

January 2025

Contents

- 1. Executive Summary
 - 1.1 Introduction
 - 1.2 Technical Details & Method
 - 1.2.1 Stakeholder Events
 - 1.2.2 Questionnaire Design
- 2. Responses to the Consultation
 - 2.1 Respondents Demographic Data
 - 2.2 Summary of Findings
- 3. Detailed Findings
 - 4.1 Adults Health and Communities Proposals
 - 4.2 Children's Services Proposals
 - 4.3 Culture, Strategy and Engagement Proposals
 - 4.4 Environment and Resident Experience Proposals
 - 4.5 Other questions
- 5. Appendix 1 Verbatim Responses

1. Executive Summary

This year, A total of 169 questionnaires have been completed – All 169 came through the council's online survey platform.

This consultation specifically asked about the extent of the impact of savings proposals and proposals for capital expenditure. For most savings proposals, a majority of respondents selected 'little or no impact', or 'don't know'. However, in some case respondents indicated that neither they or any members of their family had any experience of the potentially affected service.

The exceptions to this, were for the proposals relating to the Residents Survey and a reduction in spending on cultural activities, where a majority of respondents indicated they believed that these proposals would have a negative impact.

When asked for further suggestions around saving money, generating income and council priorities, residents put forward a range of suggestions.

This consultation asked for the extent of the impact of savings proposals and proposals for capital expenditure. For most savings proposals, a majority of respondents indicated 'little or no impact', or 'don't know'. However, in some case respondents also indicated they had no direct experience of the potentially affected service. The clear exceptions were for the proposals relating to Pendarren House and a reduction in spending on cultural activities, where a majority of respondents indicated they believed that these proposals would have a negative impact. Again, not every respondent stated they had direct experience of the services/activities within the proposal.

1.1 Introduction

The Budget proposals for **2025/2026** have been subject to formal consultation. This report sets out the findings of the from the council's consultation for its budget.

1.2 Technical Details & Method

The consultation ran from 28th November 2024 to 6th January 2025. The survey was held on haringeybudget2025.commonplace.is with hard copies of the consultation document also available on request in libraries and customer services.

The consultation was widely promoted via the Council's resident magazine, Haringey People Extra, the Council's business e-newsletter, the Council's website and via social media.

1.2.1 Stakeholder Events

A Business Budget Briefing Webinar was held on 18th December 2025.

1.2.2 Questionnaire Design

Respondents were asked:

- To what extent proposals would impact them and to provide reasons for their response.
- To provide their views on principles behind certain proposals e.g. the fairness of using council resources to give discounts to leisure facilities users based on low income or additional needs.


- To share their views on capital spending reductions and capital investments.
- To share any other changes or proposals that might save money or achieve better value from council spending or generate income.
- Their views on priorities for protecting spending and any other thoughts on the council's proposed budget.

2. Responses to the Consultation


169 responses have been completed through the online survey.

2.1 Respondents Demographic Data


Which age group applies to you?




How would you describe your sex?




Which of the following benefits do you receive, if any?




How would you describe your religion or belief?




What is your preferred language?




What best describes your living situation?




What is your ethnicity?




Are you disabled?



What is your sexual orientation?



Are you Trans?



2.2 Summary of Findings

For most savings proposals, and all those in the Adults, Health and Communities proposals, a majority of respondents selected 'little or no impact', or 'don't know'. However, in some case respondents indicated that neither they nor any members of their family had any experience of the potentially affected service.

The exceptions to this, were for the Culture, Strategy and Engagement (CSE) proposals relating to the Residents Survey and a reduction in spending on cultural activities, where a majority of respondents indicated they believed that these proposals would have a negative impact.

For the CSE proposal relating to digital transformation, residents were supportive, providing the needs of those facing digital exclusion were kept in mind with an alternative to digital remaining accessible where needed.


Where asked for further suggestions around saving money, generating income and council priorities, residents put forward a diverse range of suggestions. These are summarised in section 4.5. However these are varied and diverse, therefore it is recommended to consult the 'Verbatim Responses' attached in full in Appendix 1

3. Detailed Findings

4.1 Adults Health and Communities Proposals

4.1.1

Question 7.1 – how would changes to the way the Connected Care Service is provided impact you or someone you care for?



Please give reasons for your answer:

One respondent commented that it sounded more efficient and would free up resources for others.

There were concerns raised about what will happen to those who need support. There were concerns that those who currently use the service and enjoy the benefits may not be able to use it after any changes. Some of the parts of the service that residents may not be able to access if another model were brought in, such as social alarm services, were described as vital. There were concerns raised, in particular for the elderly and for people who have mental health conditions, as the connected care service not only makes their life more manageable but also safer through benefits such as reminder services for medication to benefit those with memory problems.

It was stressed that there is an overarching need for residents to assist residents to stay in their own home. Other ways to support the service such as community-based support and regular wellbeing checks were recommended.

A large number of respondents had no experience of the service so felt it would have no impact on them.

4.1.2

Question 8.1 – Are there any changes the council could make to the Day Opportunities provision that would improve residents' experience and help reduce the cost of providing the service?


Please describe what these might be:

Some respondents were in favour of exploring new delivery models for a more efficient, cost effective service. This included the potential adding of not-for-profit external support and co-production involving users and their families.

There were members of the public who proposed alternatives such as diverting legal costs to contest claims towards supporting provision, not spending money on cultural celebration periods or heritage months. There were also calls, as an alternative cost saving measure, to reduce costs in other parts of the council such as back-office costs and improving IT systems.

Suggestions to improve costings also included retraining staff for efficiency purposes, streamlining services, focusing on prevention, having outcome based funding and trialling new approaches. There was also a suggestion to use libraries to provide services and working closely with the voluntary care sector and community organisations.

4.1.3



Please give reasons for your answer:

It was highlighted that it may be more effective to manage issues such as social care, senior care, child services and housing support separately to make these areas more effective.

Some residents suggested it was hard to see how doing more with less would not impact negatively on the service provided. There were concerns about giving specialist staff wider roles which would lower the overall quality of service provided.

Suggested alternatives included having improved coordination and continuity of care, early intervention and greater prevention, efficient use of resources, enhanced personalization of support and having a more integrated overall service.

There were concerns raised about the uncertainty of what changes would be made.


A number of residents had no experience of the service so felt it would have no effect on them.

4.1.4

Question 10.1- what Housing Related Support services have you got experience of using – either yourself or someone you care for or work with?

Residents used this option to list a variety of different housing services. See verbatim responses for full list.

Question 10.2 - what impact would changes to Housing Related Support have on your or someone you care for?



Please give reasons for your answer:


There were concerns about the growing demand for these services. There was also acknowledgment of how important the services were. There were also concerns that this would reduce costs.

There were calls for joined up provision and to fill job vacancies.

Some residents were concerned about the uncertainty of what the plans were so were unable to make informed comment. A large number of respondents were also unable to comment, and felt it had no impact on them as they had no experience of the service

4.2 Children's Services Proposals

Question 11.1 – do you agree with the proposal that the cost of running Pendarren should be met via the income it generates rather than subsidising it from council resources – as long as it can continue to provide a high quality and affordable option for Haringey's families?



Please give reasons for your answer:


A number of respondents felt that the financing for this option needs to be reviewed. For some it feels like an unavoidable option that would maintain a safe and high quality experience for schoolchildren. It was also highlighted that not all schools visit Pendarren House.

A number of people supported this option, as long as it remained truly affordable and standards are maintained. A suggestion was made for schools to perhaps approach charities. There were also suggestions to have a 50/50 approach with Pendarren in terms of costing. Some respondents were concerned about the potential of a lack of subsidy from the council leading to closure of the site and the impacts that could have. There were also concerns about what the term "affordable" in the council's plans actually means. It was highlighted that it was crucial for inner city children.

4.3 Culture, Strategy and Engagement Proposals

4.3.1

Questions 12.1 – do you agree that we should work to reduce costs via the use of digital technology as long as we ensure there are ways for residents to access services who are not able to access it?



Please give reasons for your answer:

There was a large support for this as respondents felt that overall digital transformation was making services more efficient as well as cost effective. This included improving communication between residents and officers as it was noted a number of residents are more comfortable using digital options to engage with the council.

There were concerns about the overall experience with IT projects in the public sector, including what came to light in the recent Post Office inquiry. There were also concerns about potential digital exclusion.

Whilst some respondents thought it would improve services, they had concerns about whether it would bring in cost savings. It was also noted that digital services come with maintenance costs.


Some respondents would like to see the council ensure a hybrid approach to digital technology, using it alongside the traditional approach to delivering services rather than replacing it. There were also concerns about the complexity of moving further towards using digital technologies.

There was a suggestion that all services were web accessible and not just mobile accessible. There was also a concern that going about going for a cheap option that may not be up to standard. There were also concerns about how useful the technology would be.

1. **Reduction in culture spending** – *We will review all of our culture spending which*

4.3.2

Question 13.1 - what impact will reducing the council expenditure on cultural activities have on you?



Please give reasons for your answer:

Some residents felt that considering the economic climate, reductions to the culture budget were inevitable. Some felt cultural activities should not be prioritised by the council and should be promoted by communities.

Many respondents spoke about impact of reductions to the library service, which they are concerned will have a large impact, particularly on the least well off in the borough. Cultural activities were considered be a key benefit to the life of children in the borough.

There were concerns about how culture in the borough would be funded if the council stopped investing in it. Some residents felt it was important to ensure we had value for money from our grants.


Some felt confused with a reduction in culture spending when the borough has recently been named the Mayor's Borough of Culture. It was felt that culture was one of the most important aspects of living in Haringey. It was also felt with such a diverse borough, that culture is the one thing that brings the community together.

There were concerns over certain programmes and venues, such as Bruce Castle being unsustainable without council funding. It was also felt that it would impact those who couldn't afford to pay to experience culture the most.

Some residents were unsure what cultural activities were being referred to.

4.3.3

Question 14.1 – do you agree that ending non-essential organisational subscriptions – like this one - is an appropriate way to reduce costs?



Please give reasons for your answer:


A number of respondents felt there were other, cheaper ways to engage with other groups so all non-essential subscriptions should be terminated. It was noted that the council spends resources bidding for awards across the country and these funds could be better spent elsewhere. The LGA was cited by some respondents as a useful alternative to help networking.

There were concerns that the council were not taking into account the benefits of networking. Some respondents believed that sharing ideas should be treated as an investment rather than a cost. There were concerns that the reduction in engaging with others could lead to a poorer

performance from Haringey Staff. Residents also questioned whether or not the cut to these contracts was worth it considering there was not a lot of money saved (compared to other savings options).

4.3.4

Question 15.1 – what impact do you anticipate there may be from removing the budget for the residents survey – this means in future the survey will only be able to take place if new money can be found to pay for it?



People were concerned that without the residents survey, we wouldn't understand our residents and their needs. Some felt the council were better off doing their own survey in-house rather than seeking external support. Others suggested a different approach i.e. solely digital or via phone calls.


Other residents highlighted that they weren't sure what, if anything, came out of the survey so did not see the benefit of it compared to the cost. Others felt that with ongoing participation and consultation, the residents survey was unnecessary. Some were concerned as they see the data taken from the survey to be integral to guiding the council's strategies.

Some were concerned that removing the survey could be seen as taking away the public's voice. Some felt that the £25,000 currently invested in it was worth it.

4.4 Environment and Resident Experience Proposals

4.4.1

Question 16.1 – Do you agree that it is a fairer use of council resources to give discounts to leisure facilities based on low income or additional needs?



Please give reasons for your answer

Respondents thought that it made sense to have a fairer system of concessionary prices, there were concerns about what decisions would actually be taken.

Some felt that use of leisure facilities was not a necessity, therefore providing a concession should not be a priority, particularly in the economic climate. Some felt that it would impact the least well off in society and could help contribute to an obesity epidemic.

Question 17. Do you have any comments to make on the proposals to increase or reduce capital spending as described above?

Some residents thought digital investment would save money and improve efficiency over time.

Respondents broadly supported digital investment in order to save money and improve efficiency.

There were also suggestions to add speed cameras into the borough, reduce subsidies to Alexandra Palace and spend less money on waste services. There were suggestions to rent council properties at a commercial rate.

Some residents suggested adapting acquisition policies for property, reducing temporary housing.

Safety and investing in lighting were also mentioned.

4.5 Other questions:

18. The council will need to identify additional savings or sources of income between now and February in order to achieve a balanced budget. As we look to develop further measures:

- a. Are there any changes or proposals you think we should consider which might save money or achieve better value from council spend?**

Suggestions included running all consultations in-house, not selling local authority land, turning Alexandra Palace into a community trust, ending Wards Corner funding, maintaining existing hours for libraries, stopping Haringey People and reviewing the amount of external contracts.

Some residents wanted more street cleaning. Renting out space in River Park House was also suggested. Some suggested pressing government for more funding, adapting councillor's allowances, stopping the insourcing of leisure centres, reducing agency workers and focusing on priorities. One respondent suggested prioritising the protection of LIP funding from TFL to invest in cycle lane provision and other active travel infrastructure.

Respondents also encouraged better collaboration with businesses.

- b. Are there any changes or proposals you think we should consider which might generate more income?**

Residents suggested pressing government for more funds, holding onto council property rather than selling, increasing fines and charges, stopping investment in Wards Corner and maintaining library opening hours.

There were also suggestions to revalue property, work with businesses, add 'paid for' services such as access to documentation, having more ticketed community events, renting out office space and public space, increasing council tax and having a community bus service.

Suggestions were also made to reduce ESOL subsidies and Adult Social Care services.

- c. If you were making the decision about savings or income for the council what do you think it would be most important to consider? What would you prioritise to protect spending on? What do you think is less important?**

Some residents thought the council should aim to protect the least well off including the homeless. Other suggestions included keeping public spaces open, prioritising easy fixes along with those policies which would have the highest impact, working to mitigate impacts on the climate, promoting a 'residents first' model, maintaining library services and working with businesses.

People also suggested spending on infrastructure, education, protecting frontline services, children's services, digital services and social care.

d) Do you have any other thoughts on the council's budget that you would like to share?

Residents used this question to express the challenges they face such as the impacts of the cost-of-living crisis. The challenges that the council currently face along with other councils in the UK due to funding issues were also noted.

Comments were made on challenges within housing that need to be dealt with such as the right of tenants to be consulted on changes, the impacts of reduction on library hours and changes to Connected Communities.

Suggestions were made not to sell property, work with other local authorities more, lobby government for a London Funding Formula, reduce staff salaries and review staff performance against pay grade and the number of councillors.

3.1 Appendix 1 – Verbatim Responses

How would changes to the way the Connected Care Service is provided impact you or someone you care for?

