

## Budget Scrutiny Recommendations 2023/24

Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Corporate, CS&E and E&RE)					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed/ Not Agreed
<b><u>General Issues</u></b>					
Community Safety, Waste & Enforcement	2023/24 Budget Position	Details to be provided on the part of the underspend relating to “curtailing uncommitted maintenance and improvement works” (page 52 of agenda pack).  Response outstanding			
Culture, Strategy & Engagement	2023/24 Outturn Position & 2024/25 Budget Position	None	Noting the particular budget pressures relating to Digital and IT services and that this was exacerbated by the higher levels of insourced services in recent years, the Panel recommended that all knock-on costs associated with insourcing should be budgeted for over the longer-term at the time when that decision is made.	Yes	

Culture, Strategy & Engagement	2023/24 Outturn Position & 2024/25 Budget Position	<p>Noting that the budget pressures relating to Digital and IT services also included factors such as the exchange rate, general inflation, licences/contracts and hardware (in addition to insourcing costs as above), the Panel requested a breakdown of these costs.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The £0.23m projected budget pressure in Digital Services reported at Q2 comprised contract pressures of £0.33m offset by an underspend on staffing of £0.10m. The projected contract pressure is based primarily on additional costs being incurred on in-year contract renewals with suppliers raising prices to account for inflation and exchange rate movements. Movement</p>			
--------------------------------	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>of Digital contract inflation is tracked within the Service with pressures reported as part of the budget monitoring process and forecasted into future financial years to aid budget monitoring and financial planning. The process used to track and report inflation involves complex formulas and calculations which track contracts over multiple years of indexation linked to contract regulations and fiscal movement. This makes it difficult to break the causes of increasing contract costs down into a consolidated report in the way requested by the Committee.</p>			
Table 7.2c	Management Actions (page 56 of	The Committee noted that under Environment & Resident Experience for 2025/26, there was			

	agenda pack)	an overspend of £35k predicted and requested details on the reason for this.  Response outstanding			
<b><u>MTFS Savings Tracker</u></b>					
PL20/9	Full cost recovery of matchday cleansing service	None	The Committee considered the use of Council taxpayers funds to meet the costs of matchday cleansing services to be unacceptable and recommended that the Council continues to urgent pursue negotiations with Tottenham Hotspur Football Club to secure full cost recovery of all matchday cleansing service, including recovery of funds retrospectively for costs incurred in previous years since the opening of the new stadium.	Yes	
N/A	Digital Together	None.	The Committee noted that this proposal involved a substantive sum of money but that over 90% of the savings in 2023/24 had not yet been achieved. The Committee further noted that the savings needed to be achieved on a cross-cutting basis with all service departments adopting more efficient systems and processes. The Committee recommended that the Cabinet explain how each service department will be engaging with this proposal	Yes	

			in order to achieve the savings over the MTFS period.		
EN_SAV_004	Events income increases	The Committee requested further details on how these savings would be achieved and clarification on the reasons for the variation in the savings target in each of the years over the MTFS period and whether these targets were realistic and achievable.  Response outstanding.			
<b><u>New Revenue Growth Proposals</u></b>					
E&RE	Growth of £946k for the delivery of the Leisure Management Service in-house	The Committee requested a breakdown of the expected extra costs.  Response outstanding			
<b><u>New Revenue Savings Proposals</u></b>					

