

Overview and Scrutiny

Annual Report 2021/22



Foreword

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee has delivered its work plan for the year in difficult circumstances due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the challenges that emerging from it has presented. Scrutiny has a crucial role in articulating the concerns of the local community and the work plan was therefore based on feedback received from representatives of the community in a series of virtual consultations to determine the issues that were most important to them.

In carrying out our work, we have made sure that the issues raised by the community were followed through and either became reviews, areas of enquiry or individual questions to Cabinet members. We have addressed a wide range of topics including ones that could be challenging or were sometimes difficult to address, led as we have been by a commitment to the independence and vital role of good oversight and transparency.

The Covid-19 pandemic has affected all of us and the Council and its partners face financial and operational challenges arising from it. In addition, there is a severe cost of living crisis that is impacting on the whole community and especially the most vulnerable. We must rise to meet them if we are to adequately support our community through the tough times ahead.

More than ever, scrutiny has a role to play in helping good policy making and bringing the voices of the community forward to make sure we hear them and respond appropriately.

Councillor Khaled Moyeed - Chair, Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Haringey's Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2021/22



Cllr Khaled Moyeed (Chair)



Cllr Pippa Connor
(Vice Chair)



Cllr Dana Carlin



Cllr Makbule Gunes



Cllr Matt White

Co-opted Members:

Church Representatives

- Yvonne Denny
- Lourdes Keever

Parent Governor Representatives

- Anita Jakhu
- Kanupriya Jhunhunwala

Contents

1. What is scrutiny?
2. The structure of scrutiny in Haringey
3. Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC)
4. Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel
5. Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel
6. Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel
7. Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
8. North Central London Joint Health OSC
9. Budget Scrutiny
10. How to get involved

Appendix 1: The functions and service areas covered by scrutiny (2021/22)

1. What is scrutiny?

- 1.1 Overview and Scrutiny was brought into being by the Local Government Act 2000. A requirement of the act is for a local authority with executive arrangements to have one or more overview and scrutiny committees.
- 1.2 These are able to scrutinise the decisions or actions taken by the Council or partner organisations or, indeed, consider any matter that affects people living in the area.
- 1.3 Overview and scrutiny should:
- Provide constructive “critical friend” challenge;
 - Amplify the voices and concerns of the public;
 - Be led by independent people who take responsibility for their role; and
 - Drive improvement in public services.
- 1.4 Overview and Scrutiny plays an important role in local democracy through enhancing local accountability of services, improving transparency of decision-making and enabling Councillors to represent the views of local residents.
- 1.5 The work programme of Overview and Scrutiny is determined by the Councillors that undertake it rather than Council officers or Councillors on the Council’s Cabinet, although they can make suggestions. Suggestions from members of the local community are also very welcome. In addition, consultation exercises have been undertaken by Overview and Scrutiny, including surveys, to identify the issues that matter most to local residents.
- 1.6 The work programme covers a balance of activities:
- Holding the Executive to account;
 - Policy review and development – in-depth reviews to assess the effectiveness of existing policies or to inform the development of new strategies;
 - Performance management – identifying under-performing services, investigating and making recommendations for improvement;
 - External scrutiny – scrutinising and holding to account partners and other local agencies providing key services to the public; and
 - Public and community engagement – engaging and involving local communities in scrutiny activities and scrutinising those issues which are of concern to the local community.
- 1.7 It should also;
- Reflect local needs and priorities;
 - Prioritise issues that have most impact or benefit to residents;
 - Involve local stakeholders; and
 - Is flexible enough to respond to new or urgent issues.

- 1.8 Scrutiny is a flexible process and can be carried out in a variety of ways, using various formats. In accordance with the Scrutiny Protocol, our areas of enquiry have been drawn from the following:
- Performance Reports;
 - One-off reports on matters of national or local interest or concern;
 - Issues arising out of internal and external assessment;
 - Reports on strategies and policies under development;
 - Issues on which Cabinet or officers would like scrutiny views or support; and
 - Progress reports on implementing previous scrutiny recommendations.
- 1.9 In addition, in-depth scrutiny reviews are an important aspect of Overview and Scrutiny and provide opportunities to thoroughly investigate issues and to make recommendations regarding them. Through the gathering and consideration of evidence from a wide range of sources, this type of work enables more robust and effective challenge as well as an increased likelihood of delivering outcomes.
-

2. The structure of scrutiny in Haringey

- 2.1 In Haringey there is one over-arching Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This is supported in its work by four standing scrutiny panels that scrutinise the following service areas:
- Adults and Health;
 - Children and Young People;
 - Environment and Community Safety; and
 - Housing and Regeneration.
- 2.2 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for developing an overall scrutiny work programme, including the work done by the four standing panels.

Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Scrutiny Panels

- 2.3 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is made up of five councillors who are not members of the Council's Cabinet. Membership of Overview & Scrutiny Committee is proportional to the overall political makeup of the Council. The scrutiny panels are made up of between 3 and 7 councillors who are also not members of the Cabinet. Scrutiny panels are chaired by members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and membership is, as far as possible, politically proportionate.
- 2.4 Both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and scrutiny panels oversee discrete policy areas and are responsible for scrutinising services or issues that fall within these portfolios.
- 2.5 A number of scrutiny functions are discharged by both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the individual panels. These include:
- Questioning Cabinet members on areas within their portfolio;
 - Monitoring service performance and making suggestions for improvement;

- Assisting in the development of local policies and strategies; and
- Monitoring implementation of previous scrutiny reports; and
- Budget monitoring.

2.6 As the 'parent' committee, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is required to approve work programmes and to ratify reports and recommendations developed by scrutiny panels. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee also retains a number of scrutiny functions not undertaken by panels. This includes:

- Call-ins: where there is a challenge to decision taken by the Cabinet or individual Cabinet member or a key decision taken by an officer under delegated authority; and
- Councillor call for action: where local councillors can refer matters of genuine and persistent concern which have not been possible to resolve through usual council processes.

3. Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Councillors: Khaled Moyeed (Chair), Pippa Connor (Vice-Chair), Dana Carlin, Makbule Gunes and Matt White

Co-optees: Anita Jakhu and KanuPriya Jhunjhunwala (Parent Governor representatives), Yvonne Denny and Lourdes Keever (Church representatives)

3.1 There were eight formal meetings of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in 2021/22, as well as several evidence sessions for the Committee's Scrutiny Reviews. In addition to the issues set out below, the Committee monitored the Council's performance as set out in the Borough Plan Priority Dashboards, and held a Question and Answer session with the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive on their priorities for the year ahead.