<i>we self fund</i>
<i>We are not vulnerable people (yet)</i>
<i>Very few people are even aware of the service . I attend numerous groups for Older People and I cannot recently being involved in any effective discussion with regards to this service.</i>
<i>Until now, haven't heard of this. It is not clear from the name or your website what it is.</i>
<i>This is not applicable to my family.</i>
<i>This is clearly a foolish question to put in a questionnaire to the general public because this service appears to be a specialist service for vulnerable people who should be consulted directly. Answers given by those who are not service users or in need are likely to be misinformed.</i>
<i>This is clearly a foolish question to put in a questionnaire to the general public because this service appears to be a specialist service for vulnerable people who should be consulted directly. Answers given by those who are not service users or in need are likely to be misinformed.</i>
<i>They've done nothing to stop my neighbours harassing and assaulting me, so I don't see these proposed changes making any difference.</i>
<i>They would learn more about inclusion to community and mental health and wellbeing and stop fuelling fire on discrimination.</i>
<i>they are useless when needed</i>
<i>There is not enough detail on alternative delivery models to indicate their potential impact</i>
<i>There is insufficient information provided about the proposals to answer this question</i>
<i>The decision gives the figures who think can be saved but no detail on implementation.</i>
<i>Thankfully i personally have no need for care at present</i>
<i>sounds more efficient. will free up resources for others.</i>
<i>Proposal 7: Connected Care Service The arguments for saving in 26/27 of £879,000 on home safety and personal security systems is weak. The overarching need to assist residents to stay in their own homes is evident, both socially and financially. The suggestion that other Local Authorities experiences are adaptable to Haringey should of course be fully explored although the implementation of change needs to be budgeted for. We are also not clear how much is spent on DA survivors when the main emphasis for this group should be on the use of police powers. We also note that elsewhere pooled budgets are used to fund safety equipment for DA survivors. The Government is due to award further funds for this area which may well assist in bridging gaps in spending. We ask that in the light of these points, a review of these savings is made.</i>
<i>People need more real community and care services</i>
<i>ots not clear what you are proposing to change</i>
<i>not utilising</i>
<i>NOT APPLICABLE TO ME</i>
<i>never used the service</i>
<i>Neither I nor any family members require this service</i>
<i>My mother used this service but died in 2023. I don't know anyone else who uses this service. Rapid response to falls seems sensible.</i>

<i>long waiting lists no one answers or takes notice i am disabled waiting for reasonabel adjustments for more than 1 ys</i>
<i>lack of knowledge or understanging of local issues, short opening hours</i>
<i>It's hard to see how savings on this service wouldn't have a negative impact</i>
<i>If changes were made to the Haringey Connected Care Service, they could have a significant positive impact on the elderly and people with mental health conditions, making their daily lives safer and more manageable. Many of these individuals already face challenges with memory, organization, and managing their health, so reminder systems and alerts, such as medication reminders or wellbeing check-ins, would be incredibly beneficial. These tools would help ensure they stay on track with important tasks, offering support in maintaining their independence and reducing the likelihood of forgetting crucial actions that could affect their health. The shift towards more flexible, community-based support would also be a positive step. If elderly individuals or those with mental health conditions could access help when needed through mobile apps or online check-ins, it would give them the freedom to seek assistance outside of scheduled visits. This flexibility would allow for better management of their needs, especially for those who experience unpredictable changes in their circumstances or may feel anxious about rigid routines. A lifting service would provide a much-needed safety net for those who are at risk of falls, which is common among older adults or individuals with mental health conditions. Knowing that help is readily available if an accident occurs would offer reassurance to both the individuals and their families. Additionally, regular wellbeing checks would help reduce feelings of isolation and ensure that their health and safety are monitored regularly, catching potential issues early and providing the necessary support to avoid more serious health complications. The monitoring system that responds quickly to alerts could also make a big difference. In emergency situations, elderly individuals or those with mental health conditions may struggle to react quickly or effectively. Having an automatic system that summons help in such instances would reduce the stress and anxiety often associated with emergencies, ensuring that the right support arrives swiftly. Finally, making the service more affordable and accessible would remove financial barriers that can prevent vulnerable individuals from accessing the care they need. Introducing sliding scale fees or flexible payment options would ensure that these services remain within reach for those who rely on them most, without added financial stress. Overall, these changes would greatly enhance the safety, wellbeing, and independence of the elderly and those with mental health conditions, providing them with timely support, reducing isolation, and helping them manage their daily lives more effectively.</i>
<i>I sufficient details provided</i>
<i>I provide 4-6 hours pw of voluntary support to a friend who herself receives care.</i>
<i>I haven't (yet) had a need to call on this service</i>
<i>I have not used the service</i>
<i>I have a brain injury & the service has been valuable for me</i>
<i>I don't use this service</i>
<i>I don't use this service</i>
<i>I don't know what the Connected Care Service is and have never used it</i>
<i>I don't know what connected care is, so can't make a decision. By its name it sounds sensible!</i>
<i>I don't know if I know anyone who receives the service</i>
<i>I don't fall into any of the groups of people to whom this Service applies.</i>
<i>I don't care for anybody; It would depend on what the changes were.</i>
<i>I don't know anyone who currently benefits from this service</i>
<i>I do not use it at present</i>

<i>I do not use any of these services currently</i>
<i>I do not receive this service and don't expect to in the future</i>
<i>I do not receive or know anyone close that receives this service</i>
<i>I do not know anyone currently using this service, though i agree wholeheartedly that is it importat and should continue to be supported</i>
<i>I do not currently know anyone receiving this support</i>
<i>I am currently in good health and have no need for the service and I am not a carer</i>
<i>I am aging and will soon need easy access social alarm services and welfare services in my home. I used Haringey community social alarm services to support my mother in independent living during the last years of her life. These connected care services have a vital role to play in supporting quality of life and independent living for elderly people. Haringey needs to be expanding not contracting these services.</i>
<i>Growing demand, no plans for productivity improvements</i>
<i>do not use these services</i>
<i>Currently I am not impacted by this, but it is an important service to Haringey residents.</i>
<i>Currently i don't use this service</i>
CONNECTED CARE SERVICE IS SUFFICIENT AS IS
<i>Clients are very happy with the options given to them and although some cannot afford the costs, many take up the service and believe it to be of value to them.</i>
<i>Caring for dementia member of family never used service. These assertive technologies can be cheaply bought installed cheaply by users family/representatives. The council should be advisory rather than an actualization</i>
<i>because it doesn't affect me or someone I care for</i>
<i>As an older person living on my own a time will come when I will need support</i>
<i>A service many taxpayers do not use</i>

Are there any changes the council could make to the Day Opportunities provision that would improve residents' experience and help reduce the cost of providing the service?

*Working closely with Voluntary and Community organisations to increase their capacity.
Developing/expanding befriending or similar provisions*

Use libraries, particularly branch libraries and other local buildings, to provide services in the heart of local neighbourhoods and maximise the use and efficiency of local buildings.

To make life better for residents with learning disabilities and mental health needs while spending less on Day Opportunities services, the Council could consider a variety of changes. Here are some ideas:

1. *Personalized Support*

- ***Individual Plans:*** Create specific support plans for each resident based on their unique needs and goals. This way, services can be more focused, helping to avoid unnecessary spending.

- ***Flexible Options:*** Provide services at various times and locations, making it easier for individuals to get help when they need it, whether in the community or on-site. This could increase satisfaction and lower costs involved in fixed service setups.

- ***Choices for Residents:*** Allow individuals and their carers to pick the services they want, empowering them to choose affordable and tailored options.

2. *Community-Based Services*

- ***Engagement in the Community:*** Promote activities and outreach programs that help residents connect with their communities, moving away from fixed day center spaces. This encourages social inclusion and can save on the costs of running large facilities.

- ***Peer Support Opportunities:*** Set up peer support or volunteer activities that let residents take on leadership roles, promoting independence and reducing dependence on costly staff.

3. *Use of Technology*

- ***Digital Tools:*** Use apps and online platforms to help residents manage their schedules, communicate with staff, and track their progress. This can make services more efficient and keep an eye on residents' well-being without needing constant on-site supervision.

- ***Virtual Services:*** Offer telehealth options for mental health support or routine check-ins, helping to lower the need for face-to-face visits.

4. *Streamline Services*

- ***Collaborate with Local Organizations:*** Work with local charities or nonprofits specializing in support for disabilities. They might provide high-quality services at lower costs, easing the burden on Council resources.

- ***Share Resources:*** Team up with nearby councils or service providers to share staff, equipment, or spaces, reducing overall costs and providing more options for residents.

5. *Reevaluate Existing Facilities*

- ***Assess Facility Use:*** Look at whether some day services or buildings are underused or costly to maintain. Merging services into fewer locations or moving to smaller community venues could lower expenses.

- ***Multi-Purpose Spaces:*** Adapt existing buildings to serve various functions, such as education, social activities, and health support, maximizing their use.

6. *Train Staff for Efficiency*

- ***Skills Development:*** Provide training so staff can offer a wider range of effective

services. Well-trained staff can reduce the need for additional help and improve service quality.

- **Flexible Staffing:** Consider more adaptable staffing arrangements, like part-time roles or job sharing, to better match staff presence to resident needs.

7. **Focus on Prevention**

- **Early Support:** Invest in services for individuals showing early signs of needing help, which might prevent the need for more costly long-term care.

- **Wellness Programs:** Offer programs that help residents maintain independence, such as exercise or mental health support, potentially reducing the need for day services over time.

8. **Outcome-Based Funding**

- **Performance Contracts:** Use funding models that reward service providers for achieving specific results, such as improving residents' well-being or social skills, promoting cost efficiency.

- **Data-Driven Decisions:** Collect data on how services are used and how residents feel about them to spot opportunities for savings without compromising quality.

9. **Support Carers**

- **Carer Training and Respite:** Provide training and short breaks for carers, which can lessen the demand for day services and allow them to offer better support at home.

- **Involve Carers in Service Design:** Get feedback from carers when creating or improving services, as they often understand what works best for residents.

10. **Trial New Approaches**

- **Pilot Programs:** Test new service delivery models, such as combining on-site and community services, to gather feedback before fully implementing them. This helps ensure new ideas meet residents' needs effectively.

By combining these strategies, the Council can enhance residents' experiences while managing costs. The goal will be to find a good balance between saving money and maintaining or improving the quality of care, keeping the needs of residents and their carers at the forefront of any changes.

This service needs to be made available to more Haringey residents and could be offered to residents outside the borough to generate income. This question needs information about what this service provides.

This is clearly a foolish question to put in a questionnaire to the general public because this service appears to be a specialist service for vulnerable people who should be consulted directly. Answers given by those who are not service users or in need are likely to be misinformed. Vulnerable service users should be supported to have full access to Haringey's libraries and the service users' local branch library in particular.

This is clearly a foolish question to put in a questionnaire to members of the public because this service appears to be a specialist service for vulnerable people who should be consulted directly. Answers given by those who are not service users or in need are likely to be misinformed. Vulnerable service users should be supported to have full access to Haringey's libraries and the service users' local branch library in particular.

There is already a scarcity in this provision and many carers would be unable to work or have some respite and then would rely on benefits or suffer mental health issues from burn out if this were to be reduced at all.

<i>The present services should be reviewed effectively . I am certainly aware of a review taking place with regards to the Autism Hub . As a result of information received from the latter I believe that the contract needs urgent attention .</i>
<i>Reduce printing documents COUNCIL- CARBON</i> <i>Get rid of ***** have a Haringey Hub for ***** surgery (Only 3 in the borough) all the others step down.</i> <i>All ***** should step down after 4 years. No extensions given to them</i> <i>get rid of connected communities - it is NOT working</i>
<i>Reduce carbon prints: stop printing</i> <i>re-train councillors, after 4 years of service all councillors must step down</i> <i>Most council employees do not answer e-mails that includes you (The leader)</i> <i>Your computer system's upgrade them: improve IT</i> <i>Housing: Housing Needs team</i> <i>housing regeneration & development</i> <i>all should be restructured</i> <i>Work with stake holders amiably</i> <i>Work with landlords to eradicate social housing issues</i> <i>Accrediate good landlords give incentives to bring the housing stock into the borough</i> <i>Restructure your cabinet/ councillors, appraise their work & ask them to step down after 4 years give other residents equal opportunity</i> <i>ALL the council buildings: RRR provide refurbish, renovate, rent DO NOT CLOSE BUILDINGS</i> <i>Abolish: Selective Licensing fee: not all councils charge this</i> <i>Children & welfare section: More good youth centers, apprenticeships & careers for young people</i> <i>Have connections with universities & other so that young people are employed</i> <i>Animal cruelty: Eradicate animal cruelty: we refuse a cat which was dumped on the cambridge roundabout</i> <i>Bicycles: Bicycle lanes, as every one with lime they cycle on the payments alarming elderly disabled people</i> <i>More awareness of womens activities, domestic violence etc</i>
<i>People can participate in action plans for it</i>
<i>Parents should be taking and collecting their children from the day care facilities as other parents do. This will enhance the day to day relationship between child and primary carer and mutual information sharing of that child's triumphs etc can only benefit all parties. Also, helps that child be a visible and accepted part of the wider community; not hidden, and only in the purview of officials/organisations.</i>
<i>not aware. a review seems sensible</i>
<i>No</i>
<i>N/A</i>
<i>Make Dial a Ride more efficient!</i>
<i>I'm not at all comfortable with this it just looks like service cutting and trying to gain a subsidy by driving cost into the voluntary sector or expecting care workers to subsidise service delivered out of their wages. The problem is inadequate central funding. The chancellor needs to come up with what a welfare state costs not what is politically convenient.</i>
<i>I think government is all about priorities and ensuring tax payers money is spent efficiently. Why is it therefore that whenever questions like this are asked it is kicked into the long grass with a review?</i>
<i>I have no confidence that changes would reduce the cost of providing the service.</i>
<i>I have no idea what the impact of the changes will be. All I know is that when I had to use the service for my parents a few years ago, it was extremely good and better than most of the</i>

<i>other councils I heard of.</i>
<i>This whole exercise seems to be about saving money rather than delivering better services. i can see why but I think you should be putting more pressure on the government to increase funding.</i>
<i>I have been involved with the services & it has been a life saver. It has enormously been beneficial for me too. I have a brain injury & I am by myself. To cut this service would be detrimental for me being a Haringey resident.</i>
<i>I don't know. I don't know what will be in the review.</i>
<i>I don't know what this service is and the description does not clarify what it is.</i>
<i>I don't know -- I don't use this Service.</i>
<i>I am not up to date on current provisions but services were appalling when I was the sole carer for my mother who had dementia and needed help.</i>
<i>I am not an expert in this area and so I don't know what changes would be viable.</i>
<i>I am nor qualified to make any suggestions beyond saying that staff involved in service delivery should be asked for their views on how cost-efficiency can be improved</i>
<i>I am in favour of the proposals to explore "alternative delivery models, including full in-house provision; partnerships or external delivery by not-for-profit organisations."</i> <i>Would add more 'co-production involving users and their families.</i> <i>Plus opening up day centres to other community uses - improving community integration and potential income.</i> <i>Could a better service also be achieved by diverting legal costs of contesting claims for support to actual provision?</i>
<i>Don't know</i>
<i>Don't know.</i>
<i>Do not know what it is. Until now, haven't heard of this. It is not clear from the name or your website what it is.</i>
<i>cut further or get users to pay for the services</i>
<i>Bring full in-house.</i>
<i>Big hit. whatabout s, charities, business or school partnerships</i>
<i>Agreed. The system needs to be reviewed and needs to be more efficient and cost effective.</i>
<i>Abolish/Repeal celebration of Black History in October, Islamophobia in November, LGBT etc. Every other country Celebrates Black History (February that is International Day). Bring down 3/4 costs by having 1 Equality Month in February from 2025. And then you stop the Fire Fuelling Fire problems. Teach people in October and November about real issues. As most have half term anyway in October. And February the Short Month.</i>

What impact would integrating the Connected Communities service (in other words making it a part of) with other services such as adult social care and housing needs into one service have on you or someone you care for?

<i>Would have no effect to anyone Imknow</i>
<i>We do not currently have care needs</i>
<i>Until now, haven't heard of this. It is not clear from the name or your website what it is.</i>
<i>This is clearly a foolish question to put in a questionnaire to the general public because this service appears to be a specialist service for vulnerable people who should be consulted directly. Answers given by those who are not service users or in need are likely to be misinformed.</i>
<i>This is clearly a foolish question to put in a questionnaire to the general public because this service appears to be a specialist service for vulnerable people who should be consulted directly. Answers given by those who are not service users or in need are likely to be misinformed.</i>
<i>This is basic common sense. Agencies need to talk to each other to increase efficiency. Provided the system of communication/action is clear and not disjointed requiring multiple formats, it could work. All agencies involved should have a mutual e-system so every agency can see what, where and how things are done. This will reduce replication of workload and the person being helped has some idea of what is happening so feeling that they included in the decsion making process.</i>
<i>There will be reduced attention on the Connected Communities service and they could potentially lose out through prioritisation in other organisations</i>
<i>There is insufficient info in the 5 se to be able to answer this question</i>
<i>There is a significant lack of support for victims of domestic abuse and adults with learning disabilities. You have not made clear how you would provide sufficient protection from abuse of this nature should this service be terminated.</i>
<i>The service would be more impactful as a stand alone service as they provide support around a wide range of support needs. People who need help that doesnt pertain to housing or adult social care or specific council related support may struggle to find the right help from the right services. Also, unless there is change in accessibility of other services, this will only shut residents out who need help and only few will gain support. this is more of a barrier as most other services in the council are not easy to get in touch with as it is. How will the support be accessed in that case? I also feel that demand would be extremely high in these specific teams which means that only a few will be able to access support through these channels. it will not be accessible to people who really need it.</i>
<i>The more joined up the better for all.</i>
<i>stops wasting money</i>
<i>sounds more efficient and joined up</i>
<i>Social care, including senior care, children services, protection, and housing support, is highly nuanced and complex. I believe it is more effective to manage these areas separately, allowing focused attention on the unique challenges and requirements of each issue.</i>
<i>Services should be joined up</i>
<i>rubbish service not needed</i>
<i>Proposal 9 and 10 We support the integration of Connected Communities with housing and ASC services but want to ensure that these services are available in all wards. Currently they are piecemeal with many residents not being clear who their contacts are. We also ask if savings of £1.1m allows for the development of alternative services. To cut and not re-develop does not ensure the best prevention and early intervention support leading to savings further down the line.</i>

<i>Possible economies of scale and shared back office functions</i>
<i>Positive if more proactive services for health, wellbeing and reducing social isolation implemented</i>
<i>not utilising</i>
<i>Not using adult social care</i>
<i>not caring for anyone</i>
<i>No one I know receives this support</i>
<i>No details given of exactly what changes are proposed</i>
<i>Need to see what comes out of changes</i>
<i>NEED TO BE ABLE TO SEE CC TEAM FACE TO FACE. ISSUES ARE FAR AND WIDE BEYOND HOUSING AND ASC. A lot of people particularly elderly, people with mental health and other disabilities do not have emails or smart phones and are digitally excluded from the council march towards everything online. Who will help with benefits forms such as PIP, Capability for work - which ultimately brings money into the borough. It is short sighted to release a team with local knowledge and connections to support residents' in person - far too many services are back office such as repairs and housing and residents cannot access them despite perpetually trying. CC work with residents to assist with looking for work, housing, getting legal support. the proposed budget to end the service will increase cooperate complaints and legal cases as case progression will slow to a standstill. every £ spent for the CC team saves multiple £s per resident supported in issues escalating requiring more specialist support such as social workers and their budget. CC are creative in their approach getting to the root of issues and accessible to meet residents' face to face to assist them in moving forward. The shortage in responsive services includes Tenancy management, repairs and housing registration for starters.</i>
<i>Myself or my family do not need this service currently</i>
<i>Many people rely on Connected Communities for support in accessing their benefits or managing their finances and dealing with council services. Without this they would suffer mental health issues, fall into increasing debt and their housing situations would worsen causing homelessness and destitution. This is a crucial service for many families.</i>
<i>Mainly are symbolic and palliative interventions</i>
<i>lack of knowledge, they serve as a minimal service point</i>
<i>Joined up working can only be positive</i>
<i>It's not clear how these savings will be made</i>
<i>It's hard to see how doing more with less will not impact negatively on adult social services</i>
<i>Integrating the Connected Communities Service with other services, such as adult social care and housing needs, into a single, cohesive service could have several positive impacts for both residents and the services themselves. This integration could create a more seamless, efficient approach to supporting residents, particularly those at the highest risk of needing care and support, and help improve the overall quality of service delivery. Here's how: 1. Improved Coordination and Continuity of Care By combining services like adult social care, housing, and the Connected Communities Service, residents would benefit from a more coordinated approach. This would ensure that all their needs—whether related to health, housing, safety, or wellbeing—are addressed in a holistic way. Residents, particularly those with complex or multiple needs, often face challenges when dealing with several different departments. Integration would reduce the need for them to navigate multiple systems and would provide a single point of contact, making it easier for them to access the support they need. 2. Early Intervention and Prevention With a more unified service, there would be a stronger emphasis on early intervention. The Connected Communities Service could work in tandem with adult social care and housing teams to identify residents at risk of deterioration before they reach a crisis point. For example, the wellbeing checks and assistive technology</i>

offered by the Connected Communities Service could be linked to housing and social care assessments, ensuring that residents who need support are identified early. By intervening early, residents can maintain their independence for longer, reducing the likelihood that they will need more intensive care or support in the future. This could ultimately help reduce the demand on costly, crisis-driven services, such as emergency healthcare or long-term residential care.