EN24 _SAV_003	Enhance enforcement on environmental crime	The Committee requested that details be provided of the estimated cost of hiring more permanent staff to enhance enforcement action compared to the proposed approach of entering into a partnership with a private contractor to carry out the additional enforcement action.	<p>Response to information request in adjacent column:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1043 256 1702 900"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1043 256 1252 360"></th> <th data-bbox="1252 256 1422 360">in-house</th> <th data-bbox="1422 256 1702 360">Commission Based Contract</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1043 360 1252 464">Staffing costs to Council</td> <td data-bbox="1252 360 1422 464">£460k</td> <td data-bbox="1422 360 1702 464">Nil (Cost neutral to the Council)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1043 464 1252 651">Processing costs of FPNs</td> <td data-bbox="1252 464 1422 651">X1 member of staff (£31k)</td> <td data-bbox="1422 464 1702 651">Nil (Contained within the contract)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1043 651 1252 900">Retention of FPNs Income based on 1000 fines</td> <td data-bbox="1252 651 1422 900">c.£170K (1000 FPNs p/a)</td> <td data-bbox="1422 651 1702 900">c£750K (1000 FPNs p/w)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1043 900 1702 1353">The service will cover litter, often associated with smoking, eating and drinking, that are improperly discarded and left by members of the public; or are spilt during business operations as well as waste management operations. The contractors are service industry experts and the additional resource allows for existing staff to focus on more complicated and involved interventions/investigations, whilst the commissioned based contractor are on street 95% of the time and able to issue more FPNs.</p>		in-house	Commission Based Contract	Staffing costs to Council	£460k	Nil (Cost neutral to the Council)	Processing costs of FPNs	X1 member of staff (£31k)	Nil (Contained within the contract)	Retention of FPNs Income based on 1000 fines	c.£170K (1000 FPNs p/a)	c£750K (1000 FPNs p/w)		
	in-house	Commission Based Contract															
Staffing costs to Council	£460k	Nil (Cost neutral to the Council)															
Processing costs of FPNs	X1 member of staff (£31k)	Nil (Contained within the contract)															
Retention of FPNs Income based on 1000 fines	c.£170K (1000 FPNs p/a)	c£750K (1000 FPNs p/w)															

			In summary, we will see a net increase in the number of FPNs served if we had a commission based contract as our operational costs are higher than the commission based contractor, which is cost neutral to the Council.		
<b><u>Capital Programme</u></b>					
336	New River Sports & Fitness	The Committee requested further explanation of the self-financing of this scheme.  Response outstanding			
401	Tottenham Hale Green Space	Noting that there were considerable S106 contributions for this area following large scale development, the Committee requested details on what proportion of Haringey Council funding and S106 funding was being used to support this mixed-funded programme of green space improvements.  Response outstanding			

457	Future High Street Project	<p>The Committee requested details on what proportion of Haringey Council funding and developer/S106 funding was being used to support this mixed-funded programme of infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Response outstanding</p>			
657	Corporate Laptop Refresh	<p>Further details to be provided on the reasons for the significantly increased costs for this scheme.</p>	<p>Response to information request in adjacent column:</p> <p>Digital Services have a number of capital schemes that deliver the core IT service and functions to the council. The original profile for corporate laptop investment has been reviewed since the first draft of the capital programme was produced and re-engineered to ensure value for money for the council; this will be under constant review and assessment and may be reduced in the final programme through rationalisation, further adoption of cloud technologies and re purposing of existing equipment. This is in addition to other activities such as Data Centre move / Replacement (migration from River park</p>		



			<p>house (RPH)), Network Transformation and development of the digital offer to the council and residents. The expected life of a council laptop is 4 – 5 years, which differs from traditional retail high street equipment; this needs to be considered when we assess equipment used by the council over its lifespan, and reliability is essential as the devices often need to support the running of a range of demanding applications. Many of our current devices are approaching 5 years old as the previous major laptop deployment was conducted in 2018/19.</p> <p>The Council's projected budget for Laptop replacement was set pre Covid and the economic downturn which has impacted markets globally, driving up replacement costs. Additional pressure has been incurred through Insourcing and an increase in Council Employees. The Council is actively developing its Digital change plan and workforce strategy in support of the Corporate delivery plan and objectives. Digital Services are committed to delivering a strong strategy for the future needs of the Council and value for money in replacing corporate laptops as the current devices begin to reach end of economic life.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Children and Young People's Panel – Children's Services					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed/ Not Agreed
N/A		None	<p>The Panel was concerned about the budget gap of £16.4M reported in the draft MTFS and the fact that no further information is available at this stage on where further savings will be coming from.</p> <p>The Panel seeks assurances from Cabinet that it will seek to protect key services within Children's Services from any further cuts.</p>	Yes	

Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed/ Not Agreed
<b><u>General Issues</u></b>					
N/A		None	The Panel seeks assurances from Cabinet that the pressures on the Adult Social Care budget would not impact negatively on the quality of care as new contracts were negotiated.	Yes	

N/A		<p>The Panel requested further details on how inflation (including employee cost inflation) had been factored into the projected costs for adult social care.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Inflation of 4% across the current forecast for placement costs has been built into the assumptions for growth for 2024/25. This equates to £4.68m out of the £16.247m growth proposed for ASC.</p>			
<b><u>New Revenue Growth Proposals</u></b>					
Service Growth - Existing		<p>In relation to the proposal on funding for Connected Communities in Appendix 4, the Panel noted that the information provided was limited and requested that more</p>			

		<p>substantive details be provided.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This is an existing item approved in March 2023 in agreeing the MTFS for 2023/24, see below extract from budget papers</p> <p>Connected Communities Funding of core and project – based service activity aligned with council wide transformation programmes. This service provides resident engagement, frontline support to establish the Localities working at place and neighbourhood, resident facing resettlement work and growing portfolio of VCS development &amp; coordination and Health integration initiatives.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

**New Revenue Savings Proposals**

AHC24_SAV_008	0-19 years Public Health Nursing Services efficiencies	<p>Further details to be provided to reassure the Panel that vulnerable parents and children would not experience a decrease in level of support following the overall reduction in the number of Health Visiting hours.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> We don't anticipate an overall reduction in the number of health visiting hours per head of the infant population. We aim to deliver savings through efficiencies in the use of estates and back office support by the provider. It is important to note that the number of children born each year in Haringey fell by more than 15% between 2016 and 2021, which reduces overall demand on the</p>			
---------------	---	---	--	--	--

		<p>universal elements of the health visiting service. We are also building up a targeted element of the health visiting programme for vulnerable families called MESCH. We will continue to monitor outcomes from the service including the number of face to face new birth health visiting contacts.</p>			
AHC24_SAV_010	Continuing Healthcare	<p>Further evidence to be provided to demonstrate that these savings could be achieved.</p>	<p><b>Response to adjacent request:</b></p> <p>At present Haringey is well outside of the national average for those who are in receipt of continuing health care (CHC) funding. The national average is 92.15 per 100,000 with Haringey currently at 26 per 100,000. Not only does this provide potential high-level savings through health taking their legally required funding responsibility of cases but it also ensures residents are accessing the right level of support and that they are not being charged as CHC is not financially assessed where adult social care is.</p> <p>One of the alarming trends families have reported is that people with full <u>NHS Continuing Healthcare funding</u> – whose needs</p>		

			<p>have not reduced and are not likely to – are having their funding downgraded to a joint package of care.</p> <p>The impact of this is, of course, that the local authority element of the funding will be means-tested, and the Local Authority will have to find the financial resources to fund a package of care over which they likely had little commissioning input when the package was first put in place by health.</p> <p>Other families report having NHS Continuing Healthcare assessments that show eligibility for full NHS Continuing Healthcare funding, and yet they're given a joint package of care instead.</p> <p>There are a range of reasons as to why current numbers are as low as they are with anecdotal evidence from within the Adult Social Care workforce stating that:</p> <p>There is not the inhouse 'expertise' available to fully understand and support residents through the CHC process.</p> <p>There is an inherent reluctance to challenge CHC decisions through a misunderstanding of what can and cannot be challenged.</p> <p>The continuing healthcare team within the NHS have limited resources to complete assessments and a reluctance to accept</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>referrals from community and social care staff.</p> <p>It needs to be underscored that Continuing Healthcare operates under a different legal framework to the Care Act 2014, and so further expertise is needed for Haringey to maximise transfers of funding in this area. To this end a project team has been set up to lead on this activity.</p> <p>20 of the top 100 cases transferred over for either joint or full funding, we would be able to save between 1.1m-1.6m.</p> <p>The project team setup has been tasked with achieving these savings.</p> <p>A programme of work has commenced in Haringey which provides the knowledge and experience to support achieving better health outcomes for our residents. To further support this work local authorities across NCL are working together to change inequalities in this area.</p>		
AHC24_SAV_012	Strength Based Working	The Panel was informed that costs were being reduced through assistive technology and strength-based approaches and that data was available to			