3.2 Cabinet members were invited to share their plans and thinking for their respective areas and answered questions on progress of their work areas. The Cabinet briefs covered in the year were:

- The Leader;
- Employment, Skills and Corporate Services;
- Finance and Transformation;
- Local Investment and Economic Growth;
- Customer Service & Welfare

High Road West

- 3.3 In November 2019, the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel began a detailed piece of work into a proposed regeneration site known as 'High Road West' located in the Northumberland Park ward in the north-east of the Borough. The proposals included the demolition of council homes on the Love Lane estate, a number of businesses including those on the Peacock Industrial Estate and other Council-owned buildings used by community groups. Evidence sessions had been held with a range of witnesses including Council officers, representatives of local businesses and residents' associations. However, the Review was suspended due to the first lockdown period caused by the Covid-19 pandemic as Housing & Regeneration officers were diverted to support the Council's response to the pandemic. In May 2021 the Overview & Scrutiny Committee took the decision to prioritise the completion of the Review as part of its own work programme.
- 3.4 The Committee conducted further evidence sessions including with Council officers, the Council's developer partner Lendlease and with Tottenham Hotspur Football Club. The Committee's final report made recommendations on various aspects of the proposed redevelopment. These recommendations included guarantees that residents transferring from the Love Lane estate should not see an increase in their rent/service charges, on the required infrastructure/green space in the regeneration area and that, in future, regeneration plans should be drawn up using co-production principles with active input from residents, businesses and community and voluntary organisations. The Council's Cabinet approved a response to the recommendations of the review at its meeting on 18th January 2022.

Gambling Inquiry Day

- 3.5 At a meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in July 2021, the Council's draft Statement on Gambling Policy was considered. It was reported that Westminster City Council had undertaken their own research on gambling harms and that evidence gathered from this research was subsequently used as grounds to refuse a licensing application. It was suggested at this meeting that Haringey Council should commission its own research in order to set the Council on a better footing to potentially refuse an application and provide evidence if a decision is challenged/tested in a court of law.
- 3.6 The Centre for Governance & Scrutiny provided scrutiny officers with advice on 'Gambling Inquiry Days' held by other local authorities which aim to bring together a range of witnesses who deal with gambling and the harms that it can cause. This would help to establish what local data is currently available on gambling harms, which people are particularly vulnerable and what is known about the impact of gambling on them.
- 3.7 Haringey's Gambling Inquiry Day was held by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in March 2022. Expert witnesses included a leading academic expert with a research background on gambling policy, the CEO of a gambling support project, a person with lived experience of gambling harms, a local resident

concerned about the impact of gambling establishments in Tottenham and Council officers from the Licensing Team and the Public Health Team. After hearing the range of evidence submitted, the Committee recommended that a funding source should be sought for additional local research on gambling harms, the greater use of education/prevention on gambling as a priority and the establishment of a 'gambling harms prevention champion' to lead any lobbying activity aimed at the government on this issue.

Good Economy Recovery Plan

- 3.8 The Committee received a report from senior officers on the Council's Good Economy Recovery Plan. This had been developed in response to the impact of the pandemic on the borough which had been amongst the most severe in London. The Plan included measures to re-open and support high street and town centres, assist residents into work and training and secure social and economic value through investments in communities and neighbourhoods. The Committee Chair had consulted with Haringey Business Alliance and reported that they were fully supportive of the Plan. The Committee noted that the latest data showed a cautious of growth in the borough but that this represented business taking back some of the recent losses that they had experienced.

Voluntary & Community Sector

- 3.9 The Committee looked in detail about how the Council works with Voluntary and Community Sector in Haringey. This included a presentation from the Chief Executive of the Bridge Renewal Trust, the Council's voluntary sector strategic partner. The Committee scrutinised the outcomes of the outcomes of the voluntary sector community group initiatives that had recently been funded by external funders and by the Council as part of the Covid support grant. It was noted that the Council was aiming to support grass root organisations through specific themes developed through the new Voluntary Sector Community Strategy and a detailed finance report was requested by the Committee.

Universal Credit

- 3.10 The Committee continued to monitor the implementation of Universal Credit in Haringey, receiving a presentation from the local Employment and Partnership Manager at the Department for Work & Pensions. The Committee scrutinised the employment support schemes in the borough, queried the extent to which the DWP was involved with SEND programmes in the borough, sought assurances about the number of job vacancies available to deaf and disabled claimants and proposed further action to support people into employment after coming out of prison.

4. Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel

Chair's Introduction

Cllr Pippa Connor, Chair

Councillors: Pippa Connor (Chair), Mark Blake, Gideon Bull, Nick da Costa, Eldridge Culverwell, Mahir Demir and Sheila Peacock.

Co-optees/Non-voting Members: Ali Amasyali and Helena Kania

Overview

- 4.1 There were five formal meetings of the Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel in 2021/22, one of which was dedicated to scrutiny of the Draft Budget (2020/21) and the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (2020/21-2024/25). The meetings involved Q&A sessions with the Cabinet Member for Adults & Health and discussions with senior Adults & Health officers and a range of external witnesses on key issues of concern. The Panel also held a number of evidence sessions to gather information in support of its two Scrutiny Reviews, both of which were published in March 2022.

Scrutiny Reviews

- 4.2 The Panel published its final report for the Scrutiny Review on Adult Social Care Commissioning & Co-production in March 2022. While the Review initially began with the aim of understanding the commissioning process, the Council's recent emphasis on co-production became an area of particular interest that the Panel focused on in more detail.
- 4.3 The term co-production is not always widely understood and has a number of definitions. Throughout the evidence heard, the Panel's understanding of what residents wanted co-production to mean was for service users and carers to have an equal voice during the decision-making meetings. They wanted a defined role with terms of reference for the specific project with minutes taken and actions agreed; a desire not only to be there at the start of the project, but to monitor its delivery and advocate for any changes within the commissioned service. They wanted their opinions to count. The Panel made 18 recommendations to the Cabinet, including that a charter and framework structure should be established to ensure that everyone is clear about where responsibility of co-production lies and that the meaningful involvement of residents is embedded in the decision-making and delivery monitoring process.

- 4.4 The Panel also published its final report for the Scrutiny Review on Access to Health and Social Care Services for Sheltered Housing Residents in March 2022. The Panel had been concerned that sheltered housing was an area that was struggling with a loss of site managers for each scheme and a change from a mainly older frailer population to also include younger residents with high needs. The Panel visited two sheltered housing schemes in the borough to speak to staff and residents and also took verbal and written evidence from residents, senior managers and other staff. The Panel felt that residents within sheltered housing can often feel forgotten and that consideration needs to be taken over how residents with high health and care needs are being supported and monitored. The Panel made 10 recommendations to the Cabinet, including on embedding sheltered housing schemes in the Council's new locality approach and for improved access to services for residents, such as through regular visits by district nurses and the development of close links with local mental health staff.

Public Health response to Covid-19 pandemic

- 4.5 The Panel scrutinised the Council's public health response to the Covid-19 pandemic, receiving a report from the Director for Public Health. This included a statistical analysis of the age-standardised Covid-19 death rate in Haringey which was slightly above the median for London boroughs and data which demonstrated a moderate to strong correlation between higher rates of Covid-19 deaths and areas with a higher proportion of people from BAME backgrounds. The Panel studied the vaccination rates across the borough, noting that there was a geographical disparity in rates in the east of the borough which were considerably lower than those in the west. A discussion followed on how to increase uptake in the vaccine in communities with lower rates.
- 4.6 The Panel also endorsed the recommendations of the Joint Partnership Board's "Living Through Lockdown" report which examined the experience of adult social care service users and carers in Haringey during the first lockdown. Recommendations included improved communications from the Council/NHS, improved digital service provision/enablement and greater coordination and consistency in services, information and advice. The Panel will continue to monitor the Council's response to these recommendations.