3. Efficient Use of Resources Integrating services allows for more efficient use of resources. For instance, the same staff or service teams could handle both housing and social care needs, preventing overlap and ensuring that resources are being used where they are needed most. A single, unified service model could eliminate redundancies in service provision, such as duplicate assessments or overlapping support services. This would lead to cost savings and more streamlined delivery.

4. Enhanced Personalization of Support When different services are integrated, the approach to care and support can be more tailored to the individual's needs. Information from social care, housing, and connected communities teams could be shared more easily, providing a fuller picture of each resident's situation and allowing for more personalized care plans. For example, if a resident is struggling with housing instability and has mental health challenges, a holistic service would provide a combined support package, addressing housing needs alongside mental health services and wellbeing checks. This would improve outcomes by ensuring all aspects of the resident's life are considered when determining the most appropriate support.

5. Improved Communication and Collaboration An integrated service would foster better communication and collaboration between different departments within the council. By working together, teams can share insights, expertise, and resources to more effectively address the needs of residents. This could lead to faster response times and more effective problem-solving, as teams are no longer siloed but work toward common goals and outcomes for residents.

6. Greater Focus on Prevention and Wellbeing Integration allows for a stronger focus on prevention rather than just reacting to crises. The Connected Communities Service could be used proactively to ensure that residents are supported to remain independent, reducing the likelihood of needing more intensive interventions in the future. With services like wellbeing checks, assistive technology, and safety alarms integrated with housing and social care teams, residents could receive more proactive, preventative care that addresses issues like social isolation, mental health, and housing instability before they escalate.

7. Improved Resident Experience Residents would experience a more seamless service when they do not have to navigate different departments or multiple service providers. This could significantly improve their overall experience, making them feel supported and cared for by a coherent, well-coordinated service. By having a more joined-up approach, residents would have fewer barriers to access and could expect more consistent and timely support, improving both their safety and quality of life.

8. Cost-Effective Service Delivery The integration of these services could also reduce duplication of effort and ensure that services are delivered in a more cost-effective manner. By providing a more comprehensive and unified offering, the council could reduce the need for residents to receive multiple, fragmented services from different departments, which can often lead to inefficiencies. Additionally, the integration of services could help free up resources in the long term by enabling early intervention and prevention, which could ultimately reduce demand for more expensive, crisis-based interventions.

If you have less money and more people needing the services, how can the service have a positive impact?

I'd go further and remove it completely or charge individuals. Connected Communities offers services which every adult should be able to do on their own.

I think this needs to be kept separate to ensure that queries are answered quickly and don't get bogged down with delays in social care.

<i>I suspect that this would just be a way of giving specialist staff generic job descriptions and overworking them, which I believe eventually means there will be a lower quality of service provided overall.</i>
<i>I don't use this service</i>
<i>I don't need these services now but who knows what the future holds.</i>
<i>I don't fall into any of the groups for people to whom this Service applies.</i>
<i>I don't care for anyone that requires</i>
<i>I don't (yet) have a need to call on this service</i>
<i>I don't know enough about this to make an informed assessment</i>
<i>I do not use these services</i>
<i>I do not use- or know about- the Connected Communities service</i>
<i>I do not know anyone in care locally</i>
<i>I do not know anyone currently using this service, though I agree wholeheartedly that it is important and should continue to be supported</i>
<i>I didn't understand the description.</i>
<i>I didn't know it existed and have never used it</i>
<i>I can't answer this as you haven't set out what the changes are going to be so how can I say what impact they'll have?</i>
<i>I believe adult social care, housing and community services help to provide for a more integrated and civilized society. Adult social care, housing</i>
<i>I am not using any of these services, nor is my partner nor household.</i>
<i>I am not part of the user group for this service</i>
<i>How would I know? This is too vague</i>
<i>Hopefully</i>
<i>Fully agree with the aim of improved ways of working between teams and departments within the council, fostering a more joined-up, efficient offer for residents; but it will only work if it's managed efficiently; otherwise it could just result in yet more bureaucracy and a 'committee-led' approach!</i>
<i>Don't use it</i>
<i>Don't know.</i>
<i>Details on changes proposed are unclear</i>
<i>Connected Communities works in a very nuanced way culturally that is completely different from ASC & Housing Needs, that is likely to be lost in an integration with these services creating a diluted experience for residents</i>
<i>Connected Communities works face to face with some of the most excluded residents that have been failed by many services in the Borough. They ensure the residents' voices are heard whether this is using our BSL interpreter or Big Word. The support workers work tirelessly to ensure the Haringey values are upheld when many other services fail to do so. Termination or integration into ASC would not benefit the residents of Haringey, leaving many to suffer in detrimental circumstances which will lead to a more traumatised community.</i>
<i>Connected Communities serves any resident with any issue. By limiting what they do and how they work will negatively impact support accessibility for all residents. It is a short sighted way of saving money as CC serve and support residents to prevent more costly intervention from the council at a later stage including cooperate complaints and escalation to ombudsman and legal claims against the council</i>
<i>Centralising the back office systems and deskilling the staff as and contracting out always looks good on paper. However, you will wind up with a bunch of poorly motivated and qualified clerical staff managing a series of ever more contested contracts. You will become organisationally incompetent in social care and unable to effectively manage these services.</i>

<i>Better access to direct services</i>
<i>Although one hears of the word Integration , there needs to be more discussion as to how this should be carried out . I certainly support the idea however of a major review being conducted with regards to the delivery of Adult Social Care by both Health and the LA . As there does not seem to be anything positive one can say about the service .</i>

What Housing Related Support services have you got experience of using – either yourself or someone you care for or work with?

yes
<i>Volunteering with the Council Resettlement Team and newly eligible refugees to find temporary or PRS accommodation.</i>
<i>The only experience I have of the council is that they failed to support a covid widow who is vulnerable and has disabilities simply because she pushes herself to work a few hours a week so as to give to her community. Although the council is prepared to provide unlimited support to others who choose not to work. Disappointing and unfair on disabled and vulnerable people who want to continue to contribute.</i>
<i>The ironically named ‘support’ officers have allowed my hostile neighbours to constantly harass and assault me ever since I moved in. These officers have also been abusive to me themselves, causing me huge distress.</i>
<i>social rents should be increased with inflation, more help for working residents who cannot private rent hikes should be provided</i>
<i>Repairs</i>
<i>property investor landlords director the housing department is a shamble</i>
<i>Not sure.</i>
<i>Not sure about it</i>
<i>None at all apart from rubbish collection, street cleaning and lighting</i>
<i>My experience with housing has been with consultations over time and I'm aware of ongoing management problems over time with housing. We are all aware of current complaints to the Ombudsman. It could be worth creating a central management team comprising selected managers to consider how best to tackle this and that team would also take responsibility for changes and results.</i>
<i>My 86 yr old neighbour had workers to fit a shower room and stair lift. The level of efficiency was extremely low and so wasteful</i>
<i>It might make the transition of vulnerable adult residents into appropriate housing quicker.</i>
<i>I'm not eligible for most of housing related support</i>
<i>I work with resident engagement groups who report extreme difficulties in contacting Housing and having repairs done and having appropriate housing for residents.</i>
<i>I work in Early Help wherever almost 80% of our referrals include issues around housing. This places a huge demand on children's social care. This is a massively underfunded service and any cuts in this area would only escalate demands on other statutory services.</i>
<i>I see people sleeping on the street and long queues outside the local food bank. In the past during COVID I delivered for the food bank. It was obvious that some of the people receiving food were living in a very difficult situation. This isn't an area where service reduction should even be considered.</i>
<i>I have, and it involves going round the houses. The system is stressful, unclear, inconsistent and gives the impression the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing.</i>
<i>I have not made use of any Housing Related Support services.</i>
<i>I have no experience of this service, but I cannot believe that it is not understaffed and overstretched already. The whole homelessness issue needs a complete rethink along the lines of returning to building tens of thousands of social housing units each year.</i>
<i>I have experienced supported housing that then became assisted living with reference to my aunt. I spent years putting formal complaints and asking for the contract to be reviewed without any real response!</i>
<i>I don't know -- I don't rely on or need this Service.</i>

Housing registration, housing needs, and other teams related to housing. income collection etc

Haringey social services, Mace Housing

Don't have experience with housing related support, but know a lot of people who ricked being homeless after rent payments were raised. This needs to be controlled in some way to prevent more people being at risk of homelessness

already short staffed - making cuts will impact services

The Engage Haringey team has provided housing support where residents have been unable to contact or receive support from statutory services. They have also supported people with benefit maximisation. This is extremely important in the more deprived areas of the borough where residents are less likely to be able to advocate for themselves.

What impact would changes to Housing Related Support have on you or someone you care for?

<i>Until I know how the system is implemented, I can't comment.</i>
<i>Unless they are trained to deal with antisocial behaviour effectively, and be sensitive and genuinely supportive towards vulnerable tenants, then they're not fit for purpose.</i>
<i>Too vague to know what you're proposing, or implications. I don't assume this includes retrofitting of draughty council houses?</i>
<i>Too much wastage in council services generally</i>
<i>This question is incoherent as no changes are set out. This is clearly a foolish question to put in a questionnaire to members of the public because this service appears to be a specialist service for vulnerable people who should be consulted directly. Answers given by those are not service users or in need are likely to be misinformed.</i>
<i>This question is incoherent as no changes are set out. It is clearly a foolish question to put in a questionnaire to members of the public because this service appears to be a specialist service for vulnerable people who should be consulted directly. Answers given by those are not service users or in need are likely to be misinformed.</i>
<i>This is in theory as I don't care for anyone. It would also depend on what the specific changes were & whether they would suit different individuals.</i>
<i>These are not universal services</i>
<i>the LP plan 2024 is NOT available, homeless people increasing the housing department needs to be resturctured</i>
<i>Supported housing / Assisted Living projects need to be urgently reviewed .</i>
<i>stops wasting money</i>
<i>see above</i>
<i>please bring in-house and streamline</i>
<i>People in themore deprived areas of the borough are often unaware of the support that could be offered and would find themselves in increasingly precarious situations causing homelssness, destitution and severe mental health issues without this support.</i>
<i>not utilising</i>
<i>Not using housing related support</i>
<i>Not used</i>
<i>Not relevant to me</i>
<i>not applicable to me</i>
<i>No experience with this kinde of service</i>
<i>No comment</i>
<i>Never got involved in the subject</i>
<i>N/A for me or family</i>
<i>N/A</i>
<i>Myself or my family don't use this service</i>
<i>long wiating lists for OT assessments, elederly people neglected</i>
<i>Joined up provision, which appears currently inadequate, would be very beneficial. But not filling vacancies could overstretch staff further unless genuine efficiencies with cutting provision can be achieved.</i>
<i>It would reduce support options</i>
<i>It would depend on what these changes are. At the moment housing services have been very difficult to get help from and in many cases have not been able to provide accommodation for residents due to high demand. staffing levels wold firstly need to be increased so that there is capacity to do the role but also there needs to be an appropriate triage system which leads</i>

<i>residents to the correct place. I understand that this does not solve the problem of housing demand but it would help if staff are not so overwhelmed that people are waiting excessively long periods of time just for a decision about their living situation.</i>
<i>It might have progressed (nine years) disrepair issues quicker. Might prevent elderly residents being housed in inappropriate accommodation.</i>
<i>Insufficient info is provided to answer this question</i>
<i>Impossible to get extra help and assistance as you make the forms too long and don't ask the appropriate questions</i>
<i>I'm currently fortunate not to need those services</i>
<i>I have no experience on which to base my opinion</i>
<i>I don't use this service</i>
<i>I don't use this service</i>
<i>I don't use these</i>
<i>I don't know if I know anyone who receives this support</i>
<i>I don't know anyone using these services</i>
<i>I don't fall into any of the groups of people who use this Service.</i>
<i>I don't believe that the housing crisis in the borough will be reduced by cost cutting</i>
<i>I do not know anyone currently using this service, though I agree wholeheartedly that it is important and should continue to be supported</i>
<i>I am fortunate in not needing them.</i>
<i>Housing is one of the biggest problems for residents in this borough and needs to be given more funding and support.</i>
<i>Housing is in crisis in Haringey. The council needs more people, not less to deal with the crisis. The result can only be negative, even catastrophic.</i>
<i>Growing demand, no productivity plans</i>
<i>For reason given above, unlikely to have an impact. The council doesn't support disabled people who force themselves to work.</i>
<i>Don't use these services</i>
<i>Don't use</i>
<i>Cuts in this area will ultimately result in more homeless people on the streets of Haringey, and so even if you do not use the service you will be affected by the sight of homeless people in a desperate situation.</i>
<i>As stated earlier I believe this all contributes to a more cohesive and civilized society</i>
<i>£412K savings is a very precise amount but no detail given on how this figure was calculated.</i>

Do you agree with the proposal that the cost of running Pendarren should be met via the income it generates rather than subsidising it from council resources as long as it can continue to provide a high quality and affordable option for Haringey's families?