		<p>support this. Relevant data to be provided.</p> <p>Response outstanding.</p>			
AHC24_SAV_012	Strength Based Working	<p>On the issue of locality working, the Panel requested details of support groups available in each of the three locality areas in the Borough.</p> <p>Response outstanding</p>	<p>The Panel seeks assurances from Cabinet that the local voluntary sector would be properly supported in their provision of services to support those who need care and not put under excessive strain as a consequence of budget savings.</p>	Yes	
AHC24_SAV_015	Service Audit	<p>The Panel suggested that question marks remained over the large, estimated size of the proposed saving and requested more detailed information about how these would be achieved.</p> <p>Response outstanding</p>			
AHC24_SAV_016	Mental Health Service Review	<p>Executive summary of the Review to be shared with the Panel.</p>			

		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b></p> <p>Executive summary provided (see Attachment A)</p>			
AHC24_SAV_017	Grant Review BCF/S75	<p>The Panel was informed that there was an ongoing review being undertaken with the ICB on the Better Care Fund which included £7.8m of Haringey Council funds. Further details to be provided about the ongoing review and how the funded would be used.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> There is work underway with the Integrated Care Board and NHS England to redesign our Better Care Fund planning for 2024/25. This will review the allocation of spend and ensuring that is better aligned to the Councils and Adults</p>			

		<p>Social Care priorities. There have been extensive discussions as the review is completed and will shortly be finalised. Key areas that anticipate being supported are the Localities delivery model and improved offer to Carers.</p>			
<b><u>Format of budget scrutiny papers</u></b>					
N/A		None	<p>The Panel welcomed the updated format of the budget scrutiny papers and suggested a couple of further minor amendments for future years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A short piece of introductory text for each table (in the main report) to explain how they related to one another.</li> <li>b) Additional explanatory text on the capital budget appendix, including the impact on the revenue budget in terms of interest incurred.</li> </ul>	No	

Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel				
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)
<b><u>General Issues</u></b>				
N/A	Council Tax uplift	<p>Paragraph 6.16 of the December Cabinet Report sets out that there will be a 2.99% rise in Council Tax in 2024/25, after which the increase will be 1.99% in subsequent years.</p> <p>The Panel request clarification about whether this assumption is an error. The Panel question the feasibility of not increasing Council Tax by the maximum rate allowed by legislation in future years, given the financial pressures faced by the Council.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The Government issued a Policy statement alongside the 2023/24 local government finance settlement which confirmed the Council Tax and Adult Social Care (ASC) thresholds for 2024/25. No such policy confirmation has been provided for</p>		

		<p>2025/26 and beyond and therefore the MTFS for those years prudently assumes <u>no</u> ASC precept and a Council Tax threshold figure more in line with target inflation rates of 2%.</p> <p>These will of course be kept under review as part of future financial planning and updated as further information is provided.</p>		
<b><u>New Savings Proposals</u></b>				
AHC24_SAV_002	Increasing the supply of Lodge accommodation by 100 units.	<p>This saving appears to be similar to AHC_SAV_006 put forward in last year's budget, with different amounts involved, and a larger proportion of the total saving delayed until 2025-26. The Panel request clarification about how this saving relates to last year's saving. The Panel are unsure whether councillors are being asked to agree a saving, which was already agreed to last year, or whether this is a new request. The Panel requests assurances about the extent to which the corresponding</p>		

