy. Any significant change to the environment or projections in the interest rates in the future, the plan will be revisited. New borrowing within the HRA is being taken out at fixed interest rates (as opposed to variable) meaning that interest rates on borrowing raised to date is certain over a long-term time horizon.			
Environment and Community Safety Panel – Place Priority					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd	
N/A	General comment		The Panel are broadly supportive of the budget proposals and welcome the level of investment into the borough. The Panel are particularly pleased to see the long overdue investment into	No	

			the maintenance of the boroughs drains and road gullies, and a commitment that every drainage asset in the borough would be cleaned at least once a year.		
<u>New Capital Growth Proposals</u>					
	Tree Planting - Street & Greenspace Greening Programme.		<p>The Panel welcomes the commitment to invest in its tree stock and noted the aim of achieving a net neutral position. The panel would like to see additional investment in this area, above the £75k per year (rising to £100k per year with match funding) that has been allocated.</p> <p>Cabinet should make firm commitment to a net increase in the number of trees in the borough (rather than a net-neutral position), particularly in light of the historic decline in tree numbers over recent years due to an underinvestment in this area.</p>	Yes	<p>The views expressed are noted, this will be kept under review.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Tree Sponsorship scheme has generated additional funding for the provision of around 250 extra trees and these are currently in the throes of programmed planting. It is hoped that the Tree Sponsorship scheme will continue to have a positive impact in future planting seasons as public awareness and concern over environmental matters increases over time.</p>

	Tree Planting - Street & Greenspace Greening Programme.		<p>The Panel would also like a commitment from Cabinet that the existing inequities in tree coverage across the borough will be addressed. The Panel noted that the overwhelming number of sponsored trees to date were in the west and centre of the borough. This will exacerbate existing inequalities in tree coverage.</p> <p>Cabinet Should commit to ensuring that the east of the borough is prioritised when planting new trees.</p> <p>Cabinet should also make a specific commitment that low levels of tree coverage in wards such as Tottenham Hale, Noel Park and Bruce Grove will be addressed.</p>	Yes	For this season's Tree Sponsorship scheme, there is a reasonably even distribution of additional trees to be planted in the east and the west of the borough. The expectation of contributors to the Tree Sponsorship scheme is that the extra trees to be planted are provided close to where the live or work. The requested commitment is a matter that can potentially be addressed through the emerging Tree and Woodland Policy, as part of the Parks and Greenspaces Strategy under development and due to be discussed in a summit in March 2022.
	Upgrade Parks Lighting		That Cabinet provided assurances that areas of lighting in parks where sections of the park are lit, whilst others are in shadow are looked at as part on the investment in improved lighting. It was felt that this could create a false sense of	Yes	The funding set aside for the upgrade to parks lighting is to address the significant backlog in replacement of lighting columns at or near the end of their expected life, switching to LED lighting and the extension of the

			<p>security for people travelling through parks at night.</p> <p>The Panel would also like assurances that preservation of wildlife habitat will be considered when determining lighting requirements in our parks and open spaces.</p>		<p>central management system technology to the renewed lighting to ensure the correct lighting levels are provided, appropriate to the environment in which they are located and safeguarding the night-time habitats of protected species in particular.</p>
	Road Casualty Reduction		<p>The Panel notes that a large proportion of the active travel schemes proposed are unfunded at present and would like assurances that funding for these schemes will be pursued.</p> <p>As part of the Road Safety Strategy, the Panel would like to see additional investment into active travel, with a particular focus on improving cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>Scrutiny also suggested that Road Casualty reduction did not accurately reflect the nature of the scheme, as it was also aimed at achieving modal shift towards walking and cycling.</p>	Yes	<p>The investment in road casualty reduction is to achieve the Vision Zero ambition which is to have no-one killed or seriously injured in road traffic collisions in Haringey by 2021. The advancement of active travel initiatives (including those identified in the draft Walking and Cycling Action Plan) would be dependent on funding from alternative sources such as allocations from transport for London and Strategic Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>