<i>You haven't said how you generate income for Pendarren. If you said how it makes the income generated, then I would be able to give a considered answer. Otherwise, without sufficient information, the answer is more or less invalid.</i>
<i>You have not provided any information on where the income will come from if it becomes a private set up. Please, please, try to learn from the fact that over the last twenty years or so, the taking over of children's homes and homes for the elderly by corporate set up have only resulted in increased costs for local authorities. It is a scandal which you really should be aware of.</i>
<i>Yes, it should diversify and act to maximise the asset and try to use the space to generate revenue on its own behalf</i>
<i>Yes, but on the condition that provided services don't suffer from proposed changes</i>
<i>Would prefer 'don't know' as I don't know whether it's realistic that Pendarren would generate enough income.</i>
<i>While it is right to have such an amenity in Wales better value at little reduction in the children's experience could be achieved closer to home</i>
<i>users should pay for the services they use. If they choose not to work then they/thier children can't afford to participate, it shouldn't be subsidised.</i>
<i>This will impact on ability for most vulnerable to access services</i>
<i>This will encourage Pendarren to run more efficiently with a conscious mindset of cash flow. Otherwise inefficiency will be inevitable.</i>
<i>This is so popular and therefore with some business acumen must able to generate significant income.</i>
<i>This is a poor borough and the council should be funding these schemes instead of wasting funds on things like cycle lanes and LTNs</i>
<i>These service need to be able to manage independent of government</i>
<i>There should always be a course of redress when the site fails to meet costs.</i>
<i>There are options to commission this output if demands are justifiable</i>
<i>The quality of service will drop and fewer young people benefit.</i>
<i>The proposal is vague. Will the carers/parents of the children need to pay more? What is the self-funding model? If Pendarren is to be self-sufficient, will you open it up to other users? I don't understand the statement. If you expect users to individually pay more, then it could work. If you open up the facility to other users, that's possible. But, it's hard to say as I don't know what your business plan is.</i>
<i>The Pendarren Service is funded using the present methodology in order to ensure the service is sustainable and accessible to all school children in Haringey. Changing the funding approach will make the service unviable and unsustainable. These proposals were previously rejected so why are they being put forward again? This is clearly a foolish question to out in a questionnaire to members of the public because this service is a service given to schools. Given the biased question it is disappointing to see that the Council no longer supports the service.</i>
<i>The Pendarren Service is funded using the present methodology in order to ensure the service is sustainable and accessible to all school children in Haringey. Changing the funding approach will make the service unviable and unsustainable. Given the biased question it is disappointing to see that the Council no longer supports the service.</i>
<i>The current epidemic of Childhood obesity</i>

<i>The costs should be subsidised to ensure every child has the opportunity to go. It's a favourite and treasured part of primary school life in haringey</i>
<i>spending should equal income</i>
<i>Some families can't afford to pay to use the service. If Pendarren had to break even who will support those children</i>
<i>So long as it genuinely remains affordable, without compromising the services offered.</i>
<i>Should be done if it is sustainable and families still have access to affordable support</i>
<i>Should be a joint partnership in my view with any income Pendarren can achieve being matched by the council</i>
<i>Services should be self funding as long as users are not disadvantaged</i>
<i>Provided all Haringey children will continue to have the opportunity to go.</i>
<i>People Using the service need to realise that services have to be paid for</i>
<i>Pendarren has been of real benefit to Haringey children over the years and I think it should be subsidised by the Council.</i>
<i>Pendarren has been a wonderful resource for Haringey's children, including my own, and it should continue to be for the benefit of ALL the children of Haringey. If it becomes self-funding, then the more disadvantaged children will be left out.</i>
<i>Only if the same quality can be provided; if not, the council should continue to fund/</i>
<i>Only if standards can be maintained in this way</i>
<i>On the face of it, that appears to be the right approach</i>
<i>NOT APPLICABLE TO ME</i>
<i>Not all schools use Pendarren and it seems resources are better directed elsewhere.</i>
<i>Not a priority for funding sadly.</i>
<i>No details given of income generated now or in future years</i>
<i>My children benefited enormously from Pendarren. It should be retained for the benefit of Haringey families and schools, but self-funding through generation of income from other sources.</i>
<i>Maximum use should be made of the facilities available at Pendarren when not being used by Haringey children.</i>
<i>makes sense, so long as it doesn't exclude or cos more for those in greatest need.</i>
<i>It would be better to have different arrangements for families that cannot afford, vs families that can afford paying</i>
<i>It should be possible to generate sufficient income to allow it to be self-funding</i>
<i>It is a relatively small investment by Haringey with an outsize impact on the lives of children who get to use the service.</i>
<i>It could work if there's no major challenges with Pendarren it's self .</i>
<i>Revisit every 2 years to get value for money .</i>
<i>Check figures against total over all cost .</i>
<i>It could be self funding.</i>
<i>Investment in children should be a council priority given the problems with youth gang culture</i>
<i>Impossible to answer when you use the words high quality and affordable without saying what they mean.</i>
<i>High quality compared with what, affordable to whom</i>
<i>Important to give this opportunity to children in Haringey, my children loved it.</i>
<i>If this model maintains affordability and quality, and is achievable, this would be appropriate.</i>
<i>If these services are not covered by schools they should be self funding</i>
<i>If it works without input from council then use it. If it doesn't, think again.</i>
<i>If it is able to generate income without this impinging on the time/quality of services devoted to Haringey children. Presumably this is done by running paid courses for other organisations.</i>

<i>I would need more information on the cost of running the facility and it unlikely to be succesful in self-funding</i>
<i>I would need more details of actual numbers to be able to answer this question</i>
<i>I went to Pendarren twice as a child in Haringey; I hold fond memories of it still nearly 25 years later. Given that a number of families in the borough are likely able to pay a little for their child to attend, this seems like an appropriate step to help support the council at this financially troubled time. However, I would ask that the council think carefully about who they provide financial support to and by what metrics, and keep track of social and ethnic demongraphics of attendees to ensure this cost out a 'middle income' group of student who may, for example, not qualify for free meals but who's family may see this as an additional expense they cannot afford</i>
<i>I think families still need support the system</i>
<i>I think children's trips to Pendarren should continue be subsidised until Pendarren is able to cover the costs itself, rather than cutting the Council funding before Pendarren is realistically able to be self-sufficient. Is Pendarren sufficiently advertised as a holiday site to the public via non-Haringey resources, e.g. holiday let/ campsite websites when not in use by Haringey schools?</i>
<i>I see that this resource which is crucial to children in order to experience the countryside and bond with their peers would fail to be able to deliver the services that they currently do. If they were able to manage this currently why has it been previously subsidised? I am confused with regards to the question. How could they continue to provide high quality affordable trips without the Council's financial support. Where would the savings be? I would need to know more about the situation to give a valid and considered response.</i>
<i>I loved pendarren House and used it as a child. My family would not have been able to use it if I had to pay. It is more valuable than ten psychologists</i>
<i>I have no evidence that Pendarren House generates any income, outside provision by Haringey Schools. Not to subsidise funding suggests a lack of support for financially challenged students.</i>
<i>I don't have any children, but agree with the proposal.</i>
<i>I choose Yes, as in principle it would be great to match costs with income, but no information has been provided regarding how Pendarren house can generate income?</i>
<i>I certainly agree that some income should be generated - but this could be done in a staggered approach. My view is that people often fail to fully value services which are free. They often take these for granted, whereas if users are required to make some financial contribution, then they will value the service much more.</i>
<i>Hard to really judge from the information but I assume it means charging more (whilst staying cheaper than the competition). Not great but probably reasonable in the circumstances. I'd never heard of Pendarren so interesting to read about it.</i>
<i>Given the current financial pressures, this seems unavoidable</i>
<i>Don't know. Too vague.</i>
<i>Crucial for inner city children to retain access to the countryside. If Pendarren can fund itself then this is an ideal solution.</i>
<i>council cannot subsidises services inevitably</i>
<i>Could it be 50% paid from pendarren and 50% from haringey</i>
<i>comment reserved due to legal reasons</i>
<i>Children from low cost families will be squeezed out by those who can pay in order for the service to pay for itself.</i>
<i>Child poverty is now so severe that nothing should reduce what the council can do to provide support</i>
<i>Cannot comment. Not familiar with Pendarren and the service it provides.</i>

Because you used the word 'affordable', which means people should be able to afford it. if Later there are no poorer people using the service, your measure is wrong.

Because if running this site depends only on income generated, if you don't make income, we run the risk of having to close it down, if this happens kids have one less resource, this can lead to antisocial behavior and more crime- this should be funded by the council, we can find a way for money to be raised another way through the council though

Any income generation that preserves quality and safety of services should be pursued

Although it is an excellent project, I believe it could be self funding.

Although , I fully support the work that Pendarren delivers particularly for some children who otherwise would never experience a holiday ! However , the financing needs to be reviewed. Schools maybe able to help in approaching Charities etc.

Proposal 11: Pendarron

Saving £25k on providing an outdoor pursuit week to thousands of inner-city kids is denying them the right to opportunity.

Can Pendarron continue as it is without this money? If not, other means of finding this money need to be identified. £25,000 is not a large sum and could be found elsewhere in the budget.

Do you agree that we should work to reduce costs via the use of digital technology as long as we ensure there are ways for residents to access services who are not able to access it.

You could try but practice will show the envisaged reduction in costs will be negligible; digitalisation has its own problems and costs associated with upkeep and maintenance are often overlooked

Yes, I agree that the Council should work to reduce costs through digital technology, as long as it is done in a way that ensures accessibility for all residents. Digital transformation has the potential to significantly improve efficiency, streamline processes, and save costs by automating manual tasks and making services more accessible online. It can also help deliver services more quickly, improve communication, and enable residents to engage with services at their convenience.

However, it is critical that this digital shift does not leave behind vulnerable residents who may not have access to technology or struggle with its use. Many individuals, particularly the elderly, those with disabilities, or people experiencing financial difficulties, may find it challenging to navigate digital systems. Therefore, the Council should ensure there are alternative ways to access services, such as offering telephone support, in-person assistance, or paper-based options, for those who cannot or prefer not to engage digitally.

Additionally, clear digital literacy support and training could be provided to help those who are willing to adapt to new technology but need some assistance in doing so. This could include providing support in community hubs or through outreach programs, ensuring that no one is excluded from accessing vital services as digital solutions are implemented.

In short, while the focus on digital transformation can drive savings and improve efficiency, it's essential that these changes are inclusive and provide accessible options for everyone. By doing so, the Council can ensure that the benefits of digital technology are enjoyed by all residents, without anyone being left behind.

Yes, but you have to improve the access to services for those who find it difficult to use digital technology. It's shamefully bad at the moment.

Yes, but only if the digital solutions are then used to their full effect and the appropriate ways. For example, the digital parking permit solution could be used as a way of identifying & appropriately financially penalising individuals who are misusing daily visitor parking permits. Per the consultation that just closed, the council has no evidence of the scale of this misuse or who is responsible, meaning they have instead to chosed to financially penalise the east of the borough in their decisions to discontinue daily permits. Use your power for good!

Yes, but I would like to read more about the plans to ensure access for residents with barriers to access services online. There is a risk here for some residents who cannot access services online ending up with worsened circumstances that will make their lives worse and cost the council more than it can save with its digital transfrmation.

Yes but there must be a fault help desk function. E.g. there is a fault in the online planning portal which removes the button which allows residents to feedback. This requires notification to planning who then do a manual fix.

Would need to see the actual proposal with numbers to be able to answer this question. Digital is bot necessarily cheaper.

we are always thriving

We all need to keep up with advances in technology

Using tech is more efficient, you just have to make sure there are no issues with digital security, and make sure those in the community who are less tech savvy are taught how to use the technology

<i>Time and time again digital initiatives to reduce costs have been shown to be ineffective and frequently a waste of money that does not deliver reduced costs or improved efficiency. The Council should concentrate on delivering good frontline services. It should be cutting management layers and increasing spans of control in order to improve efficiency and reduce costs.</i>
<i>Time and time again digital initiatives to reduce costs have been shown to be ineffective and frequently a waste of money that does not deliver reduced costs or improved efficiency. The Council should concentrate on delivering good frontline services and cutting management layers and increasing spans of control in order to improve efficiency and reduce costs.</i>
<i>This makes sense in our changing world</i>
<i>There will always be many people without access to digital technology & they should not be excluded. Councils often say they will make sure of this but rarely do in practice once digital solutions have been implemented, as they get rid of the people who could help the digitally excluded access services. This is the point of technology isn't it - to sack staff & save money !</i>
<i>There are many residents of Haringey that are digitally excluded due to many reasons. unless this is addressed, it would only create another barrier for people to access support from the council. Yes having an option for digital services helps but there should also be an alternative to this for residents who may not have a smart phone, can afford data or simply know how to use this technology. The web pages and apps which would provide this service would also need to be user friendly and robust so there are no instances where people are unable to access the services they need because of technical issues on Haringey's part.</i>
<i>The Council should beware of spending significant sums on digital technology and digital transformation because evidence shows the anticipated savings do not generally materialise.</i>
<i>There are very large numbers of digitally excluded residents in the borough, residents having access is paramount to them gaining support that they need</i>
<i>Technology has limited intelligence and skills</i>
<i>Some older residents do not have access to technology or are not confident in using technology</i>
<i>Sensible if done well.</i>
<i>sensible</i>
<i>Residents need to know they can use Manual technology, hacking , cyber attacks are becoming more relevant now .</i>
<i>Data protection etc must be maintained at all levels</i>
<i>Provided there are ways for residents to access services who are not able to access it, i agree. This is not happening in my view with digital stuff across the board (e.g. bank closures) and am concerned about what happens when digital stuff is hacked.</i>
<i>Proposal 12: Digital Transformation</i> <i>We are uncertain how this can be achieved in the coming year. Surely there needs to be an initial increased spend with savings beginning in the longer term. The procurement contract is one example of this. We suggest that this is reviewed with a further breakdown of the budget.</i>
<i>Only if the cost reductions and benefits are identified up front as part of the management process. We need to avoid simply creating more bureaucratic constraints on accessing services. The overall strategy (including specific objectives) needs to be designed and set out up front, and delivery needs to be assessed so that the results are achieved</i>
<i>Obviously there are possibilities to increase efficiency and, maybe, reduce costs in this area. Just remember 'cheapest' doesn't mean 'value'. Haringey's website cost considerably more than other councils websites, back in the day, but it is immeasurably better than, say, Camden or Islington.</i>
<i>Not all people are comfortable or understand digital technology and therefore should not be isolated from those who understand and use it.</i>

Most younger people use digital services. However, it's essential that there is a human to get in touch with if there are issues. Invariably when I use digital services, whether in the public or private sector, the service doesn't cover the request I need. Digital services are only as good as the parameters placed on it and how fast responses are made. It will be all in the organisation. Perhaps Haringey should have a trial run and test for user experience before it fully commits. The thing with IT specialists is they over-say and under-deliver, and even the most tech-familiar individual can find it confusing. So, unless you have a model already used, proceed with caution.

More people are more comfortable going digital but processes must be data protection savvy, user friendly and avoid digital exclusion

More efficient.

more digital, less back office staff.

More and more people are capable of using it

Make sure residents who are not computer savvy still have access to services

Lots of residents would really rather use digital services so (if done well, with lots of user testing) this seems fine.

It seems self-evident

It is the way forward

INSUFFICIENT SUPPORT FOR PEOPLE WITH ACCESS TO TECHNOLOGY, LET ALONE THOSE WHO HAVE NONE. IT IS TOO EARLY TO MAKE MASSIVE CHANGES AS HAS BEEN PROVEN BY SOME PEOPLES' LACK OF ACCESS

Inevitable but don't tt overestimate the scalr of digital illiteracy

Increased expenditure on digital technology sounds like an excuse for Council officers to be given shiny new computers without any overall strategy for reducing costs. It is well known that much money is wasted by councils and private businesses on ambitious IT investment schemes that prove to be fatally flawed - remember the Post Office scandal - and rarely result in the hoped-for cost savings. I wonder wonder why past Council expenditure on digital technology has not reduced costs to the optimal level.

If you adopt a mobile-first strategy to digital development, involve residents in the initial user research and usability testing, then digital services provide the best opportunity to raise service standards while reducing costs for the majority of citizens, enabling you to focus budget on those who need more-resource-hungry services.

I'm worried about a decrease in access to services to people who may not be IT literate or have access to the necessary resources. I also don't think that taking humans out of the communication system is of value as it is more prone to error (against common belief).

I would like to see evidence from you that increased expenditure on digital technology has reduced costs significantly. Why have you not provided us with this information. Digital technology systems are expensive to set up and it is a well known fact that the private sector use the public sector to experiment in this area, meaning that the public sector bears the costs for systems that are ineffective. In addition, reducing Council expenditure on libraries, at a time when Haringey is preparing to be the London Borough of Culture makes no sense.

I think this is ok as long as there is a responsive back up team, which hasn't been the case so far. Also all digital services need to be web accessible and not just built for smartphones. I am concerned about elderly and disabled residents' access to these services too.

I think technology should be used to make back-end processes more efficient, therefore freeing up more time and capacity for more direct work with residents. I don't think the aim should be for everything to be digital with very little face to face interaction.

I propose that, as a first step, the Council undertakes an impartial review of its internal rules and regulations with the goal of simplifying them. Experience shows that as organisations grow and mature, numerous requirements often accumulate over time, many of which no

longer serve a clear purpose or are even counterproductive. By streamlining these rules, regulations, and procedures, the Council can unlock significant internal efficiencies and cost savings.

Only after completing this simplification process should the Council explore the adoption of digital technologies. Implementing digital solutions without first addressing unnecessary complexity risks amplifying existing inefficiencies rather than reducing costs.

I do not believe it will reduce costs. However it will improve access and speed of operations. Do you remember all the claims once made about the paperless office or that computers would fall in cost? No they didn't what happened was people got better access to more powerful tools.

Human touch is always needed. When people need service they should talk to a person ,not waist time listening to recorded messages pushing them to go on the web, when all recourses are already tried

How do people who are digitally excluded have their say? Do they know they are excluded? What is the demographic of those who are digitally excluded and how does this exclusion hinder them from seeking help?

Haringey needs to push for a digital future now more than ever. No more paper, no more manual processes.

Everything should be digital by now and if people need help with anything digital you need to have drop in centres where people can provide assistance

Digital technology is used in the private sector to effectively cut costs and the same should happen with publicly funded services

Digital technology is nothing but a menace many people do not understand. The only thing that will happen is that more people will be shut out of the wider picture and connection with the community.