		<p>savings from last year have been achieved/were on track.</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  AHC24_SAV_002 is a revision of last year's savings proposal AHC_SAV_006 and the panel are being requested to agree this change as this was not deliverable.</p> <p>A revised delivery schedule has been drafted and savings projections have therefore been revised and moved based on the best estimate of timescales to deliver these projects. An increase in the number of units proposed, (which have been identified during the design phase) has also been factored in.</p>		
AHC24_SAV_003	Use of one bed social housing as temporary accommodation for families with a baby or young children	The Panel notes that this appears to be a repeat saving from last year and requests clarification about how the savings put forward in this year's budget proposals relate to last year's. The panel are unsure whether councillors are being asked to agree a saving, which was already agreed to last year, or whether this is a new request.		

		<p>The Panel request assurances about the extent to which the corresponding savings from last year have been achieved/were on track.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> AHC24_SAV_003 is a repeat of last year's savings proposal, AHC_SAV_007 and not a new saving The panel are being asked to agree the same.</p> <p>The original overall target for 22/23 and 23/24 was to achieve 45 lets to new TA from social housing stock, but only 10 had been let. The Target delivery has therefore been revised to 30 Lets for delivery in 24/25 and 25/26.</p>		
AHC24_SAV_006	A Project Officer will be engaged to work with families to remove any barriers to moving on from temporary accommodation.	The Panel notes that this appears to be a repeat saving from last year and requests clarification about how the savings put forward in this year's budget proposals relate to last year's. The panel are unsure whether councillors are being asked to agree a saving, which was already agreed to last year, or whether this is a new request.		

		<p>The Panel request assurances about the extent to which the corresponding savings from last year have been achieved/were on track.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> AHC24_SAV_006 is a repeat of last year's proposal AHC_SAV_009. Not a new saving. The panel are being asked to agree the same.</p> <p>Both proposals assumed 180 lets to pre-localism families in TA (those whose applied before 9<sup>th</sup> November 2012 and was based on several large-scale new build schemes being delivered within the year and the voids programme delivery. While some progress has been made this year (40 lets) it has not been on the scale expected as schemes have been delayed. As a result, savings of approximately £162k have been realised to date but we are unlikely to reach target. Subject to performance in 24/25 we may look to extend the project into 25/26.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--



<p>AHC24_SAV_007</p>	<p>Converting leases to Homes for Haringey in order to charge full LHA subsidy rates.</p>	<p>The Panel notes that this appears to be a repeat saving from last year and requests clarification about how the savings put forward in this year's budget proposals relate to last year's. The panel are unsure whether councillors are being asked to agree a saving, which was already agreed to last year, or whether this is a new request.</p> <p>The Panel request assurances about the extent to which the corresponding savings from last year have been achieved/were on track.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> AHC24_SAV_007 is not a new proposal and mirror last year's proposal AHC_SAV_010. The panel are being asked to agree the same.</p> <p>Progress against targets is steady. From April to November, there has been 18 lease completions against a target of 31. The target is expected to be met.</p>		
----------------------	---	--	--	--

ENV_24_SAV_003	Additional income generation from CPNs.	<p>The Panel request a written update on the funding assumptions of achieving £13k additional revenue per year from this saving. This seems to be a very cautious assumption, given the maximum charge for one CPN is up to £30k.</p> <p><b>Response:</b>          Selective Licensing was introduced in November 2022. The saving <b>increases</b> 13k a year. This means that the saving for year 2 would be 26k year 3 would be 39k and year 4 is 52k. this increase reflects three matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The graduated enforcement of the licensing scheme over 5 years (the length of the Licensing scheme). We would expect to find more enforcement cases as the scheme matures and therefore more CPN's.</li> <li>2. Civil penalties are often paid in instalments rather</li> </ol>		
----------------	---	---	--	--