Adult Carers' Strategy

- 4.7 An overview was received by the Panel on the Council's Adult Carers' Strategy for 2020-2023 which is for unpaid adult carers. The Council had recently been working with carers across the borough to co-develop the strategy and a carer and co-Chair from the working group spoke to the Panel about her experience. She had done so because she wanted carers to have a voice and be effectively supported, including young adult carers and carers for those with mental health needs who were underrepresented.

- 4.8 The Panel heard that the launch of the strategy would be followed by the creation of a Carers' Action Plan which had been co-designed with five different workstreams. The Panel emphasised the importance of supporting young people who were caring for their parents or other family members and of understanding that carers do not always understand what support they are entitled to. The Panel also raised issues around the paperwork for carers being too complicated and the lack of awareness about the consultation work. The Panel made a recommendation on better coordination with GP colleagues, including clarification on who would be championing carers' issues within GP practices.

Locality Working

- 4.9 An overview was received by the Panel on the Council's Adult Carers' Strategy for 2020-2023 which is for unpaid adult carers. The Council had recently been working with carers across the borough to co-develop the strategy and a carer and co-Chair from the working group spoke to the Panel about her experience. She had done so because she wanted carers to have a voice and be effectively supported, including young adult carers and carers for those with mental health needs who were underrepresented.
- 4.10 The Panel raised concerns about crime/anti-social behaviour issues around the Northumberland Park Neighbourhood Resource Centre which Members felt could put some vulnerable clients off from attending. The Panel also recommended:
- A review of public transport links to the Northumberland Park Neighbourhood Resource Centre.
 - Early discussions on partnership working and funding for improvements in the surrounding area to the Neighbourhood Resource Centre including the Police, NHS partners, Tottenham Hotspur Football Club and the Council's Regeneration Team.

Mental Health

- 4.11 A presentation was received by the Panel about Haringey's Great Mental Health Programme which was designed to reduce mental health inequalities by targeting at-risk and vulnerable groups and minority ethnic communities. It comprised of seven different programmes of activity including face-to-face and digital support for residents of all ages. Activities included parenting support, befriending groups, outreach work, community-based wellbeing and social activities and tailored support for vulnerable residents. Some of the activities were focused in the central and east parts of Haringey where risk factors for poor mental health were greatest. The Panel was made aware that this was an externally funded programme for one year and that a number of programme activities were due to cease in August 2022 unless action was taken to ensure the sustainability and legacy of the programme.

4.12 The Panel noted the heightened importance of mental health and wellbeing in Haringey following the Covid-19 pandemic and would continue to monitor this as a priority issue in 2022/23.

Cabinet Member Q&A

- 4.13 The Panel held two Q&A sessions in 2021/22 with the Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care and Well-being, Cllr Lucia das Neves, covering a range of topics including:
- The Council's ongoing response to the Covid-19 pandemic, including the vaccination of care staff.
 - Funding for social care and for the prevention of Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG).
 - The renovation of the former Irish Centre site in Tottenham which included plans to provide space for the relocation of day opportunity services provided by the Grace Organisation.
 - Progress on the rebuilding of Osborne Grove Nursing Home.
 - Recent progress of the Haringey suicide prevention group including possible collaboration with the construction industry to support employees.
 - Delays in the completion of home adaptations.

Budget Scrutiny

4.14 As part of the Council's budget scrutiny process, the Panel examined proposals for the 2021/22 budget and the Medium-Term Financial Strategy with recommendations and requests for further information made to the Cabinet.

Joint Scrutiny work

4.15 The Chair of the Panel, Cllr Pippa Connor, is also Chair of the North Central London joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) which covers the boroughs of Barnet, Enfield, Camden, Haringey and Islington (see section 8 of this report). Emerging issues that are raised at the JHOSC are often reported to the Adults & Health scrutiny panel and vice-versa.

5. Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel

Chair's Introduction

"The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Panel covers, amongst other things, safeguarding and education improvement, which are high priorities for both residents

and the Council. The Panel has aimed to focus on the key issues in these areas and the following were included within its work during the year.”

Cllr Makbule Gunes, Chair

Councillors: Makbule Gunes (Chair), James Chiriyankandath, Emine Ibrahim, Josh Dixon, Sarah James, Tammy Palmer and Daniel Stone

Co-optees (Voting): Yvonne Denny (Church of England representative), Anita Jakhu (Parent Governor), Kanupriya Jhunjunwala (Parent Governor) and Lourdes Keever (Catholic Church representative).

Review on Haringey Family of Schools

- 5.1 The Panel completed its review on the range of the different types of school within the borough. It found that there are significant and permanent changes that occur when schools become academies, which are not always fully explained to school governors, who may therefore be unaware of the long-term implications of decisions. In addition, there has been a significant drop in demand for school places, which could have serious implications for the finances of schools. The Council has limited scope to agree a coordinated response to the drop and demand. It was recommended that further work be undertaken to maximise the effectiveness of schools in managing their finances.

Review on Child Poverty

- 5.2 Current data on the scale of child poverty in the borough was of deep concern to the Panel. Levels are also likely to get worse in the next four years due to increases in the cost of living. The Panel therefore felt that poverty should be a key priority within the refreshed Borough Plan. Children are not poor in isolation but as part of families and there are a range of causes. The response therefore needs to be cross cutting, coordinated and collaborative. Families can struggle to find out the support available and there is considerable stigma with seeking help. The expansion of free school meals has provided the Council with a route into schools and can provide the opportunity to improve communication of support available.
- 5.3 Customer Services are the first port of call for many struggling families seeking support. Work should be undertaken to increase further their accessibility and simplify application processes. Families do not always seek to access services at the correct location and work should be done to ensure that families are assisted irrespective of where they seek to access support. The Panel recommended that work on the development of the Council’s Food Strategy be prioritised and be a key part of the refreshed Borough Plan and any strategic plan to address poverty.

Youth Services

- 5.4 The Panel noted that the Council provided universal and targeted youth services. There was a lot of outreach work and this often also involved partners, such as the Police and schools. Mental health is a key focus and not just because of the effects of the pandemic. There had been projects on a wide range of other subjects, including gardening, media, self-defence and music. The pandemic had had a significant effect on participation, reducing attendance by two thirds and a virtual offer had been developed in response. The amount of face-to-face work was now being increased.
- 5.5 The Panel noted the service's five priorities for the forthcoming year:
- Working with the National Youth Agency (NYA) to develop hard and soft outcome measures;
 - Developing co-design;
 - Increasing the number of young people in education, employment and training;
 - Progressing significant capital projects; and
 - Securing longer term funding for a larger proportion of the service's work.

