

## Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

<b>Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel – Economy Priority</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested if appropriate)</b>	<b>Comments/Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Agreed/ Not Agreed</b>
<b><u>New Savings Proposals</u></b>					
AHC_ SAV_008	Housing Demand - Targeted 1 bedroom move on project	The Panel requested a written breakdown of the £10m spend on Temporary Accommodation and how many families were expected to be moved on as part of the £80k saving.	<p>The Panel would like further information on how this saving relates to spend for the 100 households targeted for a one bedroom move. An £80k saving spread across 100 households equates to a saving £800 per household. This does not seem to equate with the breakdown provided. What part of the Temporary Accommodation spend are we saving to reach the figure of £80k.</p> <p>In light of time constraints, the Panel are happy to receive a separate written update rather than a response for the Cabinet meeting on 7th February.</p>	No.	
<b>Response to further info request: *See full breakdown at bottom of this document.</b>					
AHC_ SAV_008	Housing Demand - Targeted 1 bedroom move on project	The Panel noted a seeming discrepancy in the figures of the 103 people in TA who required one-bedroom properties, the breakdown of the figures only added up to 100.		No	

		Are you saying that only 100 of the 103 people identified are targeted for a move or is this a typographical error.			
AHC_SAV_008	<b>Response to further info request:</b> There are currently 100 approved households with a 1 bed need in TA (figures accurate as of 3/01/23).				
AHC_SAV_007	Use of 1 bed social housing as Temporary Accommodation	Clarification requested on whether a review of suitability of TA accommodation was carried out and the frequency with which this was done.	Given the propensity of young families to grow and given the length of average stay in Temporary Accommodation, the Panel recommends that the suitability of accommodation used for Temporary Accommodation should be reviewed annually, on family by family basis.  The Panel notes that in the below response, a review is carried out every 18 months. The Panel would like Cabinet to agree to this occurring annually and on a family by family basis.	Yes	Agreed
AHC_SAV_007	<b>Response to further information request:</b> Our aim is to assess or review households every 18 months and include changes in household composition. If it becomes clear the customer's family has naturally increased in size whereby, they are classed as severely overcrowded (i.e. by 2 rooms or more) then we would list them for a transfer in addition to providing advice on their settled housing options.  The speed at which a family may be able to move when severely overcrowded is dependent on a large number of factors. Generally, our reporting allows us to quickly ascertain who may be classed as severely overcrowded. Customers also keep us informed if they have a change in their circumstances and the importance of highlighting this is detailed in the correspondence, they're provided with throughout their homelessness application.				

AHC_ SAV_007	<b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b> Agreed				
AHC_ SAV_007	Use of 1 bed social housing as Temporary Accommodation	The Panel requested a written clarification on the maximum number of adults and the maximum number of children, and the ages of the children, that would be placed in a one-bedroom property.	That Cabinet agree that the placing of families into one-bedroom temporary accommodation should be limited to families with one child only.	Yes	Agreed
AHC_ SAV_007	<b>Response to further info request:</b>  The TA placements policy passed by Cabinet on 18 October 2016 sets out that:  Accommodation must provide adequate space and room standards for the household and be fit to inhabit. Households in temporary accommodation will often be placed into units with 1 bedroom less than they would be entitled to on a permanent basis, with the expectation that the living room provides dual purpose as a living and sleeping area. The following minimum size criteria will apply:  ... One bedroom accommodation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lone parents or couples with 1 child over the age of 1 year (no upper age limit)</li> <li>• Lone parents or couples with 2 children of the same sex (no upper age limit)</li> <li>• Lone parents or couples with 2 children of opposite sexes where both children are under the age of 10 years.</li> </ul>				

AHC_ SAV_007	<b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b> Agreed				
<b><u>HRA Budget</u></b>					
N/A	London Affordable Rent Model	Further information requested on whether any of the 840 new homes scheduled to be allocated to the London Affordable Rent model had not yet received Planning Permission.		No	
London Affordable Rent Model	<b>Response to further information request:</b> 68 have not yet received planning permission.				
N/A	London Affordable Rent Model	It was commented that the gap in affordability to the cap from LAR to formula rent seemed to be slightly larger than was presented in the report.		No	