Digital technology does improve quality of service in many occasions.

Currently there is a problem with residents being excluded from digital support causing an inequality with regard to those people who are digitally excluded. How would you ensure that residents can access services without the use of the technology? What are the solutions to this. It is already difficult and sometimes impossible for older people to access the internet and the same for some with learning difficulties. Where would they access this alternative support?

Clear cost cutting possibilities providing you realise that Human to Human contact is also required and not just AI

But only if you first make the online services much better than they are now

Better use of digital tools will not only reduce costs but often improve delivery of services with a more customer orientated manner that is in keeping with current times and expectations.

Better more equal access alongside better technology would be good ONLY IF residents know about it and have the means to access it AND money isn't wasted on consultant schemes that fail to achieve this.

As long as you remember that not everyone uses digital technology

As long as some residents are not excluded.

Although the principle is laudable and if done well I would support, however experience of public sector IT projects shows this is a diversion and an excuse to cut front line services. Examples include the Post Office scandal, plethora of public sector technology project overruns, self interest of IT firms, use of capital spend as an excuse to generate savings and benefits which don't materialise etc. What is more important is to protect front line services and keep any IT spend very close to the operational services. For example on library projects, Friends of Muswell Hill library would like to work closely on setting out a strategy on how

digital technology can help, rather than relying on some completely separate capital spend with a consortium that does not meet local needs.

A I should be used more and more with regards to administrative work including areas like the development of the localities.

1. I would argue that the technology has increased the communication between residents and officers within reasonable times.

2. Having residents How To Complain work shops would really benefit residents and officers.

What impact will reducing the council expenditure on cultural activities have on you?

<i>With the rapid advances in AI the council can use those to automate more processes</i>
<i>With Haringey being the future LB Culture, this is a big loss and missed opportunity.</i>
<i>We are a high income family who don't rely on access to council-funded cultural services. I appreciate that this is not the case for everyone. However, I think that cultural activities probably have greater opportunity to access charitable and social enterprise money than some of the other services which the council must fund - e.g refuse and social care.</i>
<i>THIS COUNCIL HAS DESTROYED SO MUCH ALREADY IT IS UNTHINKABLE THAT THEY WANT TO DESTROY MORE. THEY SHOULD TRY TO SAVE THAT WHICH IS SUFFERING</i>
<i>There will be less cultural activity for residents of Haringey, especially low cost ones for people on low income.</i>
<i>There will be benefits if we make it clear we expect reasonable value for money from our grants; so that our investment is focussed on projects that actually deliver. I agree that smaller local groups are much more financially deserving than the big charities many of which spend far too much money on salaries and administration!</i>
<i>Theatre and culture are a lifeline for many- an uncultured society is an uncivilised one</i>
<i>The reduction in Council expenditure on culture at a time when Haringey is preparing to be the London Borough of Culture makes no sense. Public libraries are integral to the cultural life of the Borough: they are its cultural lifeblood. Drastically reducing library opening hours will have a serious impact on access to the resources and activities that are on offer at branch libraries, and will be particularly damaging for the young, the elderly, the unemployed, the homeless and the disabled who will not able to travel extensively around the Borough when their local library will be closed.</i>
<i>The reduction in Council expenditure on culture at a time when Haringey is preparing to be the London Borough of Culture makes no sense. Public libraries are integral to the cultural life of the Borough: they are its cultural lifeblood. Drastically reducing library opening hours will have a serious impact on my access to the resources and activities that are on offer at my branch library, and will be particularly damaging for the young, the elderly, the unemployed, the homeless and the disabled who will not able to travel extensively around the Borough when their local library will be closed.</i>
<i>The impact will be greatest for the most vulnerable and poorest in Haringey if the Council cuts its free culture - libraries - offer. The Council should reverse its 50% to branch libraries and its 20% cut to main libraries. Libraries are the only offer of culture that is free for those on low incomes, homeless people, children and toddlers, the elderly, disabled people, working people, students and others who are vulnerable. Branch libraries are particularly important for disabled and elderly residents and parents with young children who may not be able to travel to another library. The Council should not be subsidising Ally Pally or JLAC as these arts venues mainly serve non-Haringey residents. The Council should reduce non-customer-facing culture staff and delete all culture roles costing over £50,000.</i>
<i>The impact will be greatest for the most vulnerable and poorest in Haringey if the Council cuts its free culture - libraries - offer. The Council should reverse its 50% cut to branch libraries and its 20% cut to main libraries. Libraries are the only offer of culture that is free for those on low incomes, homeless people, children and toddlers, the elderly, disabled people, working people, students and others who are vulnerable. Branch libraries are particularly important for disabled and elderly residents and parents with young children who may not be able to travel to another library. The Council should not be subsidising Ally Pally or JLAC as these arts venues mainly serve non-Haringey residents. The Council should reduce non-customer-facing culture staff and delete all culture roles costing over £50,000.</i>
<i>The cultural activities (and/or cultural diversity of activities) is rather limited and not fully reflective of the communities and/or ethnic mix of the borough.</i>

<i>The council fail to manage things manually, so making them do things digitally will be disastrous. They don't even keep accurate records as a way of avoiding being held accountable for their negligence.</i>
<i>The borough is one of the most diverse local authority in the country, cutting back on these undermines the value of this privilege to have that claim and a let down for residents support in principle but need to recognise that not all residents can access services online.</i>
<i>Sadly, if Council funding is reduced, cultural activities that depend on them will suffer. However, maybe there is a role the council can play in advising the organisers of cultural events to seek funding elsewhere.</i>
<i>Sadly we've come to a place where life in the context of the cost of living crisis is more about functional things as opposed to nice cultural add ons.</i>
<i>Sadly not a funding priority when so many other needs.</i>
<i>Reducing library opening hours will diminish our opportunities for cultural enrichment by limiting the time we can spend using our library's rich cultural resources and participating in cultural activities at the library. Reducing access to libraries will also have a disproportionate impact on the most vulnerable members of the community who depend on free access to cultural activities.</i>
<i>Reducing library opening hours will diminish our opportunities for cultural enrichment by limiting the time we can spend using Highgate Library's rich cultural resources and participating in cultural activities at the Library. Reducing access to libraries will also have a disproportionate impact on the most vulnerable members of the community who depend on free access to cultural activities.</i>
<i>Proposal 13: Cultural Activities</i> <i>Although we agree on some possible savings eg street festival lighting, we disagree that savings should be made in this space. Cultural growth and recognition bring assets to Haringey. We are reluctant to see the cultural life of Haringey reduced and further,</i>
<i>Please allocate additional monies to the library service to maintain the current service levels.</i>
<i>Only ok if fully worked out and agreed with cultural organisations to avoid reducing their invaluable contribution to Haringey's rich cultural life. Some organisations are also potentially cost effective by offering an alternative to marginalised/antisocial behaviour.</i>
<i>one of the ways to reduce the costs is to have Connected Communities on the ground to assist residents with things like the council housing benefit reviews sent to pensioners who cannot navigate a digital platform and do not have an email that is necessary to complete the form. Other council e.forms that require an email is homelessness, housing benefit and council tax reduction to name a few that require an email address - many residents simply do not have an email and are digitally excluded</i>
<i>not utilising</i>
<i>Not using any culture services</i>
<i>Not sure who or what this would effect. I suspect it won't affect me directly as it doesn't feel like there are many cultural activities for me locally but hard to say until there's a list of what will be stopped.</i>
<i>Not sure what this refers to</i>
<i>Need to ensure digital sustainability and protection against hacking data</i>
<i>more resources should be put in cultural activities</i>
<i>Many of these initiatives are a total waste of money and just box ticking exercises</i>
<i>Many of the cultural activities are in places I don't normally visit. However, I M aware that other people benefit from them.</i>
<i>Make the BG arts centre self funding but cutting all grants.they need to do more commercial stuff to subsidise the arts side.</i>

<i>I've got difficulties in identifying in what ways the Council's cultural activities - whatever these might be - have enriched my life</i>
<i>It's already visible how little cultural expenditure there is in the borough, and further cuts will have a negative impact</i>
<i>It won't impact me as I can pay for my own cultural activities, however it could greatly impact people in need; deprived people, children, young people, youths, old people, disabled, disadvantaged, if the cultural activities are important to them and give them a lifeline or divert them from crime et cetera. The impact could be devastating. It could have a negative impact on them and the community and the whole of Haringey in an indirect way.</i>
<i>Increasingly our population will be digitally literate so as long as there are staff to help those of us who need it this should be an ever decreasing need.</i>
<i>In my view, cultural activities play an important part in building social cohesion.</i>
<i>I'm not aware of the present council expenditure on cultural activities therefore I don't think I would miss them</i>
<i>I would not like to see fewer local cultural events as they are important for community cohesion.</i>
<i>I have applied for funding being rejected in 2017 it was better to secure funding</i>
<i>I don't think this is an appropriate role for a council especially given the scope given the diverse residents and impossible to meet expectations</i>
<i>I don't know what council provided of subsidised services I'd miss. I'm not sure what they are but there are lots of cultural activities available in the area.</i>
<i>I do not currently avail of activities funded by the council and I am lucky to be in that position.</i>
<i>I am the current chair of the Friends of Bruce Castle, the independent support group established in 1995, when the Museum appeared to be threatened with closure. We are concerned that reduction in funding for cultural activities could again raise this possibility, despite the fact that the building -- Haringey's only Grade 1 listed structure -- is currently undergoing restoration work funded by the council and the Arts Council's MEND scheme. It must remain open, and its opening hours not be reduced!</i>
<i>I am sorry but I see very little evidence of it now .</i>
<i>I am one of the many residents who do not seem to be included in "Haringey's chosen cultures"</i>
<i>I am not sure of the current provision</i>
<i>I am not aware of any cultural activities available to me</i>
<i>I am lucky enough to access London wide cultural activities.</i>
<i>I am confident that I can use digital services</i>
<i>Hopefully my council tax will decrease, council should use precious resources on essential services for the residents. Culture should be cared for by the art councils and other agency. Ideally the culture should be self funded. The council should set priorities right and concentrate on essential services first.</i>
<i>Has great potential, but must be balanced with digital literacy and access support.</i>
<i>Haringey is obsessed with multi-culturalism. Just promote British culture and insist people integrate.</i>
<i>Haringey is a very divided borough. cultural activities can be used to bring it together. Cultural activities enrich life and can make it worth living in one place rather than another.</i>
<i>Easier and more convenient.</i>
<i>Digital system fails too much. Staff are not trained up to high standards as they are becoming too reliant on PCs. And AI. They need to be prepared and deal with social and communications skills if they are going to be able to connect and care for themselves and others in future, by working on switch boards and customer services. This is why so many people have breakdowns. As they are becoming dominant. Not moved around, and not thinking for themselves</i>

and listening to others, or having ideas listened and taken on board by senior management, so everything gets over looked and never moves forward realistically in the best way.

Cutting back on the money the council spends on cultural activities in Haringey could affect the community in many ways, especially regarding access to cultural programs, community involvement, and the local economy. Here are some possible effects:

1. Less Access to Cultural Events and Programs

- Impact on residents' experiences: Cultural activities are important for making life enjoyable, allowing people to enjoy art, theater, music, festivals, and community events. If funding is cut, there might be fewer events, which could limit the variety and number of cultural activities people can attend.*
- Impact on vulnerable groups: For some residents, especially those who are less well-off, these events provide essential chances to experience culture. Reducing funds could hit these groups the hardest, making it harder for them to feel included and enriched.*

2. Impact on Community Connection and Wellbeing

- Weaker sense of community: Cultural events bring people together, fostering community spirit and pride. Cutting funds could mean fewer chances for residents to meet, connect, and celebrate their identity, hurting the sense of community.*
- Impact on mental health: Cultural programs are good for mental health, offering ways to express creativity and unwind. A reduction in these programs could take away an important way for residents to feel better and connect with others.*

3. Economic Effects on Local Culture

- Impact on local organizations: Many local cultural groups, artists, and venues rely on council money to keep going. Budget cuts could force some organizations to close or reduce what they do, leading to job losses and fewer cultural options.*
- Impact on visitors: Cultural events draw visitors to the area, helping local businesses. Cuts to cultural spending might make Haringey less appealing to visitors, hurting local shops, restaurants, and hotels.*

4. Pressure on Partner Organizations

- Strain on partnerships: Haringey's cultural programs often work with outside organizations. Cuts might make it harder for these partnerships, forcing them to reduce their events or seek other funding, leading to fewer cultural activities.*
- More reliance on outside funds: Smaller cultural groups may struggle to find consistent funding elsewhere. This could result in less stability and diversity in available cultural programs.*

5. Opportunities to Address Cuts

- Delayed reductions: If the council delays cuts, it can give cultural groups time to look for other funding options, minimizing the immediate impact on residents.*
- Chance for new funding: Getting involved in initiatives like the London Borough of Culture could bring in additional funds and new opportunities, helping to make up for some cuts, though it's uncertain if it will cover everything.*

6. Long-term Changes in Culture

- Changing cultural focus: Reducing spending could change what types of cultural activities get support in the future, possibly prioritizing more commercial activities over community-focused ones.*
- Potential for innovation: On the upside, less funding could push cultural organizations to be*

more creative in how they engage people, possibly using digital platforms or forming partnerships with private groups.

In conclusion, while cutting council spending on cultural activities might present some challenges for residents and organizations in the short term, it also opens doors to explore new ways of delivering programs and finding funding. The outcome for Haringey will depend on how well the council addresses these cuts and supports local cultural groups to secure alternative funding while making the most of chances like the London Borough of Culture. Ultimately, it's important to find a balance between saving money and maintaining the rich cultural life that supports community spirit, local identity, and economic health.

Culture is the responsibility of the community. The council may enhance ie safety, lawfulness licences etc, not determine and this council leads in this aspect rather than acts as an advisory agent.

Culture is the future. Increase, not decrease spending on the culture.

Culture is one of THE most important aspects of life in Haringey; we have an amazing diverse, multi-cultural borough and we should be celebrating this. Haringey is the London 'Borough of Culture' in 2027 - HOW will we actually HAVE any culture to present to the rest of London if we don't start building up resources and networks NOW, & instead we cut the funding for cultural activities?! Doh.... [Response Moderated by Platform] This is the stupidest thing I've heard from a Council that's 2 years off being the London Borough of Culture! It's clearly NOT the time to slash the culture budget! We've also had riots and violence in Tottenham & culture is one of the key ways of bringing people together. It's also crucial to provide cultural activities for young people to keep them away from crime etc.

Cost reductions will be passed on to savings in council tax.

Considering the borough has been named the Mayor's Borough of Culture for 2024 and had funding and support, it seems difficult to come to terms with the idea that Haringey would not want to build on the the creativity, pride and celebration that has taken place throughout 2024. People have come together at a time of great upheaval, disruption and financial hardship to celebrate their individual cultures and come together rather than divide. There is a reason Haringey has been named a REBEL borough and its diversity is its strength. We need to feel that our different cultures are admired and respected and a reduction in funding does not give this message.

Communication about funding for the community group I am using is non-existent and gives me no confidence in the Council's strategy in this regard.

Can't afford to do cultural activities due to the rising cost of living

But need to allow for people who are not digitally savvy.

As long as you find another way to fund it, and we don't loose it all together the plan should work

As an older person I find technology quite hard to understand and find my way around. If you really can make it functional to all and it's cheaper than do so.

As a family, we use cultural activities regularly. These bring joy and child development that the council benefits from further down the road.

Art is a major income stream in the UK. Haringey needs to build the skills in the residents so they can benefit from this and not be just another brick in the wall.

Again, in the current circumstances, this seems unavoidable

Again, how can I answer this when you've not said where and on what you'll be cutting expenditure. You have to provide more info if you want people to be able to contribute meaningfully to this.

"cultural" activities are not aimed at me as a taxpaying, working Brit. If certain groups want cultural activities they should pay for it themselves

Public libraries are integral to the cultural and economic life of the Borough: they are its cultural lifeblood. Drastically reducing library opening hours and staff will have a serious impact on my access to the resources and activities that are on offer at my branch library, and will be particularly damaging for the young, the elderly, the unemployed, the homeless and the disabled who will not be able to travel extensively around the Borough when their local library will be closed. In addition, reducing Council expenditure on culture at a time when Haringey is preparing to be the London Borough of Culture makes no sense particularly as libraries are locations where culture is not just experienced but being created by residents.

Do you agree that ending non-essential organisational subscriptions – like this one - is an appropriate way to reduce costs?