Covid 19 - Impact on Children and Young People

- 5.6 The Panel heard that the full impact of the lockdowns would not be known for some time. Some children had been born during them and deprived of early socialisation, whilst other children had been affected by mental health issues or bereavement. The number of families found to be struggling with poverty had been more than anticipated. There were also concerns about domestic abuse and it was known that many families lived in cramped conditions. Poverty and family stress were most prevalent in the east of the borough but they had also now spread to the west.
- 5.7 The childcare sector had been massively affected and only local authority and a few private nurseries had remained open. The Council had nevertheless been able to offer childcare to all that had asked for it. Facilities had re-opened and there were still the same number of nurseries but not all childminders remained in business. It had been necessary to embed remote education quickly and collaborative work had ensured that provision was strong. A considerable effort had been made to ensure that children had laptops and a large number of free school meals had also been provided. It had been estimated that the average amount of learning lost was three months but it was likely to be more for the most disadvantaged children. The government had allocated £1.4 billion for education recovery and this included £1 billion for tutoring, which would be delivered through schools and colleges.
- 5.8 In respect of social care, there had been concerns regarding vulnerable children not being able to attend hospital appointments and get into school. Work had taken place through Haringey Safeguarding Children's Partnership (HSCP) to set up systems to provide support. The first three weeks after the first lockdown had been focussed on ensuring children had access to basic needs and approximately 1,000 children were identified as requiring particular attention. A system to monitor data on a daily basis was set up. Work was also undertaken with HSCP to provide for face-to-face contact with the most vulnerable children. The response had demonstrated the strength of partnership work in the borough.

- 5.9 The Panel raised the issue of authorisation of school absences of young people who were clinically extremely vulnerable or had parents who were. Many children in such a situation had stayed away when schools had reopened and Education Welfare Officers had been in communication with schools regarding how such absences were marked. The Council had been clear that schools should not be punitive and guidance and support had been provided. Panel Members expressed concern regarding the funding that the government had made available to enable children to catch up on lost learning through the provision of tutoring. It was noted that there were constraints on the use of such funding but schools were working creatively to make the best use of it.

Missing Children

- 5.10 The Panel noted that safeguarding partners supported and had adopted the protocols relating to missing children, which had been reviewed earlier this year. Training on the updated protocol was taking place and included the actions supporting it. Recent achievements by the Council and partners included:
- Development of an app to enable young people to activate support and request a return home interview;
 - Widening the quarterly reporting to provide analysis of key themes and issues in order to better understand child sexual and criminal exploitation; and
 - Repurposing Family Network meetings to provide opportunities for looked after children to develop their care plans and shape their contact arrangements safely.
- 5.11 Looked after children are most at risk from going missing. Missing children were likely to be involved with “county lines” and low-level drug distribution. A disproportionate percentage are from BAME communities and was highest amongst the 15 to 17 age group. Between April 2020 and March 2021, there had been a total of 806 missing episodes reported, involving 190 children. The service were aware of the identities of the children who most frequently went missing and provided a range of support. All children were offered a return home interview but not all took up the offer. Return home interviews were only effective if follow up support was offered that addressed the reasons for absconding.

Area SEND Inspection

- 5.12 The Assistant Director for Early Help, Prevention and SEND, summarised the outcome of the joint area inspection of SEND within Haringey. The inspection had focussed on how well SEND was identified, outcomes improved and needs met. The authority was required to address:
- Poor quality of EHC plans and the annual review process;
 - Lack of partnership working and poor communication and co-production with parents, children and young people;
 - Unacceptable waiting times for Autism Spectrum assessments and insufficient support whilst people were waiting.
- 5.13 A written statement of action was required to be produced within 70 days. Work was also taking place with parents, carers and partners to develop a new SEND strategy. There was a strong focus on outcomes so the authority knew it was making a

difference and that these were measurable through key performance indicators, based on what families told them and what they saw. To truly make the difference, there needed to be shared ownership and accountability with families and partners. The written statement of action was being drafted based on priorities within SEND Strategy. The SEND Executive Board were accountable for its delivery and ensuring the timescales were realistic and outcomes achievable. The Panel were of the view that the plan was very well thought through. A further report was requested in due course that specifically covered the development of a new parent carer forum.

Mental Health and Well-Being of Children and Young People

- 5.14 The Panel heard how the Council and its partners were working together to support the mental health and well-being of children and young people. Services were critical to supporting local children and young people. It was known that Covid had had a huge impact, although the picture from data was complex. There had been a large increase in referrals during the pandemic. Most had been for anxiety and low mood. The prime areas of investment in services had been concerned with crisis and a number of services had been developed. A 24/7 crisis line had been set up as well as an out of hours nurse led service. In addition, Diversion Hubs had been established. These aimed to see young people within four hours and prevent the need for them to go to hospital, which could be very distressing. Trailblazer was also being expanded to the west of the borough. Waiting times for autism assessments were long throughout the NCL area and solutions to this were being worked on. An online platform on ADHD was shortly being rolled out and significant service redesigns were taking place across BEH in order to remove unwarranted variations.

Haringey Safeguarding Children's Partnership – Annual Report

- 5.15 David Archibald, the Independent Chair, reported on the progress made by Haringey Safeguarding Children's Partnership since its inception. The new arrangements had been implemented from September 2019 and there were now three agencies that were equally accountable for safeguarding children. These were the Council, the Police and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The Council provided 80% of the budget. In addition to the amounts in the budget, contributions in kind were also received from agencies. The changes were significant change and a lot of preparatory work had been necessary, including publication of the new arrangements. There was a requirement for them to include independent scrutiny.
- 5.16 The partnership had been developing well but the Covid pandemic had had a severe impact. The partnership had responded strongly to it and increased the frequency of its meetings to ensure that safeguarding was maintained. There had been 10,700 contacts in the previous year. The highest number of these had come from the Police. There had been 2,877 referrals, compared to 3,612 in the year before. Performance data was monitored to identify patterns and regular audits undertaken to promote challenge and learning. National guidelines were followed in respect of serious incidents. There were currently two Serious Case Reviews in progress. There were three specific themes within the priorities for the forthcoming year. These were:
- Children living with mental health issues;
 - Prevention and early intervention; and

- Older children in need of help and protection and contextual safeguarding, including exploitation.

5.17 In answer to a question from the Panel regarding whether the new arrangements were sufficiently robust yet to safeguard children effectively, Mr Archibald stated that the three strategic partners were now working more closely together than in the past. It was widely accepted that the best systems protected children by reducing levels of harm done but it was not possible to reduce this to zero.