	<p>Highways Asset Maintenance Programme.</p>	<p>That Panel request clarification on the funding for this proposal. The bid is funded by council borrowing for the first year 2022-23. Thereafter it has been assumed that there will be grant funding available to undertake this work. How robust is this assumption of further funding?</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The government's spending review announcements (SR21) made £32bn available nationally for works to roads, potholes, resurfacing and bridges. The detail of how this funding will be disbursed is at the time of writing not yet published, and we have therefore had to make</p>		<p>No</p>	
--	--	--	--	-----------	--

		assumptions within our budget and MTFS, and this includes the assumption that this grant funding will be available to finance the capital scheme referred to here. This will be revisited within the next budget round over the course of 2022 at which time it is hoped the detail of government funding have been published.			
Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel – People Priority					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd	
N/A	General issue	The Panel noted that, despite revenue growth proposals set out in the agenda pack, the revenue budget for Adults would reduce from	That Cabinet give a commitment that the Adults and Health Budget is not reduced going into the 2022/23 budget.	Yes	The February budget report will include proposals for a further substantial growth for the Adults social care budget, which will lead to an increase for this priority area.

		<p>£83.208m in 2021/22 to £82.164m in the draft 2022/23 budget. The Panel requested a breakdown of the different elements of the revenue budget, including previously agreed savings and growth funding, in order to illustrate the reasons for the decline in the revenue budget.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The net change in priority area budgets from year to year will include a number of factors including the impact of agreed growth and savings and other factors impacting on budgets such as variations in the levels of government grants awarded. In</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

		this case the net change comprises £0.5m of minor in year changes to the priority area budget, £4.1m of agreed MTFS savings, and £3.6m of agreed budget growth.			
N/A	General issue		The Panel expressed concerns about the significant future increase in interest repayment costs to the General Fund (shown to reach over £29m by 2026/27 according to Table 8.8 on page 34 of the Dec 2021 Cabinet report) caused by the projected rise in capital investment. The Panel requested that Cabinet provide an assessment of the risk associated with the increase in the proportion of financing costs to the net revenue stream over the MTFS period.	Yes.	The budget report to Council will describe how the overall budget risks are addressed in totality including the cost of debt.
<u>MTFS Savings Tracker – 2021/22 to 2025/26</u>					
N/A	General issue		The Panel expressed concerns about whether the targeted savings for 2021/22 would be	Yes	The February budget report will provide additional recognition of the risk

			achieved by the end of the year and recommended that further analysis should be provided to demonstrate how this would be achieved.		posed by potential delays in the delivery of the Council's agreed MTFS savings.
AS101/AS102	Fast Track Financial Assessments/Client Contributions		<p>The Panel was concerned that the savings expected in 2021/22 were too high and recommended that the savings should be spread over a longer period within the MTFS. The Panel suggested that a smaller saving in 2021/22 would have allowed for the impact on residents to be properly assessed before the remainder of the savings were implemented in future years.</p> <p>The Panel also recommended that an analysis of the impact of the savings so far on residents and the associated risks should be carried out to ensure that this was not causing financial difficulties for individuals and their families.</p>	Yes	<p>Our assessments consider all financial commitments (in line with The Care Act 2014) and we ensure we do not charge more than what clients can afford.</p> <p>It is important to note that the increased efficiency in processing client contributions assists in preventing debt from building up and causing undue concern to clients.</p> <p>The targets that relate to increased efficiency in processing (denoted as savings) are also regularly reviewed and there is provision to spread over a</p>

					<p>longer period of time within the MTFS.</p> <p>We are currently reviewing our charging policy with relation to the legislative framework and this involves engagement with residents and service users.</p>
<u>Draft Capital Programme – 2022/23 to 2026/27</u>					
201	Aids & Adaptations		<p>The Panel was concerned about the significant delays experienced by residents in the installation of aids and adaptations and the consequent impact of this on health and well-being. The Panel noted that this service was funded externally from the Better Care Fund but appeared to be under-resourced. It was also noted that the amount of money available appeared to be the same each year in the MTFS with no increases to keep pace with inflation. The Panel recommended that the Cabinet give consideration about</p>	Yes	<p>The service receives funding from the Better Care Fund (BCF) to complete Disabled Facilities Grants (DFG) in residents who own their own homes or in HA/ privately rented properties and aids and equipment costs related to BCF outcomes.</p> <p>The amount awarded is decided by Central Government and given to</p>