<i>You should really be aiming to get good quality staff at the interview stage; people who are committed to the borough. I have worked in local authorities in the past and I know that if you are committed to your role, there are many ways that you can keep up to date with important changes. It seems strange that at a time when our society is basically saturated with social media, the internet, Zoom meetings etc, that the council is not thinking of these routes as a means of keeping up to date.</i>
<i>You said it. 'Non-essential'</i>
<i>You need to listen to what the residents want and not the political fashion, ideologies and parasitic middle class mysticism that brought us the LTN debacle.</i>
<i>You have a website and a digital team that can create these services.</i>
<i>You can read about successful ideas and network without that expense.</i>
<i>Yes if it's not effective. No if it could be made more productive and increase council efficiency</i>
<i>Working in silo can be narrowing in perspectives and ideas for improvement.</i>
<i>We need the connection with Haringey.</i>
<i>Very important for staff and Members to interact with people in other authorities</i>
<i>Until now, haven't heard of this. It is not clear from the name or your website what it is. Their website suggests it's non-residential.</i>
<i>Unfortunate for council staff, but preferable to cutting services.</i>
TOO MUCH MONEY IS WASTED WITH THESE GROUPS WHO NEVER SEEM TO PROVIDE ANY POSITIVE OUTCOMES
<i>Times are hard</i>
<i>This seems an obvious way to save money, but the savings appear to be small.</i>
<i>This seems a miniscule amount to sustain a partnership with other boroughs, access best practise [sic] and generate a positive attitude</i>
<i>This is the first time I've heard of the particular 'Think Tank', which by the way are mostly useless talking exercises</i>
<i>This is a great way to give our opinion, but many do not believe that Haringey Council listens to consultations, nor takes these consultations into account. We are aware of the fact that difficult decisions need to be made, but so often it appears that rash and rushed decisions are made and implemented without considering the implications. Only when there is mass outrage does anything change. Hence there is little faith that these subscriptions are of any practical use to residents. Trust needs to be restored.</i>
<i>There's more than enough free resources / networks (LGA for example). It would be good to know what impact past subscriptions have had on service delivery.</i>
<i>There need to be effective lines of communication</i>
<i>There are various other networks, e.g. the Local Government Association, which do provide a similar benefit. It's a minor saving anyway.</i>
<i>There are other ways to network and share best practice.</i>
<i>The council should set priorities right and concentrate on essential services first.</i>
<i>The Council has spent a vast amount of resources bidding for awards, attending awards ceremonies across the country, paying for accommodation, travel and guest tables, and residents have seen nothing to show for this. Yes, there should be an end to this.</i>
<i>The Council has spent a vast amount of resources bidding for awards, attending awards ceremonies across the country, paying for accommodation, travel and guest tables and residents have seen nothing to show for this. Yes, there should be an end to this.</i>
<i>Shutting out learning from others</i>

<i>Sharing best practise with other Councils is valuable for staff and a saving of just £20k is paltry. Keep it</i>
<i>Same as above. Council should focus on essential services and delivering those wellm</i>
<i>Not an essential</i>
<i>Not always. It's a question of the benefits delivered against what might be modest costs. Sharing best practice with councils in similar circumstances could be helpful; other memberships might not be</i>
<i>New Local is an excellent network and Haringey would do well to be able to share and learn from the good practise they can get from NL</i>
<i>Logical</i>
<i>Locals must have a voice</i>
<i>Learning about how others can save money is helpful and we can emulate it.</i>
<i>Lack of consultation and positive input from others can only be negative.</i>
<i>It's absolutely crucial that there are ways for residents to voice their views and opinions on things the Council is doing. It's essential that any major changes - to services, roads, parks, infrastructure etc - are properly consulted on with residents, and this is a very good vehicle to do that.</i>
<i>It would be better to learn from other councils best practice and experience. The cost saving is small. Depends whether there are other ways to share and learn from best practice if this membership is not continued. There's no explanation here of the assessment of the benefit of this membership so its hard to give a proper response.</i>
<i>It sounds as though the subscription to the New Local Think Tank and attendance at its events have been a complete waste of money. The Group Think mentality of local authorities has proved to be spectacularly disastrous in the case of the Grenfell Tower cladding which so many councils decided to install on such a large number of their tower blocks.</i>
<i>It is evident that, like many other local authorities in the UK, Haringey Council faces significant challenges in adapting to the realities of the post-COVID world. Having a forum to exchange ideas and share solutions with other local authorities would be immensely beneficial, enabling the Council to learn from best practices and collaboratively address common issues.</i>
<i>It depends what is considered non-essential which is vague. Giving people input into your plans and transparency is essential. However I'm sure there are certain subscriptions can be cut.</i>
<i>Information can be obtained elsewhere.</i>
<i>In this particular case it might lead to missing opportunities for cost savings or income generation identified by others</i>
<i>If you are bringing you are standard policy where necessary inline with Government, Parliament and Mayor's Office etc . That is good. Where you stand on your own you need Individual. And there policy advice wording they provide you is outdated. You should generally be following gov.uk for ethnic minority groups etc and school standards and wording and football. That changes have come in. Find a better Independence where you need one. That the government approval.</i>
<i>If we have done any cost-benefit analysis of this, I'm sure it will confirm the proposal</i>
<i>If it is not substanable get rid off</i>
<i>If it hasn't proved that useful it makes sense not to renew it.</i>
<i>I'm sure this takes up council staff time and is little benefit to the community</i>
<i>I think cross fertilization of ideas/experience across similar organizations is important to avoid a "bunker" mentality.</i>
<i>I have no idea what this organisation is for.</i>

<i>I don't know what a non-essential organisational subscription is it says 'like this one' that doesn't make sense. Like what one? How is this a non-essential organisational subscription? I don't pay anything, what does this mean? The question needs to be clear before you get a helpful answer. If the question isn't clear then the answers are meaningless, you are assuming background knowledge that is not there or been given.</i>
<i>I do not see any evidence reference the benefits of such involvement.</i>
<i>I do not know what benefit staff/Haringey get from this but likely to minimal</i>
<i>I do not know enough about the New Local Think Tank to opine.</i>
<i>I agree that this is not essential</i>
<i>Haringey need to maintain relationships and learn from other councils. This is a very small sum to sacrifice for what I would consider very high value.</i>
<i>Group think initiatives tend to fail (e.g Grenfell tower cladding fiasco).</i>
<i>Ending non-essential organizational subscriptions is a reasonable strategy to reduce costs, especially when the membership does not directly contribute to the core objectives or deliver significant benefits. The savings from these kinds of cuts can be reallocated to more critical areas, ensuring that the council continues to focus on services that directly benefit its residents. However, it would be important to ensure that any alternative methods for gaining policy insights and sharing best practices are found, so the council can continue to stay informed without unnecessary costs.</i>
<i>Don't know. Too vague. This questionnaire is ridiculous.</i>
<i>Depends on whether the positive impacts of being a member outweigh the cost of membership.</i>
<i>Depends on how you look at things like this, but I'm my opinions being in a organization subscription could be looked at as an investment as opposed to a cost, if you are part of a group that comes up with ideas for the local community and the only saving seems to be a very small amount it's worth staying on</i>
<i>Council staff may miss out on ideas and suggestions for good practice, but perhaps they will develop their own ideas.</i>
<i>Can't believe that if "good practice" were to include sharing of value for money ideas this organisation could not produce at least £20K of savings pa</i>
<i>Because sharing good practice itself can help to reduce costs</i>
<i>Anything that promotes good practice should be continued until they actually provide a good service. More training is needed, not less.</i>
<i>Amuthing non-essential needs to be cut in order to provided services of benefit to the community</i>
<i>All non-essential membership subscriptions should be terminated.</i>
<i>£20k/year seems cheap for access to good ideas from other councils. That depends on the quality/feasibility of the ideas of course...</i>
<i>A shame to reduce knowledge sharing but understandable in the financial situation</i>

What impact do you anticipate there may be from removing the budget for the Resident's Survey - this means in future the survey will only be able to take place if new money can be found to pay for it?

<i>You won't know what your residents want from you. How are you supposed to get detailed understanding of the residents reaction to the events taking place in the borough?</i>
<i>You need to seek input from residents otherwise you are not doing a good job and are not getting broad enough perspectives.</i>
<i>You need to listen to residents but you ignore what you are told</i>
<i>You need to know what residents think, you should keep</i>
<i>You don't explain what happens as a result of the survey so how can I give an opinion on this? I agree its non essential.</i>
<i>you dont deliver anything in the borough anyway</i>
<i>You could make it every five years and target those that don't respond to a digital survey.</i>
<i>Would minimise the voices of those who can't participate otherwise. You could try to source volunteers for the door to door research and fund a coordinator for this instead.</i>
<i>Why can't you just run a digital/phone survey and those residents who chose not to engage then that's just what it is. Saying you need to stop the survey altogether is nonsense</i>
<i>What benefit has the Council gained from previous surveys? Has anyone put a monetary value to this benefit so the relative value of the survey can be measured?</i>
<i>We already collect a lot of information from consultations about residents (e.g. our Turnpike Lane Customer Survey, Tottenham Quality of Life survey etc. If we have much increased co-working across Directorates, we can easily use existing consultations to share results and inform policy. Also our in-house consultations are better focussed than the Residents' Survey.</i>
<i>Until now, haven't heard of this. It is not clear from your website how the residents are randomly selected and how you ensure it is fully represented of the borough which over the past 5 or so years has become a two tier borough - where the needs of one half are favoured over the others as has been the case with LTNs etc. Proper representation is required.</i>
<i>Undemocratic</i>
<i>Undemocratic</i>
<i>Two heads are better than one. The council can learn from other councils and collaborate and share info</i>
<i>This survey can be created inhouse and accessed from your web site.</i>
<i>This is the broadest and most reliable source of quantitative evidence that the council has at its disposal. Being a truly representative survey means that the results represent the population of the borough; this particularly important when the council needs to ascertain whether across the borough's neighbourhoods and communities there is equality of access, experience and outcomes of the services it provides to residents. Removing the survey is removing a key element of evidence to guide strategy and activities, resource allocation and to guarantee accountability.</i>
<i>This is necessary to understand the community's needs and wants but should be delivered using IT - QR code rather than people knocking on doors.</i>
<i>There will be fewer channels for gathering residents' views</i>
<i>There could be other cheaper alternatives.</i>
<i>The whole point of a consultation is to tell people what they're going to do. Consult, then do what they were going to do irrespective of the answer.</i>
<i>The survey could be conducted online more cheaply. This could be combined with an in person survey using a random sampling approach (e.g. 500 residents are surveyed in person</i>

<i>and selected at random and all residents can answer the survey online). surveys are also cheaper to implement if you use closed questions and AI to analyse the answers).</i>
<i>The same reason as above.</i>
<i>The Council's surveys and consultations are notorious for being token operations the results of which do not influence the action or inaction already decided upon by the Council. Council policy appears to be established by a small elite group of senior officers and the Leader of the Council - and implemented without comprehensive scrutiny, democratic control, or public accountability. Most of the majority party councillors have no input into policy decisions and - based on observation of full Council meetings - merely act as a rubber-stamp for decisions already taken by the elite inner group.</i>
<i>The Council will be more disconnected from the needs and make up of residents</i>
<i>The council needs to listen to residents' complaints and resolve them. Without the survey, how will anything stand a chance of improvement?</i>
<i>The Council must have a thorough understanding of its residents to deliver the best possible services. Investing £25,000 to gain accurate insights into the community is a relatively small price to pay, especially when it helps prevent costly policy mistakes that stem from a lack of understanding of the residents' needs and circumstances.</i>
<i>The council is there to serve it's residents and so needs to know what they think</i>
<i>The council fails to listen to any feedback from residents anyway so this would be a good way to recoup money</i>
<i>survey must be done, online only, stop wasting on printed resources</i>
<i>surely you need to know what residents issues are</i>
<i>surely a combination of complaints and councillor enquiries would yield the same picture</i>
<i>stops wasting money</i>
<i>so many are digitally excluded or and have language barriers.. residents who respond are more able and a small proportion</i>
<i>residents need a voice and should be able to express their concerns in a way that is open and accessible. decisions should not be made without a proper consultation or survey to gather the views of the people that will be affected by it.</i>
<i>Removing the budget for the Resident's Survey will likely result in reduced insight into the needs, concerns, and satisfaction levels of Haringey residents. While alternative research methods can be used, they may not offer the same level of inclusivity or accuracy, particularly for those who are hard to reach. Moreover, not having a dedicated budget could lead to uncertainty in future planning, making it more difficult for the council to make data-driven decisions and track progress over time. The impact on transparency and community trust could also be significant if residents feel their feedback is no longer actively sought. The council should carefully consider how to maintain robust engagement and evidence-based decision-making if the survey is to be discontinued or limited.</i>
<i>If the Council decides to cut funding for the Resident's Survey, which is done every three years in person, it could lead to several important issues that affect how well the Council understands and addresses the needs of local residents. Here are some possible effects:</i>
<p>1. **Missing Out on Resident Opinions**</p> <p><i>The survey gathers feedback from a wide range of residents, especially those who might not speak up through other ways like phone calls or online surveys. Without it, we might miss important viewpoints and needs from certain groups, particularly those who are harder to reach, like the elderly or those with limited internet access.</i></p> <p>2. **Less Reliable Information for Decisions**</p>

The survey gives the Council important data to help shape policies and provide services. Without this feedback, there may be less reliable information to determine what residents need and whether the Council is doing a good job. This could lead to decisions being made without solid evidence, missing chances to tackle issues effectively.

3. *Reliance on Different Methods*****

While other methods, like online surveys or phone calls, might save money, they likely won't reach as many people, especially those who are hard to reach. The personal touch of face-to-face surveys helps capture a more diverse range of opinions, which would be tough to achieve through other ways.

4. *Budget Concerns*****

If the survey's budget is removed, it might be harder to justify future surveys without dedicated funding. This could slow down getting necessary data or even stop surveys altogether if money isn't available. Planning for future surveys would also become uncertain, making it challenging to engage with residents effectively.

5. *Trust and Openness Issues*****

Regular surveys show that the Council values residents' input and is committed to transparency. If the survey is cut or made harder to fund, residents may feel their opinions matter less, possibly damaging trust in the Council's openness and responsiveness. Additionally, if surveys are infrequent, residents might think the Council is avoiding certain topics.

6. *Challenges in Improving Services*****

The Resident's Survey helps the Council understand what services are working well and where they need to improve. Without it, targeted improvements may be neglected, and it could be difficult to identify community needs or issues, especially from groups that are usually overlooked.

Not impressed by these surveys.

No-one has ever knocked on my door

No idea because i don't know what's done with the data and what negative effect it would have if this kind of activity wouldn't continue

Need to save money for other things.

Make it electronic

It's important that the council continues to reach residents who otherwise would not respond to surveys

It means the council would not be accountable. Officers already ignore foi requests and the local councillors say officers ignore their calls and emails.

IT IS IMPORTANT TO INVOLVE RESIDENTS. HOWEVER BETTER FORMAT FOR THE SURVEY WOULD MAKE IT MORE BENEFICIAL

It is good to have residents input

It depends on how much the results of the Resident's Survey are normally used. If it's mainly a tick-box exercise anyway then cutting it won't change much but if it is used to shape decisions then those decisions will be poorer for being less informed. Would it be possible to replace the external polling company with volunteers from within the Council who would be allowed a few days off from their day job to do the polling (as at election times)? Then the data analysis could be done in house by one of the data teams.

Insufficient info is provided. I don't know how many people were spoken to the last time this survey took place

<i>In theory should be good for democracy. However, my experience is that all the responses on not cutting library hours fell on deaf ears, in that the cuts went ahead even though there was a hugely negative response from residents. This undermined the public's confidence in Haringey and the use of it's surveys.</i>
<i>In 35 years no one has EVER knocked on my door for a survey of this sort</i>
<i>I've never had anyone knock on my door to complete a resident survey</i>
<i>I won't answer a stranger at the door, but online surveys in my own time are doable.</i>
<i>I think the Resident's Survey should continue. The problem is not with the survey, but the fact that the information in the survey is not acted upon by the council officers or cabinet. I believe that information provided by surveys is valuable and if the resident survey is not carried out, then this will provide an opportunity for officers and councillors just to go ahead with plans which will have an even more negative impacts on the lives of residents. Without a survey, I can a situation where the actions of officers and councils and the needs and requirements of residents drift even further apart than they are now.</i>
<i>I think residents will not have an opportunity to have their viewa heard properly. Non professional surveys can have questions slanted to get answers required,</i>
<i>I sort of assume the survey doesn't really influence actions much so, whilst it's bad not to be trying to consult a representative group, it doesn't make sense to spend money on information that will only be lightly used.</i>
<i>I query the value of these surveys, given that people are not necessarily able to give informed views when approached on the doorstep. I would imagine it's usually just an opportunity for people to complain about things, rather than provide considered or constructive feedback.</i>
<i>I generally respond to a survey if I feel strongly one way or another.</i>
<i>I don't know whether the results of the survey are used appropriately by the council- do I'm not in a position to judge the impact.</i>
<i>I don't know what value this has at the moment.</i>
<i>I dont know what is implemted or changes as a result of the surveys</i>
<i>I don't believe i have ever been surveyed and what is the point of every 3 years? If move into digital era this could be done by those means with opportunity for those unable to access to participate.</i>
<i>I don't approve people knocking on my door.</i>
<i>I don't recall being interviewed for a residents' survey, but I feel you will get a better response from a door-to-door survey than an online or telephone one. What is the evidence?</i>
<i>I do not believe that the information obtained is put to any use .</i>
<i>I did not know there was a rolling residents survey so what is the point. I've been resident nearly 40 years</i>
<i>I can't provide a positive or negative answer here because this is the first time I've heard that there is a Residents' Survey.</i>
<i>I</i>
<i>How will you know what residents think about services.</i>
<i>How on earth are you supposed to understand the implications of this? Without knowledge of what activities were undertaken, at what cost, with what results or benefits?</i>
<i>How else will you know what residents need? This proposal is ridiculous.</i>
<i>How do you know what's needed locally without asking the community you serve?</i>
<i>Given the lack of competence demonstrated in this questionnaire it would seem that Haringey Council does not have a competent manager to oversee such surveys. So competent is the manager overseeing the Libraries commonplace questionnaire that it was thought inconceivable that someone might visit a library in order to read.</i>
<i>Given the lack of competence demonstrated in this questionnaire it would seem that Haringey Council does not have a competent manager to oversee such surveys. So</i>

competent is the manager overseeing the Libraries commonplace questionnaire that it was thought inconceivable that someone might visit a library in order to read.