		<p>than all at one, we therefore expect income to increase over time.</p> <p>3. The figures are based on our current projections based on the pipeline of cases and expected income.</p> <p>The service constantly monitors these matters and should we find in future years that the level of fines paid exceeds the projections a further proposal can be made.</p>		
<b><u>Request for Additional Investment</u></b>				
N/A	Additional investment in landscaping and green space maintenance on new build developments	<p>The Panel request clarification about whether additional funding for maintaining communal green spaces in our new housing developments could come out of the HRA, rather than the revenue budget, which is facing significant pressures.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The HRA is the revenue budget for Housing. Additional landscaping works would come out of the HRA</p>	<p>The Panel welcomes the standard of landscaping and green space provision that has been put in place for our new build housing developments.</p> <p>The Panel would like to see additional investment put into maintaining the high standard of landscaping, so that it does not fall into disrepair or become overgrown. Given the amount of investment the Council has put into its housebuilding programme, maintaining the surrounding green</p>	Yes.

		budget, rather than the GF revenue budget.	spaces is an important part of their upkeep and ensuring those sites are attractive.  Consideration should be given to securing additional resources to undertake additional maintenance of communal green spaces on new developments, including cutting back overgrown foliage, weeding and maintaining flower beds.	
--	--	--	---	--

<b>Climate, Community Safety and Culture Scrutiny Panel</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><u>New Savings Proposals</u></b>				
CSE24_SAV_003	The proposal is to stop providing hard copy newspapers and magazines in libraries. Newspapers and magazines are now available on Pressreader which provides thousands of newspapers and	None	Given the impact the proposed savings would have on elderly citizens and citizens accessing papers in community languages together with the social benefits that this provision of hard copy newspapers provided, the Panel recommended that this saving not be taken forward.	Yes

	magazines from around the globe. Many library services that stopped newspapers and magazines during COVID lockdown have not reintroduced them.			
CSE24_SAV_001	The use of our libraries varies from one branch to another at different time of the day. Based on footfall analysis we know that library use is typically lowest in mornings. Young people in particular have a need for study space in the evenings and libraries are ideal as a free and safe community space. We want to look at varying the opening hours of our libraries to times when they are most heavily used, which could include later in the evenings, allowing us to allocate resources in a more targeted way. Library buildings and facilities could be made available to	None.	<p>The Panel would like Cabinet to reconsider this saving. The Panel would not like to see any reduction in Library opening hours and the net saving found from elsewhere.</p> <p>If library opening hours were reduced, the Cabinet should give assurance that it intended to engage robustly with schools, early years users, and local groups to explore options on how to keep Library buildings open at the appropriate times for these users. Also, to provide more information on 'wrap around' services that could be provided in Library buildings from other council services outside of the Library opening times.</p>	Yes

	<p>other services even when the library service itself is not operating e.g., Community Hub teams and VCS organisations. The proposed saving is based on reviewing hours at the six branch libraries with a mixture of mornings and afternoons opening times based on demand and demographics, to ensure libraries remain accessible to all. The service is currently carrying some vacancies and agency cover which will reduce the need for any proposed redundancies. No library building would be closed.</p>		<p>The Cabinet response should also indicate if the service had considered other ways to generate income into libraries by potentially looking at hiring out spaces before putting this saving forward.</p>	
CSE24_SAV_001		<p>The Panel requested further information on the use of Libraries within the borough, other than the data on footfall data collected. Further information around peak times of use, weather, and seasonal changes should</p>		