		The Chair requested some clarity and reassurance of the relative affordability of LAR against formula rent, based on the actual formulas used, rather than their relative proximity to the cap.			
London Affordable Rent Model	<p><b>Response to further information request:</b></p> <p>Formula rents charged for the same bed size varies due to several factors including property values. Hence the gap between formula rent and LAR also varies depending on the location of the property in the borough.</p> <p>The gap between the average actual 2022/23 formula rent, and average LAR (£32.36) is slightly higher than that between average formula rent cap and average LAR (£13.73).</p> <p>However, LAR is significantly less than the Local Housing Allowance rate. This means that any tenant entitled to Housing Benefit, or the housing element of Universal Credit would have their housing costs covered.</p>				
N/A	General point.	Clarification requested on the number of people in Council and Temporary accommodation		No	

		who were working and not in receipt of benefits.			
General Point – TA figures	<p><b>Response to further info request:</b></p> <p>Around 8,290 households renting from the Council – 56.7% - don't get any benefits. We can safely assume that the vast majority work.</p> <p>Around 420 households in TA – 16.8% - don't get any benefits. We can safely assume that the vast majority work.</p> <p>These figures are calculated from December's LIFT data on benefit claimants, data on tenanted Council stock, and data on TA residents. There are some caveats. As these data sources are separately collected, there may be a slight margin of error. There is another very small margin of error connected to the fact that LIFT data excludes a very small group of TA residents (maybe 20-30) in private sector leases whose housing costs are paid by benefits but won't be picked up by LIFT because of a loophole in benefit legislation relating to TA tenants on UC. But they are a very fair indication.</p>				
N/A	London Affordable Rent Model	None	<p>When producing reports in future, that Cabinet commit to the Council being clear, when it talked about different rent levels, about exactly what it was referring to.</p> <p>Rather than using terms like social rents or council rents seemingly interchangeably, the term formula rent should be used when formula rents were meant and similarly London Affordable Rent should be used when that was meant.</p>	Yes	Agreed.

			<p>The Council should also be clear that if a proposal was slightly vaguer on what model should be used, then it should also be clear about this.</p> <p>Members commented that there seemed to be differing expectations at Planning Committee meetings about whether a scheme was using formula rent versus LAR.</p>		
London Affordable Rent Model	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b>  Future reports to Planning Committee and to Cabinet (and any other council committee) will use specific terms for rents.</p>				
N/A	London Affordable Rent Model	None	<p>That the Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel be kept informed of which individual schemes used London Affordable Rent and Formula rent going forwards, and that this be reported regularly to the panel as an update.</p>	Yes	Agreed.
London Affordable Rent Model	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b>  It is suggested that an update report to Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel be presented in 6 months' time with an update on which rents various schemes are using.</p>				

Environment & Community Safety Scrutiny Panel – Environment & Neighbourhoods					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed/ Not Agreed
PL20/9	Full Cost Recovery of Services for Match Day Cleansing Costs.	None	<p>That Cabinet give assurances that it intends to engage robustly with Tottenham Hotspur F.C. to ensure that THFC pays its fair share of the clean-up costs from match days and other event days. The cost should not be borne solely by local tax Council Taxpayers.</p> <p>The Panel would also like clarity as to the amount of money involved in relation to the clean-up costs and how much it is estimated THFC have failed to contribute. The Environment &amp; Community Safety Panel is happy to either receive an update on the figures involved at Cabinet or for a written response to be provided separately.</p>	Yes	See Response

PL20/9	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b></p> <p>Financial Position</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 2021/22 MTFS target to recover £130,000 costs for from the club for matchday cleansing was agreed by Cabinet.</li> <li>• The total costs of match day cleansing will vary each season dependent on the number of matches.</li> <li>• During 2022/23 the service is forecast to spend £100,100 on match day cleansing.</li> <li>• In 2023/24 the service forecasts it will spend a total of £115,000.</li> <li>• To date, the club have contributed no funding towards these costs.</li> </ul> <p>LAMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Area Management Plan (LAMP) was developed and all agreed except for match day cleansing as arrangements for cleansing. responsibilities and costs have yet to be agreed and formalised.</li> <li>• The club provide operational resources within the agreement to undertake waste and cleansing activities pre and post matches, however this is supplemented by the Council to ensure cleanliness is at an acceptable level across all areas directly impacted by matches.</li> </ul> <p>Next steps to achieve the recommendation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LAMP is due for a review, and this is an opportunity to reset expectations across the agreement in its entity including waste and cleansing requirements.</li> <li>• In keeping with the Haringey Deal, we believe that this review should be fully transparent and include Scrutiny, ward councillors, residents and Spurs within the process.</li> </ul>				
ENV_ SAV_004	Not recruiting to existing vacancies within the	None	The Panel would like Cabinet to reconsider this saving. The Panel would like to see the weed control operative post within the Parks service retained and recruited to, and the net saving found from elsewhere.	Yes	See response.