			<p>whether the funding in this area is sufficient to meet the needs of local residents and, if not, what steps could be taken to increase the resources available for this including from external sources such as the Better Care Fund.</p> <p>Concerns were put forward that part of the reasons for delays were due to a lack Occupational Therapists. Scrutiny would also like Cabinet to ensure that there is additional funding available to provide additional Occupational Therapists to undertake assessments in order to implement aids and adaptations.</p> <p>Is there scope for joint partnership working on this. Could Occupational Therapists working in the community health sector be used to undertake assessments, if the Council could provide the funding.</p>	<p>local CCG's in their BCF to pass onto LA's.</p> <p>Major Adaptations for Council properties is funded through the HRA funding from Homes for Haringey and provided to ASC to adapt residents' property identified, or registered as disabled, and experiencing difficulties accessing essential facilities.</p> <p>We are currently working with Comm Health partners to scope the possibility of simplifying referral processes for major adaptations as they are also experiencing workforce capacity and recruitment issues for Occupational Therapists.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

214	Osborne Grove Nursing Home	<p>The Panel commented that the total costs for this item seemed high at over £44m. The Panel requested a short summary of the reasons for the increase in the overall costs and details of any contributions from health partners towards the cost of the project.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The investment in the Osborne Grove Nursing Home is to create a 70-bed nursing and ancillary facilities. This project, like many others, has suffered from cost inflation due to the pandemic and Brexit, which is estimated to have</p>	That Cabinet include the income expected from the health sector for the nursing beds.	Yes	<p>The investment in the Osborne Grove Nursing Home is to create a 70 bed nursing and ancillary facilities.</p> <p>This project, like many others, has suffered from cost inflation due to the pandemic and Brexit, which is estimated to have added £1.35m to the cost base. In addition, as part of the process of design development via co production, the specification for the facility has been refined to meet the client group's needs.</p> <p>This has meant that the scheme cost has increased by £2.25m. Also, as the building is larger than the existing one, there is a need to provide a new electricity substation which has added £0.25m.</p>

		<p>added £1.35m to the cost base. In addition, as part of the process of design development via co production, the specification for the facility has been refined to meet the client group's needs. This has meant that the scheme cost has increased by £2.25m. Also, as the building is larger than the existing one, there is a need to provide a new electricity sub station which has added £0.25m. The project steering group are undertaking a review of the scheme in light of the budget position. There are no budgeted contributions from health partners to the scheme.</p>			<p>The project steering group are undertaking a review of the scheme to more closely align it to the budget, and all these considerations are being factored into the business case. There are no budgeted contributions from health partners to the scheme.</p>
<p>Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel – People Priority</p>					

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd	
N/A		None.	The Panel noted concerns from Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) parents and carers that the explanation for the overspend in the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Budget (DSB) as being mainly due to the increase in the number of children with Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs) might be misconstrued as apportioning blame. It also noted assurances from the Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Families and officers that there was no intention to do this and that the overspend was due to structural issues arising from inadequate government funding, as referred to in the report. The Panel recommends that the language used in describing the reasons for the overspend in the High Needs Block in future	Yes..	The importance of using appropriate narrative in describing the situation and financial implications of this vital service is recognised.

			documentation be modified in order to avoid the possibility of it being misinterpreted as apportioning blame on SEND families.		
N/A			The Panel noted and welcomed the commitment by the Council to engage with the community regarding the MTFS proposals. However, it was felt that attention needed to be given to how they could be made easier to understand so that they were more accessible to the wider community. This could be done through measures such as providing an easy-to-read version as Hammersmith and Fulham had done. The Panel therefore recommends that work be undertaken to improve the accessibility of the MTFS documentation to promote more effective engagement with the local community.	Yes	The Council's budget consultation and engagement activities are reviewed annually, including considerations around accessibility. The Council's consultation process was fair and followed our Consultation Charter.
N/A			The Panel recommends that a briefing be provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the outcome of the engagement undertaken	Yes	The February budget report to Cabinet (which will form part of the Full Council papers) will include all details of the outcome of

			as part of the MTFS process, including which stakeholders were involved and their responses to the proposals.		the public consultation on the budget.
Your Council					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd	
<u>Revenue Growth proposals</u>					
	Residents & Communities Engagement and Participation		The Committee recommended that the Cabinet should publish further details about this project, including specific details on how the funds are expected to be spent and how it would make a difference to participation with residents including hard to reach groups.	Yes	<p>We have ambitious plans to develop and embed the participation agenda across the work of the council - providing new ways for residents get involved in local decision making, shape the services they use and be part of co-producing the borough of the future.</p> <p>There is significant pre-existing work and expertise within the council, but to take this work to the next level will require some</p>