		<p>be included for the OSC meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> of January.</p> <p>Response outstanding</p>		
CSE24_SAV_002	<p>The proposal is to introduce self-service technology in libraries. Further work is required to establish feasibility, based on learning from other boroughs; it would require investment in digital and other technologies e.g. CCTV but has the potential to reduce staffing by 40%. This could be</p> <p>introduced potentially along with a community run library service option as has been introduced in other boroughs (e.g. Camden and Barnet) and could also sit alongside use of library buildings by other public services and agencies, enabling users to access, check out or return library items when</p>	<p>Further information was requested on the how the savings in the proposal would be costed, particularly with staffing, the number of staff being cut should also be included for the meeting of OSC on the 18<sup>th</sup> of January.</p> <p>The Panel requested an outline on the savings from self-service technology and the costs of introducing self-service technology. It appeared that the Capital Investment with this savings had not been costed and further information to clarify this should be brought to the Overview and Scrutiny</p>		

	<p>using those other services. No library building would be closed. The saving is modelled on a similar reduction in numbers of library staff to the previous proposal, but later in the MTFS period to enable the detailed feasibility work to be done</p>	<p>Budget meeting on the 18th of January.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The library Service has 62.5 FTE staff, a total headcount of 95. The reduction in the staffing budget which the saving from 2025/26 represents would equal 15 FTE, however different grades need to be taken into account so it is not possible to give a precise figure at this stage.</p> <p>At this stage, the commitment is to explore the feasibility of these proposals and the Council will engage and consult fully before any final decision is taken in advance of the 2025/26 budget setting.</p> <p>The capital investment required has not been costed at this stage and this would be part of the feasibility work.</p>		
--	---	---	--	--



**Draft Capital Programme 2024/25 - 28/29**

<p>4014 Walking and Cycling Action Plan (WCAP) LTN delivery</p> <p>4015 Walking and Cycling Action Plan (WCAP) Strategic cycle route delivery</p> <p>4016 Walking and Cycling Action Plan (WCAP) Cycle Parking (Hangers) delivery.</p>		<p>The Panel requested further information on the funding of these proposals for the 18<sup>th</sup> of January OSC meeting. These proposals borrow within the first year with external funding for the following years, the Panel sought clarification if the external funding is reliant on Haringey Council's investment in the first year and whether the external funding is committed.</p> <p>The Panel requested that rather than using terms like 'external funding' the budget reports to scrutiny should clarify when this is 'mixed funding' (combination of Council and external grant funding)</p> <p>The Scrutiny finance capital related reports</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<p>Scheme 630 (New Bid) libraries IT and Buildings upgrade</p>		<p>should also indicate, in the Council funded element, whether there has been or will be borrowing, and the rates of borrowing so the different implications on the revenue account are apparent.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This was an error and has been amended as the schemes are wholly funded through external sources as stated in the description.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Further information was needed on the Libraries IT and Buildings upgrade (scheme 630 new Bid) for the OSC meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> of January OSC meeting as not enough information had been provided in the meeting to understand what this investment would be used for and it would be helpful to understand sources of investment relied upon</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>and the potential impact on the revenue budget, in turn impacting on the savings proposed for Libraries.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This scheme is for an upgrading of our public access computers and the hub/network that supports them, as they are end of life and going out of support. The summary from the capital working papers states:</p> <p>The public computers, which are accessible at all nine libraries, are a well-used asset to Haringey residents and library users. In 2022-2023, almost 34,000 hours of computer use were recorded which generated over £30,000 income via printing. We would like to ensure that the service meets the demand and expectation of our users as this integral service</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>offer, which combats digital exclusion for those who have no other recourse to computer/internet access.</p> <p>However, the infrastructure is ageing and non-compliant; we require upgrades to servers and networks; the use of Windows Server 2012 is end of support and soon Server 2016 and Windows 10 will also be end of support.</p> <p>It is proposed to be funded through borrowing.</p>		
Appendix 6	Budget Scrutiny Process Recommendation	Concerning the capital expenditure programme, the Panel recommends that where there were mixed sources of funding, those that could potentially be impacted by the Council's Treasury Management income and investment should be	Yes	

		marked with a simple Asterix.		
--	--	-------------------------------	--	--

\*Attachment A (in relation to Mental Health Service Review - AHC24\_SAV\_016) is appended as a separate PDF on the next page.