	Parks Service (Net £45k)				
ENV_ SAV_004	<b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b> The impact of these savings will be mitigated by training a number of existing staff in the use of the new weed treatment systems. Whilst this will take staff away from other work, it will mean that there is more resilience within the team to cover the weed treatment works programme.				

Children and Young People's Panel – Children's Services					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed/ Not Agreed
N/A		None	The Panel recommends that, in future years, consultation with residents and stakeholders on the MTFS should aim to be more meaningful, reach a wider range of people and provide a greater opportunity for them to influence proposals.	Yes	Agreed
Consultation Process	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b></p> <p>The council is currently undertaking programmes of work not just to develop our consultation practice but also to broaden the range of approaches we use for meaningfully engaging residents in decisions that affect them. As part of this, officers will review the budget consultation process with a view to identifying how it can be developed to reflect this recommendation and to align with the wider commitments to a different way of working set out in the Haringey Deal.</p>				
N/A		None	<p>The Panel emphasised the importance of rigorous monitoring and reviewing of external risk and measures to mitigate it so that any changes can be responded to in a timely manner.</p> <p>It recommends that, in particular, the budgetary impact of the Safety Valve programme be closely monitored and requests that this be included in the regular quarterly finance updates to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p>	Yes	

Rigorous Monitoring	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b></p> <p>The Safety Valve programme has robust scrutiny and oversight through the Safety Vave Steering Group which is co-chaired by the Director of Finance and Director of Children’s Services and meets on a monthly basis. In addition, the programme is subject to rigorous monitoring externally through quarterly reporting to the Department for Education. Quarterly finance updates provided to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel will include an update on this programme as part of routine reporting on the Dedicated Schools Grant.</p>				
N/A		None	The Panel recommends that, in future years, the equalities impact of specific proposals in the MTFS be outlined more clearly in order to provide Members with a clearer understanding of them.	Yes	See response
MTFS - Equalities Impacts	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b></p> <p>It is important that members have access to available equalities impact analysis to inform the budget decision making process. This reflects our shared responsibility for discharging the public sector equality duty (PSED). Officers will review the process for capturing, and providing members with, equality impact analysis on individual proposals as part of the budget process and will make necessary improvements to this to ensure that members have access to analysis at the right stages of the process.</p>				

Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel – People Priority					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed/ Not Agreed
<b><u>New Revenue Savings Proposals</u></b>					
AHC_SAV_001 & AHC_SAV_005	Improved processes & practices/Improved commissioning & efficiencies	None	<p>Officers explained to the Panel that much of the previously agreed savings proposals, based on demand management approaches had not been possible to achieve (proposals PA9 &amp; C19 on the MTFS Savings Tracker) and so they had been scrapped in favour of alternative savings proposals based on commissioning efficiencies.</p> <p>The Panel observed that the bulk of the new revenue savings for 2023/24 were based on just two proposals and expressed concerns about the risk to the budget if these savings were also not achieved.</p> <p>In relation to improved processes &amp; practices, the Panel would like assurances that residents will continue to have access to the care packages that they need.</p>	Yes	See response
AHC_SAV_001 & AHC_SAV_005	<b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b>				