					<p>additional corporate resource. This will support the provision of good quality engagement tools, advice and organisational capacity building. Having been established in 2019, now is also the right time to develop the next stage of development for the Haringey Citizens Panel.</p> <p>The budget growth bid resources of £100k p/a will be utilised to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - develop, test and roll-out new approaches to participation including co-design and co-production across the council. This will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o developing best practise
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>around involving and engaging residents from a wide range of different backgrounds and communities including our young people</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ providing practical support for 'demonstrator' projects on key strategic issues that will act as examples for our new approach – for instance climate change○ build internal expertise around the use of structured, deliberative engagement
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>methods as part of the borough plan process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- provide resources to meet translation and interpretation costs to ensure residents who are less confident to speak or write in English can fully participate in our engagement activities- support the next steps in the development of the Citizens' Panel including event costs and support for a new software platform.- ensure our work is informed by the significant learning and good practice available externally via membership of New Local. Membership of the New Local network would give us
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>access to relevant events, tailored workshops on our organisational potential, research and briefings.</p> <p>Further details on this programme of work will be developed ahead of the start of the new financial year and will be made available in due course.</p>
<u>New Capital bids</u>					
	Web and Self Service Projects	<p>The Committee agreed that the Council's website was in need of improvement and requested that the expected timescales for this improvement work be provided.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The current implementation date</p>	<p>The Committee requested that the Cabinet provide clarification on what was meant by "installation of a new platform" and for further details on what improvements will be made to the Council's website.</p>	Yes	<p>The current Haringey website is built using the technology system known as the Drupal 7 platform (This is also often referred to as Content Management System or CMS).</p> <p>Drupal 7 is coming to their end of life – Nov 22</p> <p>End of life means that no more security patches will</p>

		<p>for the installation of a new platform for the Council website is:</p> <p>Start Date 1/12/21</p> <p>End Date 30/11/22</p>		<p>be available, or improvements will be produced for this platform (Drupal 7). Drupal 7 has a very different architecture form Drupal 8 and 9, so it can't be upgraded. We need to move everything to a new version/platform.</p> <p>We are considering Drupal 8 or 9 alongside options outside of Drupal, for due diligence purposes and to the choose the best and most cost-effective alternative.</p> <p>We also considering flexibility and scalability besides cost benefit. Improvement to the residents' online experience improvement is also being considered when upgrading the platform.</p> <p>The new platform will provide a more</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>sophisticated and interactive customer experience to address changing customer expectations from our digital offer - making it easier to navigate and to provide a more tailored experience for residents</p> <p>The council has other websites built in Drupal 7 which need to be moved before Nov 22. Youth space, Tottenham generation. This will also benefit from the current exercise.</p> <p>The new CMS will allow digital services to replace these micro websites and give digital services the capability to roll out other/new microsites. The service will have the option to build microsites via the internal web team rather than going to market. This</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					should enable further costs savings
<u>Draft Capital Programme – 2022/23 to 2026/27</u>					
330	Civic Centre Works	<p>The Committee requested further information about the self-financing element of the scheme, including the role of the Treasury Management Strategy and the repayment of the debt costs.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The Full Business Case for the Civic Centre works including the self-financing elements of the scheme are set out in the Jan 18th Cabinet report.</p>	<p>The Committee noted that the estimated capital cost for Alexandra House were £35m under Option 1 and £1.7m under Option 2. The Committee requested that the Cabinet provides further details about how these figures were arrived at.</p>	Yes	<p>The refurbishment cost of £35m for Alex House, used within the business case, was produced by Internal cost consultants at Haringey Council in December 2021. BCIS figures are based on the latest industry information and provides an independent data source for cost estimating, taking into account the recent market increases being experienced as a result of the Covid Pandemic. These figures are further validated by previous costs estimates, externally produced by GL Hearn.</p> <p>The £1.7m figure is informed by external cost consultancy work by Fulkers Russell and Bailey for the wider refurbishment of station road sites. The figure can be found in the November</p>

					21 Station road Cabinet Report table 1.1. and reflects the asset enhancement works.
N/A	General issue	<p>The Panel a breakdown of the total of £92m allocated across the five years of the draft capital programme, specifically on the proportion of borrowing and of self-financing and on the expected cost of the borrowing to the revenue budget in future.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The Council's capital expenditure programme is set out in section 8 of the budgets report presented to cabinet on 7 December. Appendix</p>	N/A		

		4 to the report contains a line by line breakdown of each priority area capital programme, including the financing for each scheme.			
<u>MTFS Savings Tracker – 2021/22 to 2025/26</u>					
N/A	General issue	The Committee concluded that further clarification was required on the savings and the RAG ratings provided in the table. Specially there were some concerns that some savings were apparently not being achieved but still being rated as amber. The Committee asked for further details to be provided on why the savings had not been achieved and, if pushed into future years, when the	The Committee requested that the savings achieved to date column be fully completed in future savings tracker documents provided to Scrutiny.	No	