Getting residence views is very important, proper consultation is important in the lives of the people whose decision it affects. However, these resident surveys are of little use because they often don't make sense and I think it's a tick box exercise. However, if you got rid of them, this should not be used as an excuse to just do what counsellors want without any regard to what the residence themselves want. There has to be a way where you can gauge residence opinions and the impact that decisions will have on them. This could be targeted surveys, focus groups of representative residents, or a proper peoples assembly. You can't just stop these surveys and say no one wanted them because the reason people may not want them is because they're useless to start with and it's up to the council to employ a firm that can do them properly, or the council do them properly themselves.

Doubt whether it is a representative survey, so scrap it.

don't know what difference it makes at the moment. It may well be money well spent.

detailed understanding of residents is good value for decisions

Could do a cost benefit analysis

Be useful to know what questions are asked, what the data is used for, and what other means you will use to understand residents' views, needs, and characteristics

As long as the gold standard approach remains a target

Already, people feel disengaged from local government. The surveys could certainly be made more meaningful but at least, when they are there, you can pretend to be engaging with people.

Do you agree that it is a fairer use of Council resources to give discounts to leisure facilities based on low income or additional needs?

<i>Yes if the discounts are linked to recognised needs/eligibility criteria and do not undermine the universal nature of local service provision.</i>
<i>Yes but consider using income from leisure centres to offset this (ie put price up for other people to pay for it)</i>
<i>While I benefit from a free service based on my age it is unfair given my level of income and this is the case with many 65 + in the Borough</i>
<i>We want people to be fit and healthy. This saves money on health and social care so it's a no brainer. It pays to prevent!</i>
<i>Use of Leisure facilities is not a necessity but choice as such we should all pay equally for what we use. Subsidizing for some is not fare for others. We are all stretched to a limit.</i>
<i>Those who live on less would require council services more, and things like leisure services are important for overall health and well-being. Subsidize for those who need it most in the area</i>
<i>THOSE WHO LIVE NEAR THE POVERTY LINE AND ELDERLY WILL HAVE MUCH TO GAIN FROM BEING ABLE TO AFFORD TO ENJOY LEISURE FACILITIES</i>
<i>Those who can pay should but there needs to be some incentive to use facilities to promote a healthier lifestyle</i>
<i>This would be another policy aimed at people with low incomes, what is the point of being financially independent if you are always being penalised. There is no incentive for people on low income to improve their situation. They are better off claiming every benefit available.</i>
<i>This should come together with a through reorganisation of services so that no member is neglected. So far the leisure centres have mainly focused on members with concession memberships which made that full paying members had little to no options available (e.g. no lane swimming able swimmers; no high intensity classes or group exercises for appropriate level of ability)</i>
<i>This is money well spent as it does allow people to keep fit and be less of a burden on the NHS, for example. It is also a good thing that those from poorer background have the opportunity to participate.</i>
<i>This helps the NHs and other services, its also a way to help older oeople feel less lonely.</i>
<i>the staff at the counter they are lazy i have gone tehre 5 times & have been denied as a dance practioner I have taken my business outside the council, very incompetent staff (Saturday , Sunday) workers at Marcuse Garvey/ Tottenham Leisure center</i>
<i>The majority of people with gym membership don't use it, even when paying for it. I would prefer to have accessible leisure facilities subsidised for people who need to use them for health reasons. Having said that, promoting exercise activities to improve physical and mental health should be pursued more aggressively, perhaps through social prescribing. The same should be considered for cultural activities.</i>
<i>The council wasted so much money previously letting a shambolic company run its leisure centres, now the council want residents to make up for the wastage by paying for their mistake</i>
<i>The cost is too high. If discount has to provide, there must be some restrictions, e.g. the discounted users shouldn't be allowed to use facilities during the peak times.</i>
<i>That would be great</i>
<i>Supports those who need access most.</i>
<i>Should be discounted for all Haringey residents.</i>
<i>Residents who do not need discounts as they have enough financial means should not be getting any discounts</i>
<i>residents who can afford leisure activities will create long term savings for health</i>

<i>Provided low income or additional needs are assessed efficiently</i>
<i>Prices for children and seniors should always be low/free to encourage healthy living</i>
<i>People with less money should attract higher discounts</i>
<i>People with disabilities should be given free or cheaper access. Those on low incomes should still pay for these facilities as there are other free options for exercise for most able bodied people, such as going for a walk or run.</i>
<i>People already pay for these services through council tax- they should be subsidised for all residents and are a good way to promote healthy lifestyles rather than 'active travel' which is not a viable option for the majority</i>
<i>Open to abuse</i>
<i>Old people can benefit</i>
<i>Often those on regular income are paying full council tax, full rent, full cost with very little left, using very minimal of the councils resources.. being excluded exacerbates the ability to engage in local resources</i>
<i>Not sure who is getting discounts other than low income and additional needs so this seems a bit cryptic.</i>
<i>More social equity</i>
<i>Makes sense to offer discounts where they are genuinely needed.</i>
<i>Makes absolute sense to subsidise people who can least afford and would most benefit these facilities, including asylum seekers and refugees. Improving their well being could also prove cost effective.</i>
<i>leisure, health and wellbeing should be available for everyone. Those of us who can contribute a little more to pay for it have a duty to do so to ensure this is case</i>
<i>Leisure services should be accessible to all and at discounted prices for Haringey residents.</i>
<i>In all honesty, those on really high incomes usually choose to go to private leisure centres.</i>
<i>Leisure is essential to the wellbeing of all</i>
<i>Lack of money might never be a reason not having access to these kind of health promoting activities</i>
<i>It's important for people mental and physical health and reduces need of medical care</i>
<i>It sounds only fair.</i>
<i>It sounds fairer, but if you make people 'claim' discounts, the uptake is usually lower.</i>
<i>It is right that the council s have control of its Borough facilities for its residents and not be subject to a profit making private organisation.</i>
<i>Fusion did not prioritise the welfare and benefit of residents.</i>
<i>It is part of a Council's function to look after the interests of the more disadvantaged members of the community, and discounted or free access to leisure and cultural facilities is most important for these people. I think it is fair that the system is reviewed from time to time; but the state of the economy at the moment means that even people with jobs etc are struggling. The council needs to be aware of that. Also, health wise investing in leisure services ultimately saves money for the council and the health service, as it provides a means for people to keep well mentally and physically. A simple and comprehensible scheme of discount is obviously desirable but please take account of the fact that due to the failing economy a lot of people with jobs are basically still poor. A lot of people are working in insecure jobs and the gig economy and it will be difficult to set up a system to meet their needs as their job situation is constantly in flux.</i>
<i>It is part of a Council's function to look after the interests of the more disadvantaged members of the community, and discounted or free access to leisure and cultural facilities is most important for these people. A simple and comprehensible scheme of discount is</i>

obviously desirable. Discounts will not however produce savings: so those residents who are in full-time employment and those who are retired but not on benefit should be required to pay reasonable fees e.g. £10 per hour to use a tennis court.

It is much fairer and simpler to establish discounts based on age: child, student, elderly.

In principle I think discounted access to leisure facilities for those who need it is a good idea, but if it results in a large increase in the cost for other users it may reduce numbers and put the leisure centres in a deficit. Would the local NHS Board be able to contribute any funding as they are the ones who will see savings from improved local health outcomes more directly than the Council? Could there be instead an increase in the number of genuinely very low cost classes in community settings (£2 or under per class) on a pay as you go model that anyone can attend without being means tested?

In general terms this sounds reasonable, but it really depends on the specific proposals and who is affected.

Improving physical and mental health is good in itself and will save local and national govt money

important safety valve which more affluent areas can pay for themselves

I'm well enough off to afford many things others can't. I'm happy to pay a bit more.

If people choose not to work, they don't deserve to get amenities. Why should taxpayers pay full price while those who don't work get their housing paid, "cost of living" payments, benefit handouts, council tax reductions and ALSO get discounts at leisure facilities?! NO

I would rather subsidise council services through the payment of higher levels of council tax but, as that is not an option, I think that wealthier households in the borough should subsidise access to leisure services for lower income households.

I support this as I believe that the benefits are highly effective .

I feel that this could be shared between council services and the NHS as a primary preventative intervention. In both adults and children, physical activity contributes to prevention and management of obesity and noncommunicable diseases such as cardiovascular diseases, cancer and diabetes and reduces symptoms of depression and anxiety, enhances brain health, and can improve overall well-being.

I believe it's fairer for the Council to offer discounts for leisure activities based on people's income or special needs. Here's why:

1. ****Helping Those in Need****

Many residents are struggling with rising living costs, making it hard for them to afford basic necessities and leisure activities. By offering discounts to low-income individuals or those with additional needs, the Council can help those who need it most enjoy leisure facilities that they might not otherwise be able to afford. This also promotes inclusivity, allowing people facing financial hardships, disabilities, or health challenges to benefit from physical activity and the health perks it brings.

2. ****Promoting Health and Wellbeing****

Giving discounts to those who need them can encourage more people to be active, which is a key part of staying healthy. This could lead to lower healthcare costs in the long run and benefit the community as a whole. Plus, access to leisure facilities can significantly improve mental health, as exercise is known to help reduce stress and anxiety. By focusing on those with additional needs, the Council can help create a more inclusive environment where everyone has the chance to improve their wellbeing.

3. ****Using Resources Wisely****

Currently, the discount system might not be helping those who need it most. By simplifying the program and targeting discounts more effectively, the Council can better support those

truly in need, making sure that resources are used where they'll have the greatest impact. This approach promotes fairness and ensures that public funds support the residents who will benefit the most.

4. ****Tackling Inequalities****

Some residents, especially those with lower incomes or disabilities, often face challenges when trying to access leisure services. A focused discount program can help break down these barriers, making sure that everyone, no matter their financial situation or abilities, has equal access to leisure activities. This promotes a sense of community and belonging among residents from various backgrounds.

5. ****Making It Simple and Clear****

The existing pricing system is seen as complicated and confusing. A simpler, clearer approach that directly targets low-income individuals and those with additional needs would make it easier to understand and access discounts. This could encourage more residents to participate in activities and make the most of the services available. Involving residents in creating the new pricing scheme ensures it meets community needs and preferences, making it more likely to be successful.

In conclusion, offering discounts for leisure facilities based on income or special needs is a fairer way to use Council resources. It helps vulnerable residents access health, social, and community benefits that leisure activities provide. This strategy not only supports health and wellbeing but also moves us closer to a fairer society, where everyone can enjoy leisure options regardless of their financial situation. By simplifying the pricing and working with residents, the Council can create a more transparent and inclusive system.

I agree with this proposal.

I agree with this in principle but I also don't think discounts to those on low income should be very much at all. I would much rather have better leisure services that charge more.

For example, in Tottenham Green, the pools and the soft play are not high quality, however at least for the soft play it is incredible value. I can pay £6 to go with my 3 children, whereas equivalent in Waltham Forest would be nearly £25.

That said, the facilities in Waltham Forest are much nicer and cleaner.

So, I believe Haringey have a duty to generate revenue from its leisure services to invest back in the provision, which is why I say a discount is fine but maybe say 10-20%.

How do I know? I've never had leisure benefits provided by the council.

Health. Access to healthy life styles reduces mental and physical ailments thus reducing health care budgets. The more access a child has to facilities the better. E.g I would like to take my child swimming once a week but the cost is prohibitive instead we go on average once every two months. And every time the cost of living goes up activities such as swimming reduces.

Has health and wellbeing benefits

Fusion were absolutely useless. Hopefully the council will do better.

Fairer than what?

everyone should pay, discount should be minimal

Epidemic of childhood and adult obesity

Energy should be directed towards addressing exercise prescription using non gym resources unless there are the only way

Ending concessions can be a false economy. Having expensive leisure services can price people out even if they're working. The country has an obesity, mental health crises and due to lockdown skeletal and muscle strength issues. All can be mitigated by people doing more exercise. It may save money in the long term if people are healthier. If the council is not doing so, they should work with the NHS to see if access to cheaper leisure will give long-term savings by encouraging people to exercise. Exercise can reduce social care costs treating people who are obese and there is evidence exercise can reduce depression. Furthermore, I know people with mobility problems could benefit from exercises such as yoga and swimming. This is especially true if they are under-going physiotherapy. Look at Sports Clubs, boys and young men might be particularly interested in activities such as boxing, whereas females may be more into dance. Ultimately, it depends on how you plan, organise and what market research you do to maximise this resource.

Encouraging more use.

Definitely because it will pay for itself through people having healthier activities, better mental health, more community spirit et cetera. It is essential that regardless of how much money people have they can use leisure facilities. It's beneficial for everyone in the long run.

Council should be looking after interests of disadvantaged members of the community.

Council leisure services are important to those who are less well-off and therefore have fewer alternatives

Concessions for the elderly and less abled are vital to enable them to stay fit and have social intercourse.

Discounts for those on benefits should be reviewed as they already receive so much it discourages them from finding employment

Because seniors or those with health conditions would benefit healthwise from encouragement to get fit, saving costs to social services

As someone who falls outside the traditional low income band, I would find it increasingly difficult to access exercise centres without a concession rate. I have no ability to increase my income. I know of many older people who would feel they would have to stop using the centres if prices increased or spend less on heating or food. A healthy population is better value for money for the borough in the long run.

As long as the pricing is fair to everyone as some residents are not able to claim anything even though they have been told that they can

As long as all people with a need to use the services are included not just people on benefits

And over 60s

Also for young people and older residents

All residents that pay the council tax should get the discount. Some people who are unemployed do not request money from the government and therefore do not have the correct documents.

Again the ***** is in the detail but it is known that subsidising leisure activities can have a significantly positive impact on welfare of community, learning and crime. However the scheme has to be open transparent and easy to manage (eg Leisure passes/membership schemes) available throughout borough and not usual chosen communities

Absolutely. Should always be means tested

Do you have any comments to make on the proposals to increase or reduce capital spending as described above?

With Asset Management- Many Staff have/ Councillors have left onto other roles etc. If all their equipment has been returned/retrieved and much IT has now become redundant. All that is sitting in storage should be checked "i". If the IT Specialist have done their jobs correctly then all the redundant in storage that will not take new Haringey Council Software could be sold, to reduce cost.

Why is there a reduction in "Tottenham streets and spaces" and not the rest of the borough? For eg Crouch end

We have No NHS HUB in Wood green , Drs surgeries are smaller , less multi services given . Yet it is central to Haringey .

New drs surgery for Green lanes - Haringey and Ferry Lane Ashley Road.

But leaves nothing for Wood green .

Resource centre , needs to be maintained , as its is a strong forum point for an area with a diverse population/ crime / Health etc

Alexandra Palace is a major plus to this area . More joined up thinking with the voluntary sector could be useful .

Trafford Hall just outside Chester is a wonderful Residents/ commercial training centre.

Maybe AP could look at that side again a joint approach so less monies taken back

Road spending : Accidents , higher insurance claims . Floods , sunken drains

Haringey residents safety. PLEASE LOOKNAGAIN AT ROAD FUNDING

To introduce tax reductions to people are taking responsibility for the community in the sense of working in a voluntary position.

Also encourage organic food consumption via organic food schemes organised by the council

Thumbs up for digital investment. But contractors have to be carefully managed by people with digital project experience or you risk contractors taking the piss.

This needs to be looked at in much more detail. The reductions make sense but some of the increases need more focus e.g Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) . We've already installed these where they are wanted, and residents' main concerns now are LTNs - which many of them hate! and our perceived obsession with reallocating roads to cyclists. We need to sit down and discuss these issues as many highways schemes are seen as vanity projects, Actually we do very little road resurfacing and pothole repairs, so, again, we need to examine policies in detail and make changes where required.