	As a result of additional specific funding for Adult Social Care announced in the local government financial settlement it has now been possible to reduce the level of savings required from Adult Social Care by £2.7m. It is still recognised that the approach to the delivery of savings in 2023/24 and future years needs to be robust with clear plans in place with rigorous controls to ensure delivery of savings in full.				
N/A	Winter discharge funding	Breakdown to be provided on the distribution of the additional winter discharge funding across the 5 NCL Boroughs.		No	
Winter discharge funding	<b>Response to further info request:</b> <i>** See full breakdown at bottom of this document.</i>				
<b><u>New Revenue Growth Proposals</u></b>					
AHC_GR_001	Acuity/complexity in adult social care clients	None	This proposal related to an additional £2m of funding over and above the £2.8m provided in the existing MTFS due to the increased level of acuity and complexity observed in adult social care clients since the pandemic.  The Panel observed that this was an ongoing risk to the Budget in the	Yes	See Response

			<p>medium/long term and requested further information which showed that a further £3.1m had already been allocated to the 2024/25 adult social care budget due to anticipated growth pressures.</p> <p>The Panel acknowledged the current challenging financial circumstances for adult social care services and sought reassurance from the Cabinet that further anticipated increases in demand on services had been adequately factored into the MTFS going forward.</p>		
AHC_GR_001	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b>  Levels of acuity and complexity will continue to be a challenge for the service from both older adults and younger people transitions. Forecast growth will be regularly reviewed for both older and younger adults, to ensure that any changes are understood by the service and shared with corporate colleagues. At the same time ensure where appropriate health pay for their fair share of the cost of care packages.</p>				
AHC_GR_002	Inflationary Pressures	None	<p>This proposal related to an additional £4m of funding to meet additional costs to adult care purchasing budgets resulting from increased costs to providers. The Panel heard that an expected inflation rate of 5% had been used to calculate the additional funds required. The Panel noted that other projected inflation figures were considerably higher than this. The Office</p>	Yes	See response

			<p>for Budget Responsibility (OBR) for example had recently predicted the inflation rate for 2023 to be 7.4%.*</p> <p>The Panel expressed concerns about the risk of a budget shortfall in 2023/24 should the actual rate of inflation prove to be higher than 5%.</p> <p>(* Based on the Consumer Price Index – see p.19, Economic &amp; Fiscal Outlook – November 2022, OBR  <a href="https://obr.uk/efo/economic-and-fiscal-outlook-november-2022/">https://obr.uk/efo/economic-and-fiscal-outlook-november-2022/</a>)</p>		
AHC_GR_002	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that the impact of inflation on providers will continue to have an impact across 2023 and potentially beyond. Fee increases paid to providers in 2023/24 will be rigorous but fair to help address inflationary pressure and market challenges taking account of the £4m built into the 2023/24 budget together with new funding announced in the provisional local government financial settlement through the Adult Social Care Market Sustainability and Improvement Funding of £1.914m which has now been included in the service budget. Provider cost pressures will remain under review as any provider failure can be extremely expensive to the service.</p>				
N/A	Additional funding – 2024/25	Details to be provided on the additional funding that had already been			

		allocated for 2024/25.			
Additional funding - 2024/25	<b>Response to further info request:</b> The net demographic / inflation growth allocation for Adults Social Care (above current MTFS) for 2024/25 is £3.1m.				
<b><u>Draft Capital Programme – 2023/24 to 2027/28</u></b>					
201	Aids & Adaptations	It was agreed that further data would be provided to the Panel on what the DFG (Disabled Facilities Grant) was currently funding in Haringey and the revised grant position which would be available in early 2023.		No	
201 – Aids and Adaptions	<b>Response to further info request:</b> As of 13 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2023, the 2023/24 grant allocation is yet to be confirmed.				

214	Osborne Grove Nursing Home	<p>The Panel discussed the inflationary pressures on capital projects with a particular focus on Osborne Grove Nursing Home given the significant levels of investment in this project. The Panel was informed that there had been continuous business case reprofiling on Osborne Grove over the past 12 months and that the project remained financially viable.</p> <p>It was agreed that a more detailed update report would be brought to a meeting of the Panel in 2023. This has been added to the</p>	The Committee requested a breakdown of the financial benefits expected, if the scheme went ahead. This was so that these could be shared with the co-design group, in order to elicit further engagement/buy-in from residents.	Yes	Response provided.
-----	----------------------------	---	---	-----	--------------------

