

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)	Cabinet to agree not agree/partially agree recommendation
<u>General Issues</u>					
Recommendation 1 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 response to be added below	To be added
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 1					
Recommendation 2 Culture, Strategy & Engagement	2023/24 Outturn Position & 2024/25 Budget Position	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 Committee noted the response to this but considered that this was a high spend area of the council and continued to request that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee receive a report on the causes of increasing contract costs in a consolidated report.	Yes response to be added below	To be added

the Panel requested a breakdown of these costs.

Response: 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 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.			
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 2					
<u>MTFS Savings Tracker</u>					
Recommendation 3 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 – response to be added below	
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 3					

Recommendation 4 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 in order to achieve the savings over the MTFS period.	Yes Response to be added below	
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 4					

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/ Partially agreed
Recommendation 5		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 non statutory services within Children's Services from any further cuts.</p>	Yes – response to be added below	
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 5					

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/Partially agreed
General Issues					
Recommendation 6 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 response to be added below	
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 6					

Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed / Not Agreed/ Partially Agreed
<u>Request for Additional Investment</u>					
Recommendation 7	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>Response: The HRA is the revenue budget for Housing. Additional landscaping works would come out of the HRA budget, rather than the GF revenue budget.</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 spaces is an important part of their upkeep and ensuring those sites are attractive.</p> <p>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.</p>	Yes – cabinet Response to be added below	

Cabinet Response to Recommendation 7

Climate, Community Safety and Culture Scrutiny Panel					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Agreed Not Agreed Partially Agreed
<u>New Savings Proposals</u>					
Recommendation 8 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 magazines from around the globe. Many library	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 – Cabinet Response to be added below	

	services that stopped newspapers and magazines during COVID lockdown have not reintroduced them.				
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 8					
Recommendation 9 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	None.	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.	Yes	

<p>more targeted way. Library buildings and facilities could be made available to 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>				
--	--	--	--	--

Response to Recommendation 9					
Recommendation 10 CSE24_SAV_001	As above		<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> <p>The Cabinet response should also indicate if the service had considered other ways to generate income into libraries by potentially looking at hiring</p>	Yes, to be set out below	

			out spaces before putting this saving forward.		
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 10					
Recommendation 11 CSE24_SAV_001			The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recognise the need to make savings to balance the budget and that there are not easy savings to make and not making this associated saving will have an impact on other areas of the budget. Assurance is sought from Cabinet on measures to mitigate impact of reduced library hours on service users including that, individually, the libraries remain open at times of the highest usage and each library is assessed, on a case by case basis, to understand what this peak user time is. Also ensuring that the library opening times are compiled in a way that allows a user to use a library that is in reasonable close reach, if one local library is not open when they need to use it.	Yes to be set out below	

Cabinet Response to Recommendation 11

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	<u>Agreed/</u> <u>Not Agreed</u> <u>Partially Agreed</u>	
<u>Format of budget scrutiny papers</u>						
Recommendation 12	N/A	None	<p>The Committee welcomed the updated format of the budget scrutiny papers and requested the following updates for future years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A short piece of introductory text for each table (in the main report) to explain how they related to one another. b) Additional explanatory text on the capital budget appendix, including the impact on the revenue budget in terms of interest incurred. c) Additional discussions between the Assistant Director for Finance and the Chair of the Housing, 	Yes to be set out below		

		<p>In the budget compilation exercise, there had been an assessment of capital schemes that: had a risk of not being self-financing and those which were not deemed essential, and projects that could be re-profiled, resulting in £400m reduction in</p>	<p>Planning & Development Scrutiny Panel on the format of appendices and reports for this Panel.</p> <p>d) Concerning the agreed capital expenditure programme, where there are mixed sources of funding supporting a scheme, this should be set out more fully and in more detail.</p> <p>e) Reductions in the Capital Programme should be set out separately in a tabular format, rather than being embedded in the MTFS report. The table should include brief information on the individual scheme and the impact it has on the Council's aims and ambitions. The table should further indicate whether the decision involves a reduction in the scope of a particular program with figures included or whether this is a capital scheme that has been discontinued; making clear whether it</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>borrowing for capital that could in future years impact on the General Fund and have revenue implications. Information on this was embedded in the MTFS report</p>	<p>was a particular line that was in the capital budget in the previous year and has now been deleted.</p>			
<p>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 12</p>						