		<p>savings were expected to be achieved.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The Council's MTFS savings programme is kept under review throughout the financial year, an update on this will be provided as part of the Q3 cabinet report which will be presented in the March meeting.</p>			
A6.2	Audits and Risk Management	<p>The Committee requested more details about whether the number of audits was being reduced and, if so, an explanation of what these audits involved and why they were no longer required.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p>	<p>The Committee considered that audits are required for robust and independent oversight. The Committee requested that the Cabinet provide clarification on the consequences for audit work from this saving and recommended that the saving should not go ahead if it would result in a reduction of audit work being carried out.</p>	Yes	<p>The Council is committed to maintaining a strong public audit regime, including the work of internal audit. The Council will continue to ensure internal audit work is maintained to meet internal audit standards and ensure any budgetary savings does not compromise the integrity of the work of internal audit. The Authority</p>

		<p>The saving is based on the Council increasing assurances obtained from other parties. The Audit and Risk Management service will continue to identify key areas of audit and present the audit plan to the corporate committee, but with a sharper focus on areas where audits are carried out. The expectation is other parties and external agencies will provide assurances required by the corporate committee over the operations of the Council.</p>			<p>will ensure that there is adequate budget available to provide the necessary levels of assurance from this function.</p>
YC106	Reduction in Legal Services Support	<p>The Committee noted that, under the revenue growth section, there was a proposal to increase funding for back office functions</p>	<p>The Committee felt that the response provided on this item was unclear as they had understood from the previous scrutiny meeting that the original savings proposals to</p>	Yes	<p>The previously agreed savings for Legal Services for 2021/22 have been met. The revenue growth proposal for Legal Services for 2022/23 would enable</p>

		<p>including legal services. However, this previously agreed saving involved a reduction, so the Committee asked for further clarification on how the growth and reduction proposals fitted together and whether they involved different parts of the legal service.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The increased investment in the legal service's establishment is proposed to increase the internal qualified legal capacity to deal with Council priority areas. The prior year's savings proposal primarily focussed on changing work requirements due to</p>	<p>reduce legal support services had not been met.</p> <p>The Committee emphasised their concerns about the impact of a reduction in legal support services, including that specialist legal staff would be required to carry out more administrative functions. The Cabinet recommended that legal services support should not be reduced and sought assurances from the Cabinet that this would not be the consequence of the overall changes proposed.</p>		<p>the service to meet in parts the increasing demand in the Council's priority areas.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

		increased home working following the pandemic and consequently less administration capacity required.			
	Digital Together	<p>The Committee expressed concerns about the low proportion of this saving that had been achieved so far in 2021/22 (£90k out of a target of £750k) and that there was a lack of evidence provided on how this saving would be achieved. The Committee requested further information to clarify this.</p> <p>RESPONSE:</p> <p>The programme has made a total of £328K savings out of which £90K is cashable. The other</p>	<p>The Committee considered that it should be possible for the £328k of savings referred to in the response provided to be quantified and identified.</p> <p>The Committee requested that the Cabinet provides a breakdown of the £328k of savings that have been achieved through this proposal.</p> <p>The Committee also requested that further details be provided on how the overall target of £750k was expected to be achieved.</p>	Yes	<p>Cashable savings of £90k were derived from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic contract review: £60k • Print reduction: £30k <p>Non cashable savings were derived from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £160k reduced spend print • £10k cost avoidance: Automated solution for commercial bin hire • £68k estimated by the Libraries project (move to LMS)- review on-going re profiling of savings between cashable and non-cashable

		<p>savings are either cost avoidance or derived from circumstances in which it is not possible for services to attribute the saving to various budgets which benefit, e.g. efficiencies assisting with savings which impact on many officers' time.</p> <p>We have concentrated effort to find new opportunities which will need to be scoped and then implemented with the necessary savings then being realised. It is the nature of most projects that the savings can only be taken towards the end of the process</p>			<p>Work with management teams across the Council has provided lots of initiatives and opportunities that are being investigated, and will be incorporated into the programme of work, these include processes in revenues and benefits, cross Council procurement processes and contractual savings opportunities.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

		and would fall in later years.			
--	--	--------------------------------	--	--	--