		Panel's Work Programme.			
214 – Osbourne Grove	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b>  The business case clearly defines the local need for nursing provision within the borough with only one privately run nursing home located in Haringey at present and two potential new developments in planning for nursing homes which are aimed at the private care market. The creation of OGNH will include 18 Reablement supported accommodation units. An innovative new service that will benefit from its co-location to the nursing home. This provision is aimed at diverting residents from admission into residential and nursing care following hospital discharge. Increased local nursing provision and Reablement supported accommodation will also support wider system savings relating to delayed discharges from acute hospital. An updated business case will be presented to Cabinet when ready.</p>				
<b><u>General issues</u></b>					
N/A	Estimated Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP)	The Panel queried whether capital expenditure was sustainable at the projected levels given the costs incurred by rising interest rates - noting that paragraph 8.35 (Table 8.4) of the Cabinet report on the Budget & MTFs (6 <sup>th</sup> Dec		No	

		2022) illustrated a rise in the estimated MPR from £13.3m in 2022/23 to £37.9m by 2027/28.			
MRP	<p><b>Response to further info request:</b> The overall level of capital spending and resultant borrowing must be affordable and prudent, and the assessment of this forms part of the MTFS process and the report, including the Treasury Management Strategy. The capital programme schemes serve a number of purposes as is stated in the report and the inclusion of a scheme in the capital programme is not in itself permission to spend, as a variety of approvals are required before a scheme can proceed. The capital programme is also an enabling mechanism so that the Council can respond to changes in the environment whilst staying within the budget and policy framework.</p> <p>A significant number of schemes in the programme are assumed to be self-financing and the MTFS assumes that those schemes will produce savings and/or income that at least meets the cost of the borrowing. Whether they will proceed is dependent on their subsequent business case covering the cost of the investment and being approved, and it was noted in the Cabinet report that the current cost and interest rate environment is making it increasingly difficult for business cases to meet this hurdle. Nevertheless, the capital programme must facilitate the possible progression of these schemes and hence their inclusion.</p> <p>The estimated MRP charges (not interest charges) arising from the capital programme are expressed in that table as gross to ensure that there is clarity over the financial effect of the capital programme. Table 8.8 (of the Cabinet report on the budget – 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 2022) shows the effect of the compensatory savings that are assumed as arising from the self-financing programme that offset the costs set out in table 8.4.</p>				

N/A	Council Tax	The Panel asked for an estimate to be provided on the funds that would be raised by a 1% increase in Council Tax.		No.	
Council Tax	<b>Response to further info request:</b> A 1% rise in Council Tax would raise an estimated sum of approximately £1.2m				
N/A	Future reports on the Budget/MTFS to Scrutiny Panels	None	<p>The Panel would like to see future MTFS reports with a panel specific cover report, setting out the key information relevant to each panel and the main Cabinet report attached as an appendix. There was an acknowledgement that this was done to some extent already, but Members would like to see a few extra pages added that pick out the specific parts of the MTFS report relevant to each panel. It was suggested that Members already needed to know their way around the pack to understand where one appendix ended and another began.</p> <p>The Panel would also like to see additional information in relation to joined up budgets between Adult Social Services and Health partners, at future quarterly budget monitoring reports. It was suggested that information was lacking in relation to the health side of joint budgets</p>	Yes	Agreed

Future reports on the Budget/MTFS to Scrutiny Panels	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b>          Next years budget scrutiny process will take on board the recommendation and look to prepare specific panel reports setting out the key information relevant to each panel / Committee.          Further information on joint budget / funding between Adult social services and health partners will be provided at future Adults and Health panel quarterly budget monitoring reports.</p>				

Culture, Strategy & Engagement					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed/ Not Agreed
<b><u>New Revenue Savings Proposals</u></b>					
CSE_SAV_002	Additional commercial advertising opportunities	Clarification to be provided on the definition of "carbon purifying technology".		No.	
CSE_SAV_002	<p><b>Response to further info request:</b></p> <p>Some operators in the market have developed air purifying technology that is embedded in their large format screens. As we would be going out to a competitive tender for this contract it is not possible at this stage to provide further detail on the specific technology or its effectiveness as this is likely to vary between providers. This is something that would be explored through the tender process.</p>				
CSE_SAV_002	Additional commercial advertising opportunities	The Committee raised concerns about the commercialisation of the Council vehicle fleet, given their high profile. The Committee requested a briefing note	<p>The Committee request that Cabinet remove the portion of the overall saving, CSE_SAV_002, that specifically relates to advertising on Council fleet vehicles.</p> <p>In light of the £30k anticipated income stream from having commercial advertising on Council vehicles, the Committee felt that the risks to the Council's image outweighed the relatively low sum of money involved.</p>	Yes	Partial