Scrutiny of the 2022/23 Draft Budget/5 Year Medium Term Financial Strategy (2022/23-2026/27)

5.18 The Panel considered the budget proposals for 2022/23, which included growth spending of £11.8 million across the Council. Short term use of reserves had made the growth proposals possible. The Quarter Two financial position for Children and Young People (C&YP) showed an overspend of £7 million, £3 million of which was from Covid. The Dedicated Schools Grant showed an overspend of £6.3 million. The key driver for this was the increased number of children with Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans. The proposals provided growth funding for C&YP of £4.172 million in 2022/23 and £5.376 million during the MTFS period. There were also savings of £1.679 million in 2022/23 and £2.039 million for the period as a whole. The capital budget included £92.9 for C&YP services during the MTFS period, which was funded by government grant and borrowing. There was one new scheme included within this, which was for a new in-borough residential care home, which would provide high quality provision at a lower cost. The projected year end deficit of the DSG was £23.9 million. The total within the DSG for the forthcoming year was £288.34 million.

5.19 The Panel commented that the language that was used in the report to describe the reasons for the overspend in the High Needs Block of the DSG could be open to the misinterpretation that children with EHC plans were being blamed. An overspend was inevitable as SEN was inadequately funded by central government. It was demand led and the Council had a responsibility to deliver services. Councillor Zena Brabazon, the Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Families, stated that the cause of the overspend was that there was insufficient funding from the government and there was no intention to blame families. The responsibility for providing support had been extended until the age of 25 for some young people but no additional funding had been provided. Families had a legal right to support and it was a demand led service. It was noted that there was a commitment by the Council to consult but the documentation was not easy to understand and needed to be made more accessible to members of the community. Other local authorities had addressed this issue and an option that could be explored was the provision of easy to read version.

Cabinet Q & A

5.20 Councillor Zena Brabazon, the Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children, and Families, attended meetings of the Panel and took part in a Q&A at two meetings. Amongst the issues raised were;

- Parental involvement in special educational needs and the development of a new parents forum;

- Early Years provision; and
 - Falling school rolls.
-

6. Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel

Chair's Introduction

"We had a busy year in 2021/2022. As well as the normal business of the panel, taking evidence from cabinet members and scrutinising the budget, there were a number of matters that required specific focus. We took evidence from a delegation regarding the Edmonton incinerator and then followed up with a session with North London Waste Authority, in order to find out more about the scheme. We also took evidence on the difficulties with the online parking permit system and on the destruction of trees at various locations in the borough. We began an in-depth scrutiny on Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, which will need to be completed this year. The meetings were held in a hybrid format, for Covid security. Hopefully we will be able to go back to in person meetings this year.

Cllr Dana Carlin, Chair

Councillors: Dana Carlin (Chair), Gideon Bull, Scott Emery, Julia Ogiehor, Eldridge Culverwell, Preston Tabois & Kaushika Amin

Co-opted Member: Ian Sygrave (Haringey Association of Neighbourhood Watches)

Overview

6.1 There were five formal meetings of the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel in 2021/22, one of which was focused on scrutinising the budget proposals for the Place priority of the Council's Borough Plan. The work plan for the panel for 2021/22 was made up of a combination of issues raised by the Panel Members and areas of concern put forward by councillors, residents and partners as part of the scrutiny survey undertaken in February 2021. The Panel held Q&A Sessions with the Cabinet Members responsible for the policy areas under its remit and discussions with senior Environment & Neighbourhoods officers, Strategic Planning officers and a number of external stakeholders on key issues of concern. The Panel also began its Scrutiny Review on Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and held evidence sessions to gather information in support of the review.

Community Safety

6.2 The Panel scrutinised a range of topics during the year. In relation to community safety these included a report which set out the Haringey Crime and ASB hotspots and the actions being taken to reduce crime in these areas. The Panel

received performance information against MOPAC performance indicators, as well as a presentation from the Borough Commander and the Leader of the Council on the Community Safety Partnership's local priorities for tackling crime in the Borough.

Strategic Transport

- 6.3 The Panel received a number of updates on the Council's Transport Planning programmes, including the draft Walking and Cycling Action Plan, the Low Traffic Neighbourhood Programme, Transport for London funding update (post covid), and actions being taken to reduce congestion and improve east to west transport links.

Waste, Recycling & Parking.

- 6.4 The Panel received updates on Veolia as well as performance levels in respect of waste, recycling and street cleansing performance. The Panel also received an update on the Fly tipping Strategy as well as an update on the implementation of the Parking Transformation Plan. The Panel received updates on proposed changes to waste legislation that have been announced by the government, which include the Extended Producer Responsibility Consultation 2021, the Deposit Return Scheme 2021 and the Household and Business Consistency in Recycling Consultation 2021.

Parks & Green Spaces.

- 6.5 The Panel received updates on the Council's tree strategy, including additional investment in new trees. The Panel also received updates on the draft Parks and Green Spaces Strategy and flood management works that were being undertaken in Queen's Wood.
- 6.6 The Panel received a deputation on proposals to replace the NLWA waste incinerator at Edmonton and how this fitted in with the Council's wider climate change goals. The Panel also received deputations at its meetings around the management and maintenance of Parkland Walk and the need for increased investment in street trees across the borough.

NLWA Heat and Power Project

- 6.7 Following concerns raised by local residents, the Panel invited the North London waste Authority to give a presentation and to answer questions around its Heat and Power Project, which included proposals to invest in a new waste incinerator at its Edmonton Eco Park site.

Updates on Previous Scrutiny Reviews

- 6.8 The Panel received a further update on the implementation of the recommendations from its Scrutiny Review into Cycling and also received an initial update on the implementation of the recommendations from the review into Supporting Better Access to Parking for Disabled People and Blue Badges.

Financial Scrutiny

- 6.9 As part of the Council's formal budget scrutiny process the Panel examined proposals for the 2022/23 budget and the Medium Term Financial Strategy in December 2021 with recommendations subsequently made to Cabinet.

Cabinet Member Q&A

- 6.10 The remit of the Panel covers the portfolios of three Cabinet Members and the Panel held Q&A sessions with each Cabinet Member. The Panel had two Q&A sessions with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and the Climate Emergency, key areas of questioning involved; the Climate Emergency, Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, Parks and Green Spaces and the Walking and Cycling Action Plan.
- 6.11 The Panel also held one session with the Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Welfare and the Public Realm. Key areas of questioning included; Parking and Blue Badges, Public Realm improvements, Waste Management and Enforcement. The Panel held one Q&A session with the Leader of the Council around her Community Safety portfolio, which focused on Serious Youth Violence, Crime Hotspots, Violence against Women and Girls, Hate Crime, Early intervention and the Turnpike Lane Strategy Forum.

7. Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel

Chair's Introduction

"This year, the Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel has covered a wide range of topics within its remit. We've heard evidence on how regeneration projects like the Wards Corner scheme in Seven Sisters impact on the local communities there. We've looked at how outstanding repairs and maintenance issues affect Broadwater Farm residents. We've examined how well the Council is embedding the need to combat climate change in its council house building and estate renewal schemes. We've asked questions about how well the Council is conducting ballots on demolitions of existing council housing in its housing and estate renewal projects.