		<p>which provided assurances about how realistic the assumptions were, and a breakdown of how much income was expected to be raised through this proposal. The Committee also requested information about the oversight of fleet advertising and for example, how the Council could prevent its vehicles being used to advertise a company or organisation that it may not be comfortable with associating itself.</p>			
CSE_SAV_002	<p><b>Response to further info request:</b></p> <p>The council have been working with external advertisers over the last 6 years – from large businesses to other public sector bodies to local small businesses. We ensure that before</p>				

	<p>working with any organisation we undertake appropriate due diligence this includes confirming that for instance they are fully up to date with regards to business rates and regulatory requirements e.g. food hygiene.</p> <p>We have an advertising policy which also ensures that the council are able to refuse advertising where this is appropriate.</p>			
CSE_SAV_002	<p><b>Response to recommendation to Cabinet:</b> The Cabinet share the Committee's view that reputation of the council is crucial. This is why the council has put in place a rigorous advertising policy and strict terms and conditions for advertising.</p> <p>It is proposed that this element of the income generation is moved into year 2 of the draft MTFS. This will create time for further discussion with the Committee about whether the existing policy provides sufficient assurance for this measure to proceed or whether bespoke, additional arrangements should be considered.</p>			
<b><u>Draft Capital Programme – 2023/24 to 2027/28</u></b>				
330 & 464	Civic Centre Works/Bruce Castle	The Committee requested further reassurances on the impact on the revenue budget from the borrowing costs and the ability of the Council to meet those costs, given the economic climate and the significant sums involved. Further		No

		details were required on the self-financing nature of these schemes and what this meant in practice.			
330 & 464	<p><b>Response to further info request:</b></p> <p>Both of these schemes are included in the capital programme as self-financing. This means that a business case (following the 5 Case Business Case model process, which is the standard model for public sector investment) would need to be prepared before any significant investment was undertaken. The business case would need to prove that the expenditure would generate sufficient income and/or savings to pay the capital financing charges.</p> <p>If the schemes were to proceed, then there would adjustments in the Council's budgets to reflect the savings and/or increased income generated by the investment which would offset the cost of the investment.</p>				
<b><u>General issues</u></b>					
N/A	Updated budget figures.	It was agreed that any updated figures for the overall proposed 2023/24 budget, given that new information may be now available that was not available at the time that the original finance reports were		No	

		provided to the Cabinet and Scrutiny Panels in Dec 2022, should be provided to the OSC ahead of its meeting on 19 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2023.			
	<b>Response to further info request:</b> A verbal update was provided to OSC by the Director of Finance on 19 <sup>th</sup> January.				

\* Housing, Planning & Development Panel - Summary of Housing Demand's projected EOY spend as at P8 - 2022/23

<b>Summary of Housing Demand's projected EOY spend as at P8 - 2022/23</b>		
<b>Area of expenditure</b>	<b>£k</b>	<b>Detail</b>
Staffing	4,552	Total staff & other costs
Direct costs of TA	11,145	cost of NPA/PSL/Lodges/AST etc. Includes BDP and HB subsidy
Indirect TA costs	477	Legal and other client costs
Corporate OHDS	1,401	Corporate overheads
Other Hsg initiatives outside HD	907	Various Homelessness Initiatives.
HPG contribution	-8,394	Homelessness prevention grant received
<b>P8 EOY projection</b>	<b>10,088</b>	

Number of families expected to be moved as part of the project = 100 households

**\*\* Adults & Health Panel - Breakdown on the distribution of the additional winter discharge funding across the 5 NCL Boroughs**

North Central London						
Borough	LA Allocation	ICB Allocation		TOTAL	% of London Total	% of England
		Weighted ICB population Allocation	Discharge Performance Allocation			
Barnet	1.21	2.02	4.46	11.87	18%	2%
Camden	1.07					
Enfield	1.08					
Haringey	0.96					
Islington	1.07					
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.39</b>	<b>6.48</b>				