As well as asking questions of the two Cabinet Members whose portfolios fall within the Panel's remit, we've heard from several deputations from residents, who have provided valuable input into our deliberations and helped us form the recommendations we put to the Council's decision makers.

More detail on the Panel's activities is set out below."

Cllr Matt White (Chair)

Councillors: Matt White (Chair), Dawn Barnes, Ermine Ibrahim, Bob Hare, Noah Tucker, Kirsten Hearn, Charles Adje.

Overview

- 7.1 There were five formal meetings of the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel in 2021/22, one of which was dedicated to scrutiny of the Draft Budget (2022/23) and the Medium Term Financial Strategy (2022/23-2026/27). The meetings involved questioning Cabinet Members and discussions with senior Housing & Regeneration officers and senior Homes for Haringey staff on key issues of concern. The Panel also held a number of evidence sessions to gather information in support of its scrutiny reviews.

Scrutiny Review – Wards Corner

- 7.2 The Panel has been gathering evidence during 2021/22 as part of a Scrutiny Review into the future of the Seven Sisters indoor market site in Tottenham, as part of the Wards Corner development. The Panel received deputations from two different sets of community groups at its September meeting and agreed to look into the issue in more detail.
- 7.3 The Panel undertook a Scrutiny Review on Wards Corner in 2018, the current review is a follow-up review to look at future options for the site following the end of the Council's development agreement with Grainger, after Grainger pulled out. The site is owned and managed by TfL. TfL are pulling together proposals for the future management of the site and have been engaging with local stakeholders, including the Council and community groups. Cabinet has been exploring options to support a community plan for the site. However, not all of the community groups and market stall holders support the community plan. The Panel have been looking into the various options and will be producing a report with recommendations about the future of the site and the Council's role within this.

Scrutiny Review – Broadwater Farm Repairs

- 7.4 Site visits by Panel Members have taken place at Broadwater Farm to examine the progress with implementation of the Decent Homes Plus monies agreed by Cabinet in 2019. This money was to cover estate improvements such as kitchens and bathrooms, but also investment in communal areas across the Broadwater Farm estate. The recommendations from the Review will be rolled into a future Scrutiny Review on the future of Housing Delivery options in Haringey.

St Ann's Development

- 7.5 The Panel received an update on the proposed development of the St Ann's site. This site was purchased by the Mayor in 2018 as part of the Mayor's Land Fund and the Mayor has subsequently appointed Catalyst as its development partner. The redevelopment would deliver around 930 new homes, 60% of which will be affordable. It will also provide a new and enlarged Peace Garden, improved

streets as well as new retail and affordable workspaces. The Council was in negotiations to purchase 50% of the affordable rent homes. The Panel's focus in this area has been on the purchase of new Council homes, seeking to maximise the number of homes that we can purchase, and the number of homes provided at social rents. The Panel was also interested in ensuring that service charges should be the same across all Council properties and ensuring that the Council would have full nomination rights for the 50% of affordable homes it has purchased.

Climate Change

- 7.6 The Panel received a report on Climate Change and how portfolios and services across the Council were contributing to reducing carbon emissions. Haringey has made a commitment that the borough would be carbon net-zero by 2041 and that the Council's buildings and vehicle fleet would be carbon net-zero by 2027. The Council has allocated £101m to retrofitting Council housing stock and the Panel was advised that a strategy is being developed around this programme, which includes focusing on the worst performing buildings first. The Panel's key areas of interest in this area were: Discussions on a pan-London energy retrofit programme, as well as the Energiesprong pilot to retrofit homes in Haringey in agreed pilot locations; progress against carbon reduction targets; the roll-out of electric vehicles; and enforcing minimal energy efficiency standards through the private landlord licensing scheme.

Love Lane

- 7.7 The Panel received an update on the resident ballot undertaken on the Love Lane estate as part of the High Road West Regeneration scheme. The ballot took place from 13 August to 6th September and was administered by Civica Election Services. The results of the ballot were that 55.7% voted in favour of the proposals, with a turnout of 69.4%. The Panel made some recommendations to the Cabinet Member about ensuring that, in future, officers did not post sealed ballot papers on behalf of residents with mobility issues and that the Cabinet Member give consideration to looking at undertaking a further ballot.

Cabinet Member Q&A

- 7.8 The Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel oversees a range of issues that cover the portfolios of two different Cabinet Members: the Cabinet member for Planning, Licensing and Housing Services and the Cabinet Member for House Building, Place Making and Development. Rather than have dedicated Q&A sessions focused around a particular portfolio area, the Panel sought to have both Cabinet Members attend each meeting and to respond to questions throughout the course of the meeting. The key areas of questioning were around:
- The Council's Housebuilding programme and progress to date on building new Council homes.
 - The refresh of the Local Plan and consultation around this.
 - High Road West
 - Wards Corner and future plans for this site
 - Broadwater Farm – Repairs and maintenance issues

- Homes for Haringey's Repairs Service
- St Ann's Development
- The Climate Emergency.

Financial Scrutiny

- 7.9 As part of the Council's budget scrutiny process, the Panel examined proposals for the 2022/23 budget and the Medium-Term Financial Strategy with recommendations and requests for further information made to the Cabinet.
-

8. North Central London Joint Health OSC

Overview

- 8.1 Haringey is a part of a joint health overview and scrutiny committee (JHOSC) covering the boroughs of Barnet, Enfield, Camden, Haringey and Islington. Each borough has two representatives on the Committee. Haringey's representatives on the JHOSC were Cllrs Pippa Connor (Chair) and Khaled Moyeed. The Committee was established to scrutinise health issues common to all of the five boroughs. Amongst the issues discussed this year at the JHOSC were the following:

GP Services

- 8.2 The Committee heard that all contracts with GP practices were delegated from NHS England to CCGs. GP practices were working together with local health and voluntary services in groups, known as Primary Care Networks. Alliances of GP practices were also working together to deliver primary care services and these were known as GP Federations. Under the developing Integrated Care System (ICS), it was envisioned that GP provider alliances would ensure a strong voice for primary care in decision-making.
- 8.3 Primary care had worked exceptionally hard throughout the Covid-19 pandemic. There had been a reduction in face-to-face provision at the beginning of the pandemic but over 50% of appointments were now face-to-face and were provided if requested. The traditional model was still important but the system needed to modernise to deal with demand and ensure high standards. The Committee highlighted the principles of post-Covid digital healthcare that were included in the Healthwatch report; Locked Out: Digitally excluded people's experiences of remote GP appointments:
- Maintain traditional models of care alongside remote methods and support patients to choose the most appropriate appointment type to meet their needs;
 - Invest in support programmes to give as many people as possible the skills to access remote care;
 - Clarify patients' rights regarding remote care, ensuring people with support or access needs are not disadvantaged when accessing care remotely;

- Enable practices to be proactive about inclusion by recording people's support needs;
- Commit to digital inclusion by treating the internet as a universal right.

8.4 The Committee noted that changes to the way NHS Digital would access and use GP data had been announced. GPs would provide pseudonymised data, which would be used to plan services and monitor delivery. They accepted that the data would be valuable for research purposes but expressed concerns about its commercialisation. It was considered that the governance arrangements and safeguards for patient data needed to be clearer.

Mental Health and Community Services Review

8.5 The Committee noted that there were mental health and community services reviews being run concurrently as they provided a number of related services. A key aim of the reviews was to ensure that there was a consistent offer across North Central London. Resident engagement was at the centre of the review design principles and there was a resident reference group with diverse membership and representation from all five boroughs. It was acknowledged that there had been minimal feedback from harder to reach groups and work was underway to maximise engagement from such groups. The review had a strong focus on increased prevention and would consider whether it was possible to provide services more directly, without the need for a referral.

Digital Inclusion and Health Inequalities

8.6 The Committee received a report on the work of the Communities Team, which had been set up as part of the NCL CCG Borough Directorate. It had been developed to focus on health inequalities and the delivery of plans to address them. The team was focusing on developing interventions to address inequalities but their wider determinants needed to be understood to do so effectively. Understanding the needs of residents and empowering them would enable the right interventions to be put in place.

8.7 Officers stated that it was important that they were able to demonstrate that local communities and residents had been listened to. Medical interventions were not always required to address inequalities and social interventions, employment opportunities or access to digital resources were sometimes needed instead. Through understanding the experiences of residents, interventions could be better embedded into assessments. The Committee requested an update in due course, including information on the next cohort of projects and how residents had been engaged with.

Update on Integrated Care Systems (ICS)

8.8 An overview of the development of the ICS, including its benefits for residents, was received by the Committee. The ICS would take on responsibilities which previously sat under the CCG and be placed based. The new set up would enable continued engagement with residents and the ability to respond to their needs, which had changed following the pandemic. The Integrated Care Board (ICB)

would be established to work with local authorities to understand the place-based partnerships arrangements and how the ICS could best deliver these. The primary aim of the ICS was to streamline work and reduce unnecessary bureaucracy. Clinicians would remain at the heart of the system, but services would be designed around local people.

- 8.9 The Committee noted that local authority involvement would be a key aspect of the ICS and the NCL Partnership Council would have all five local authority Chief Executives on it. There was a commitment to collaborative working, which had already been evidenced over the previous 18 months. It was not anticipated that there would be any change in terms of the role and engagement with the JHOSC but officers were unable to provide specific detail on arrangements as the bill had still not been confirmed.
- 8.10 Seven recommendations had been put forward by the Committee:
1. The Integrated Care System (ICS) and its committees should be as open to the public as possible.
 2. The NHS ICS Board should include local authority representation, local authority voting rights, and the ability to discuss and challenge decisions. It should also ensure that all agendas, minutes, and relevant documents are open to the public. It was considered that this would ensure transparency and accountability.
 3. The role of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) should be maintained, including the ability to scrutinise all decisions made by the ICS. It was also considered that the JHOSC should retain the right of refer matters to the Secretary of State.
 4. The ICS should consider how patient and resident voices would be included in its processes. The JHOSC felt that patient and resident voices should be included at all levels, including the top level.
 5. The JHOSC also requested further detail on the arrangements for the NHS ICS Board, the governance and committee structure within the ICS, and the relationship between the different committees, and how the voices of patients and residents would be included.
 6. The ICS should have an identified committee that was aware of any business relationships between primary, secondary, and tertiary providers to ensure openness and transparency.
 7. To support the NCL NHS Watch recommendation.
- 8.11 They had been noted by the ICS but they were unable to respond until after the bill had been passed.

Winter Pressures

- 8.12 The Committee noted that the priorities for winter were to reduce ambulance handover delays, to maintain elective recovery and to maintain the rollout of the vaccination programmes for Covid-19 and the flu. There had been increases in primary care and urgent presentations, as well as low acuity appearances at A&E. 6% of general and acute beds and 20% of critical care beds were occupied by Covid positive patients. 80% of these patients were unvaccinated, which underlined the importance of maintaining the vaccination programme. There were high levels of bed occupancy with an average of 96% across North Central

London (NCL). The pandemic had exponentially increased how trusts provided mutual aid and that escalation triggers were in place and had been strengthened for winter.

- 8.13 In relation to primary care, situation reports were being undertaken by practices every two weeks. There were some concerns about a small number of practices being closed and work was underway with them to ensure continuous provision. 20% of practices were reporting constraints on administrative capacity and some staff were experiencing abuse from patients. The Winter Access Fund had provided approximately £7 million to extend primary care capacity over the winter period. This would be supporting practices to extend same day access and would be channelled into the areas with the highest levels of deprivation.
- 8.14 The Committee noted that the London Ambulance Service (LAS) had experienced a large increase in demand. In relation to hospital breaches in October 2021, it was reported that there had been 450 over an hour at North Middlesex Hospital, 459 at Barnet, 333 at the Royal Free, 159 at Whittington, and 48 at University College London Hospital. Since October, the LAS had been developing a new process, which had been trialled over a two week period and had reduced delays. The non-emergency NHS number, 111, had seen significant activity over the pandemic with a 30% increase in calls which was approximately 610,000 calls per year. Additional call volumes were anticipated over the winter and that suitable resources should be in place, although there were staff retention issues across the country. Work had been undertaken by the LAS to identify which trusts were under the most pressure and which had capacity and boundary areas had been adapted in response. A number of LAS sites across London had been reconfigured in response to the Covid-19 pandemic but had now been deconsolidated to increase capacity. There was a long term ambition for the LAS to move to a more centralised model but no further changes were anticipated at present. It had been difficult to identify direct links between changes and impacts due to the number of developments that had taken place.
- 8.15 The Committee requested a future update on the results of the proposed actions to improve LAS waiting times. In relation to e-consult, the Committee asked to receive additional information on how it was being used and whether it was an appropriate platform. In relation to workforce pressures, the Committee requested a future update to ensure that GPs and staff were appropriately supported.

Elective Services Recovery

- 8.16 The Committee received an update on elective services recovery in North Central London. At various points over the past two years, elective services resources had been redeployed to respond to the Covid-19 pandemic. Infection prevention control measures had also reduced the efficiency of services by about 15%. The elective services waiting list had grown but this had provided some opportunities to transform delivery and work differently. NCL had been the first Integrated Care System (ICS) in London to be given permission to re-start elective services. A new elective centre had been opened in the Grafton Way building of University College London Hospital (UCLH). Seven clinical networks had been developed, which covered the high volume elective specialties and had resulted in improvements to pathways.

- 8.17 NCL had been identified as an accelerator site and this provided some additional funding. 15 projects had been funded through the programme, including a community gynaecology service and a data system which meant that all providers had access to waiting lists and could look to redistribute patients accordingly to even out waiting times.
- 8.18 The Chair noted that there were particular stresses around workforce and suggested that it would be useful for the Committee to consider this. It was commented that this could focus on the pilots, possibly the health and social care pilot where there was some council involvement. The Chair added that the Committee would request an update on the outcomes of the elective services recovery programme and whether waiting times had been reduced as a result.

Dental Services Update

- 8.19 The Committee noted that dental practices had been asked to close at the start of the Covid pandemic due to safety concerns and had remained closed for 12 weeks, which had caused a large backlog. During this period, only patients in urgent need had been seen. Urgent care hubs had been established and these had been treating between 1500 and 1750 patients per day. Primary care dental services were being gradually re-established, with full capacity being reached in the current quarter. £50 million of short term funding had been allocated by the government to address backlog. The funding was only for eight weeks and could not be carried over.
- 8.20 There was a London wide access issue for dental care and this had been the case before the pandemic. Services were doing that they could to deal with it. There were still 35 urgent care hubs and these were operational from 8:00 a.m. till 1:00 a.m. and were treating 600 patients per day. However, they could only see people who were in pain. The eight weeks of additional funding was welcome but would not fully address the backlog. The Committee expressed concern at the backlog and the long waiting times for secondary care. It expressed its support for efforts to secure additional funding and improve access.

Estates Strategy Update

- 8.21 The Committee received a report on progress with the Estates Strategy. More than 50% of primary care accommodation had been assessed as unfit for purpose. There was a driving need for investment and the realisation of assets. The strategy was also about reinvestment of capital. The aim was to ensure that all primary care estates were fit for purpose but there was insufficient capital available currently. However, there had been some successful external bids for capital. It was important that there was system wide prioritisation covering the next three to ten years. NCL were looking to work with partners on a local and national basis.
- 8.22 The three-year indication of capital allowances was useful as it facilitated planning. There was a £20 million reduction in capital though and consideration was being given to clinical led prioritisation. It was expected that the capital shortfall would reduce. There was a need for ambition to be maintained and

external funding to be obtained. The Strategy would need to ensure that Primary Care and Primary Network (PCN) priorities reflected local needs and optimised work with local authorities. There had been few recent estates disposals because of the pandemic.

- 8.23 The Committee requested further information regarding terms of reference, how local concerns were fed into the forums, their relationship with the NCL Estates Board. Details of membership and access to minutes were also requested. They also requested an update on disposal of assets, including details of which estates had been sold and how the capital realised had been used. It was noted that there was a £40 million gap in funding for primary care. More work was needed on how this gap would be reduced. Further information was requested on how revenue fitted in with capital as well as to gain an understanding regarding capital receipts, including who they were retained by. It was important to avoid the selling estates to mitigate revenue pressures.

9. Budget Scrutiny

- 9.1 As part of the Council's governance arrangements for the development of the new Medium Term Financial Strategy, Overview and Scrutiny considered savings proposals that were presented to the December 2021 Cabinet. Following consideration by Cabinet, all four Scrutiny Panels met in December and January to scrutinise the draft budget proposals that fell within their portfolio areas. In addition, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee met on 13th January to consider proposals relating to Your Council/Priority X.
- 9.2 Cabinet Members, senior officers and finance leads were in attendance at each meeting to present proposals and to respond to questions from members. For some of the proposals, additional information was requested. This was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 20th January, along with emerging recommendations from each Panel, ahead of final recommendations being agreed and referred to Cabinet.
- 9.3 Key recommendations from Overview & Scrutiny included:
- The Committee expressed concerns about slippage from previously agreed savings leading to additional pressure on growth budgets and sought reassurance from Cabinet about these risks.
 - The Committee scrutinised the site acquisition of the 'Wards Corner' site requesting that the Cabinet provide clarity about future investment to make the

market viable and recommended that any capital funding used if the Council was minded to carry out the CPO without the developer should be used for the maximum provision of council homes at council rents.

- A commitment was sought from the Cabinet to address existing inequities in tree coverage and recommended that the east of the borough be prioritised when planting new trees.
- A recommendation was made in support of additional investment into active travel, with a particular focus on cycling infrastructure.
- Concerns were raised 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. A recommendation was made that the Cabinet give consideration to whether funding is sufficient in this area, including specifically on whether additional Occupational Therapists were required.
- The commitment by the Council to engage with the community regarding the MTFS proposals was welcomed. However, it was felt that more needed to be done to improve the accessibility of the MTFS documentation to promote more effective engagement with the local community.

- 9.4 The final recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, were considered by Cabinet at its 8th February meeting. The response from Cabinet to all recommendations can be found via the following link:
<https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s129919/Appendix%209%20Budget%20Scrutiny%20Recommendations%202021-22.pdf>

10. How to get involved

- 10.1 Public engagement and involvement is a key function of scrutiny and local residents and community groups are encouraged to participate in all aspects of scrutiny from the development of the work programme to participation in project work. For this purpose, all formal meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the four scrutiny panels are held in public and everyone is welcome to attend.
- 10.2 As well as attending a scrutiny meeting, there are a number of ways in which local people can be actively involved in the scrutiny process:

Suggest a topic for review

- 10.3 Members of the public and community groups can suggest topics for possible scrutiny review. Please use the scrutiny suggestion form (Word, 52KB) to suggest a topic for inclusion within the scrutiny work programme.

Being a witness

- 10.4 Like parliamentary select committees, a range of individuals may be asked to give evidence to support scrutiny reviews. This may include service users and community stakeholders, as well as service providers, policy makers, managers and people who have some knowledge or expertise of the area under consideration.
- 10.5 The ways in which evidence is collected will vary, but may include online surveys, focus groups or public meetings. Details of current scrutiny projects and how you can participate can be viewed on the scrutiny consultation page.

Asking questions

- 10.6 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee or scrutiny panels may call a Member of the Cabinet and chief officer (such as a service Director) to answer questions on the performance, policy plans and targets for their portfolio or service. The Committee or relevant scrutiny panel may also call local NHS executives to account for policy and performance issues in the health sector. Representatives from other local public services (for example, police service, fire service, housing associations or Jobcentre Plus) may also be invited to scrutiny meetings where appropriate.
- 10.7 Members of the public can also raise questions about a subject being scrutinised and can submit written questions to be asked of executive councillors and chief officers called before the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or panels. 11.8 Questions should be sent in writing at least 5 clear working days in advance of the meeting. Questions can be sent by email or post to the Democratic Services Manager, or the appropriate committee or panel support officer.
-



www.haringey.gov.uk

Further information

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Dominic O'Brien: 020 8489 5896 dominic.obrien@haringey.gov.uk

Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel

Dominic O'Brien: 020 8489 5896 dominic.obrien@haringey.gov.uk

Children and Young People Scrutiny Panel

Rob Mack: 020 8489 2921 rob.mack@haringey.gov.uk

Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Panel

Philip Slawther: 020 8489 2957 philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel

Philip Slawther: 020 8489 2957 philip.slawther2@haringey.gov.uk

For general information or enquiries:

scrutiny@haringey.gov.uk

Overview and Scrutiny
George Meehan House
294 High Road N22 8JZ