There needs to be a place where residents can see all public tenders and RFPs and see which companies are ultimately awarded them. They need to be public before they are awarded so a broad number of companies can to ensure contracts are not being awarded in back rooms and that the council is getting the best price and quality for their services.

The spending needs to be monitored for its effectiveness. So much money is wasted on unnecessary things, whilst urgent matters are neglected. Decent management is imperative.

The review of CPZ does not include the possibility of their removal where it is clear they are not wanted by the residents.

It is frequently claimed that parking in the borough is a racist policy. The poorest and most vulnerable areas experiencing the highest charges. The review should include parking charges and ensure equality across the borough.

Many cycle faciary are unused or use minimaly during summer months. These cost the borough to build and maintain. There should be a review of these and those not used by residents in sufficient numbers should be removed and the road space reallocated.

The reduction of wards corner funding is an excuse for the council to give the regeneration back to grainger after the local residents have been fighting for over a decade to keep the local residents plan. A simple refurbishment of wards corner as the local residents plan, cannot be more expensive than the plan grainger proposed.

The Placemaking and housing (P&H) funding for wards corner should end now. The aging council plan has just caused planning blight for years in order to satisfy an out of date vision of shopping centres. Release all compulsory purchase and re-let the 4 council owned buildings to raise income from today.

The entire network of parking for the disabled needs to be reviewed as I regularly witness people abusing these parking permits, which seem to be given out like sweets. I am fully aware that many disabilities are not visible. However surely those with parking needs should have visible disabilities? I'm also aware that this is probably not a politically correct comment, but it's my opinion nonetheless.

As for ridiculous schemes, such as Harringay, the rebel borough are concerned. These are a total waste of money and whoever thought them up should be fired so we could save money there too

The Council's proposed changes to capital spending reflect a balanced approach, with some reductions in non-essential projects and targeted increases in areas such as housing, infrastructure, IT, and environmental resilience. The focus on essential services and long-term investments that offer cost savings or social benefits (e.g., housing, flood management, IT tools) is commendable. However, careful attention must be paid to the impact of cuts, particularly in areas like road maintenance and festive lights, which contribute to community well-being. Moving forward, it will be critical to monitor the effectiveness of these changes and ensure that the capital programme continues to reflect the borough's evolving needs and priorities:

The proposals to increase or reduce capital spending in Haringey reflect a mix of prudence, targeted investment, and cost-saving measures, in response to the current financial position of the Council. Here are some comments and considerations regarding the changes:

Reductions:

Osbourne Grove Nursing Home Scheme:

Comment: The decision to cancel the Osbourne Grove Nursing Home project seems prudent given the financial challenges due to rising construction costs. Repurposing the existing building for another use ensures that the resource isn't left idle, although it will be important to clearly communicate the new purpose of the building to the community and stakeholders to manage expectations and maintain support.

Wood Green Integrated Care Hub:

Comment: The NHS's decision not to proceed with the scheme removes the Council's financial burden. It's important that the Council continues to explore alternative healthcare or community-driven projects in the area to meet the needs of local residents, especially given the significant demand for healthcare and social services in Wood Green.

Locality Hub Scheme Neighbourhood Resource Centre:

Comment: Narrowing the focus to just refurbishing the Neighbourhood Resource Centre is a sensible step in light of budgetary constraints. However, it's essential to ensure that the refurbishment meets the needs of the community and that the remaining resources are effectively allocated to other priority areas.

Alexandra Palace Funding Reduction:

Comment: A reduction of £1.5m for Alexandra Palace seems reasonable, given the financial pressures. However, the Council must balance cost-saving measures with the ongoing need for maintaining and preserving the Palace, a key cultural and historical asset.

Festive Lights and Road Resurfacing Reductions:

Comment: Cutting back on festive lights and road resurfacing is understandable in light of the budgetary constraints. However, these reductions may impact community engagement and local satisfaction, particularly in areas where festive lights contribute to local morale or tourism. The impact on road safety should be closely monitored as the reduced number of resurfacing schemes could lead to deteriorating road conditions in some areas.

Decentralised Energy Network (DEN) Scheme:

Comment: Pausing the DEN scheme due to its reliance on significant borrowing is a pragmatic decision given the current financial challenges. Exploring other delivery methods with key stakeholders is wise, but the Council should ensure that it does not lose momentum on environmental and energy sustainability goals.

Wards Corner and Place Shaping Projects:

Comment: Removing the Wards Corner scheme from the capital programme seems like a necessary step due to financial viability concerns. It's crucial that the Council works closely with local partners to develop a more feasible plan. Additionally, the review of other place shaping schemes should focus on ensuring the projects are truly impactful for the communities of Wood Green and Tottenham Hale.

Increases:

Housing Initiatives to Reduce Temporary Accommodation Use:

Comment: Increasing investment to reduce reliance on temporary accommodation is a very positive initiative. The Council's efforts to purchase homes for permanent use can have long-term financial and social benefits by reducing the costs of temporary accommodation while providing stable housing for residents. Each purchase should, however, be carefully assessed to ensure it delivers savings and long-term value.

Investing in IT and Digital Tools:

Comment: The increased investment in IT and digital tools is essential for improving service delivery and efficiency. Technology is a key enabler of streamlined services, and such investment will not only improve the resident experience but can lead to long-term cost savings. The Council should ensure that any new digital systems are user-friendly and accessible for all residents, particularly those with limited digital skills.

Urgent Infrastructure Works and Flood Management:

Comment: The proposals to invest in urgent works for Cornwall Road, Ferry Lane, and Wareham Road bridges are necessary to maintain road safety and structural integrity. Additionally, addressing flooding and surface water management is a key step in future-proofing the borough against the impacts of climate change. However, it's important that these investments are closely monitored to ensure they meet both short- and long-term resilience goals.

Parks and Open Spaces Maintenance:

Comment: Ongoing investment in parks and open spaces is crucial for maintaining the borough's green infrastructure, which provides numerous social, environmental, and health

benefits. Regular maintenance and equipment replacement will help ensure these spaces remain accessible and attractive for residents.

Disabled Parking Provision:

Comment: Increasing the provision of disabled parking facilities is a positive step for inclusivity and accessibility. Ensuring adequate parking spaces at key locations like high streets and medical centres is essential for enabling people with disabilities to live more independently and engage more easily with their communities.

Communal Refuse Collection:

Comment: The investment in additional vehicles for communal refuse collection aligns with the Council's need to manage waste effectively. The cost-saving potential from moving away from leasing vehicles could benefit the Council in the long term. However, careful planning is needed to ensure the new vehicles meet the growing demands of the borough's waste collection needs.

Operational and Commercial Estate Maintenance:

Comment: The £13m required for essential maintenance and compliance of the Council's non-residential buildings is a necessary investment to ensure that these buildings remain safe and fit for purpose. This investment should be seen as a long-term commitment to the upkeep of critical infrastructure, as failure to invest in maintenance now may lead to higher costs later.

The council should withdraw all LTNs and not introduce restricted parking permits for resident's visitors. We have a right to travel about the borough, have visitors and services come to our homes. Hiding behind greenwashed BS is shameful

See earlier comments on digital technology capital investments. In principle these are a good thing if benefits can be proven which if focused on residents needs they can well be. However, experience to date has not been positive in that they can often be cited as an excuse to cut front line library services. What is needed is for the council to work closely with Friends of library groups on the library strategy and then include digital and building investment projects as part of this. It is nonsense to invest in refurbishing all the libraries with the capital budget, only to cut their hours drastically when the refurbishments are complete. This results in all the spend going on capital budgets to outside firms, with all the benefits to residents then being cut, resulting in an undermined business case. Similar thing as to what happened with HS2, when the government gave lucrative construction contracts to suppliers, but then cut the plans half way through, leaving residents / taxpayers footing the bill and not getting the benefits of improved transport links to the North. The same is happening with libraries in Haringey as benefits have been cut as libraries hours of the newly refurbished libraries are cut, denying all the benefits of their use to just a reduced number of hours.

Roads maintenance will be a major issue if we are cutting funds for this, everything else seems reasonable though

Road works can be funded by introducing speed cameras in the borough. Not only would that reduce speeds, and accidents, but it would generate income, through fines, which could be recycled back into roadworks.

Reducing the use of temporary accommodation would be good.

It is a shame that Osborne Grove will not be progressing.

Reduce all.

Reduce all

Please do not use the creation of new unneeded CPZs as a way to raise new income.

Personally I won't benefit from any of the investments the council is making. I think it is a shame to reduce the Christmas lights. Being able to create a good atmosphere during the holidays by decorating and organising events to bring people together shows the true character of a community. From what I am reading in your investment plans we are a community of potholes and dark streets who have no interest in culture and no care for those in need.

Firstly, you need to campaign this consultation better and also organise council meetings to get a proper vote from the residents on how we want our money to be spent. Secondly, it would be useful to involve the community and businesses to create events & decorations for holidays and festivities.

*Object to any revenue raising through unfair raising of resident permits
More spending is required on traffic reduction schemes*

Noting your reference to CPZ Investment Plan, and the absence of reference in detail to the proposed changes to daily parking permits, I confirm I am NOT in favor of using this consultation to affirm support for that measure

Not sure why funding for the Broadwater Farm Leisure Centre should only come from Housing. Are there not other sources such as Community Safety, Family Hub, other sectors making use of the building?

Not enough information to scrutinise. On what basis do you think you can fund waste vehicles cheaper than Veolia. This could prove to be a huge risk in the long term

Not enough information to form a valid opinion

None at all - all seem sensible at present but important to keep this expenditure under constant review .

no comment

No - I do not have the knowledge nor expertise on council budgets to comment. I don't understand how the roads are underfunded when there has been such an uptick of finances due to the fines imposed on so many residents. I was under the impression that this funding was ring fenced for road works. Currently, parking restrictions seem to be weighted very unfairly on the more deprived areas of the borough. which means that there is less time to park for free and more visitor parking tickets (which have to be paid for) are required and yet the same amount of visitor parking tickets can be bought across the borough.

No

No

No

No

No

No

No

Need to reduce or eliminate funding to all building work for new residence particularly for one in Muswell Hill area where the project is not being supported by residence, infrastructure and parking requirements are not met and does not fit in with the ability of the area to have more housing.

Disagree on increasing disabled parking lots as parking is at a premium. More work should be to reduce the number of people that get disabled parking when it is not required for them.

More income can be generated by enforcing fines for speeding. I think it is a very good idea to reduce spend on festive lights, but investment in green spaces and litter clearing is essential for resident morale and safety. Could the council also reduce spending on streetlights / bulbs? The ones local to me at least are overly bright and numerous - more like floodlights than streetlights.

<i>Lighting essential for safety - not mentioned here?</i>
<i>Just reduce non essential</i>
<i>I've often wondered why so much is spent on roads around us. It seems there was never ending work on our road over the last couple of years disrupting public transport and I wondered how some of it could be justified as some of it seemed to be 'nice to have' rather than 'need to have', so if that budget is reduced I'd be o.k with that. Essential safety work should be continued though.</i>
<i>It's very difficult. I think, Haringey will be in a worse position next year. The reason being the increase in population due to mass migration -legal and illegal and domestic, an aging population which require social care and increasingly people with numerous needs which require supporting, Until Haringey Council stops blaming the Tories and austerity for their position and start looking at what is causing the downward pressure for resources/services. This will never be resolved. Banging your head against a brick wall would be more productive.</i>
<i>It's imperative that the Council minimises savings on services related to maintain and improve health of its citizens. As the general population is ageing, the low cost availability of gym and sport centres is essential to achieve this. Most pensioners aren't in the position to pay the often high fees for attending commercially operating gyms and sport centres.</i>
<i>It's absolutely insane that there is no proposed spending to filter roads, reduce car traffic, install safe cycling infrastructure in line with WCAP - for example in Shelbourne Rd N17 there was a funded LTN and protected cycle lane shown in October 2021 but nothing was implemented despite showing as 'funded', and again in Turnpike Lane there is a protected cycle lane up to Muswell Hill and Finchley in the WCAB confirmed future cycling network, and Turnpike Lane is on a strategic TfL cycling corridor, but current proposals fall foul of this and will thus lose TfL funding and partnership. Alexandra Park should have had an LTN years ago but the money was diverted to BG LTN. It has up to 5 hours of traffic jams all the way to Wood Green most nights. All these areas suffer from high levels of air pollution, noise, congestion and inability of public transport - buses - to get through. This mismanagement costs the council a fortune in delays, deaths and road repairs. There is also a complete misconception about spending on disabled drivers. 81% of disabled people are pedestrians! But the council wants to do more and more expeditions and street spaces for car owners -this is neither fair nor equal! Equality for disabled people would mean strengthening and widening pavements, access to reliable quick busses and trains, better air quality, safe cycling for disabled and cargo bikes. Not more car spaces in the road that hinder buses and cyclists.</i>
<i>It would be good to understand in more detail what these reductions in capital spend will mean in practise. Eg: what is the impact of reducing money to Ally Pally by £1.5m? I'm likely to agree that it sounds sensible but how can I judge without all the facts?</i>
<i>it is short-sighted to continue to invest in digitalising the council for residents to access services. It creates a backlog for back office staff who do not communicate in a timely fashion, which then goes on to create a raft of cooperate complaints, rent and council tax arrears with no in person support to assist residents with things like budgets to make repayment plans - inevitably this costs the council more money. This is where connected Communities offer tailored in person support for residents</i>
<i>Invest in more enforcement officers and cameras. There's too many bad drivers, drunks, druggies, people who cant see red lights, cycling on pavements etc. Lets crush and make those sort of people pay before looking at increasing tax of decent hardworking people</i>
<i>Instead of selling council property (in the building sense) why's re these not rented at a commercial rate to bring in income? In terms of temporary housing, rather than spending the limited resources we have on this, why does the council not invest in tackling the cause of this need e.g. by training and adjustments to help people get back into work; lobby for fairer wages</i>

<i>in line with inflation and cost of living? The amount for IT appears excessive - is this truly the most cost efficient option? Given the lack of care given to our parks, I am surprised by the cost of proposed machinery.</i>
<p><i>Increase the income: Councillors step down, have a Haringey Hub: the whole of Haringey integrated into one hub (HH)-HARINGEY HUB The councillors can work hybrid. No allowances to be paid to the councillors or cabinet members.</i></p> <p><i>Housing: Have a good regeneration Manager/ Acquisition Manager to bring properties, bring empty homes into use. Give accreditations to landlords work in partnership with RSL's stakeholders</i></p> <p><i>Bicycle: Limes scheme scrap it outsource it obstructs the payments people thrown bicycles on the payment & the disabled people & others inconvenienced</i></p> <p><i>Environment: Reduce carbon print by the council</i></p>
<i>Implementation and maintenance of CPZs is expensive. When you revisit the CPZ restrictions, this should also include the opportunity for those of us with extremely long CPZ restrictions to advocate for a reduction in hours, especially if the council moves ahead with its decision to discontinue daily visitor permits. Two hours a day has proven sufficient in many wards in the west of the borough, and these should not be increased for the purpose of income generation for the council. Yes, money from parking is 'ringfenced' but wherever the income is spent still represents spending that doesn't need to be taken from elsewhere in the budget, so the argument does not hold true. I also sincerely hope that the answers from this very broad survey with no specific detail will not be used to support the TMO to remove daily visitor permits, as that would be highly disingenuous.</i>
<i>I'd be interested to know what the estimated £1.96m for "Digital investment" will be getting residents and tax payers. That's a huge sum. My concern is that the council are going to be rinsed by tech firms thinking a big pay day has arrived.</i>
<i>I'm not sure what you're going to do with the CPZs. it just says you're looking at it. But from what I saw of the council proposals it would be a disaster if you carried them out and didn't take residence needs & views into consideration; to reduce visitor parking to such a drastic extent is basically stopping residents from receiving outside people, workers, friends, family, guests et cetera. If there is abuse of the system then deal with it, collective punishment is not an option. The council has no right to do this; it's supposed to regulate parking, not bring it to an almost standstill.</i>
<i>I would not want to see any reduction in spending on roads and pedestrian areas.</i>
<i>I think the wards corner scheme could produce planning gain in partnership with a private developer which could reduce the current high levels of street crime in that area</i>
<i>i THINK THAT VEOILA PROVIDE A GOOD SERVICE AND I AM SCEPTICAL OF THE COUNCIL BEING ABLE TO TAKE BACK CONTROL OF SO MANY PROJECTS/CONTRACTS, ESPECIALLY AS THEIR TRACK RECORD FOR WASTING MONEY IS SO BAD</i>
<i>I think consideration should be given to how any currently under-used Council-owned buildings could be better utilised. By thinking imaginatively about each space there may be new options that can make use of the space, either to generate income by hiring out the space (e.g. as communal workspaces, event spaces for pop-up events, storage for local businesses who need it etc) or by savings on the costs of hiring/ buying other spaces for Council run activity (e.g. shelters, playgroups, training).</i>
<i>I strongly support a reduction in the use of temporary accommodation and replacing it with more suitable homes.</i>
<i>I object to proposals to remove daily permits for residents to hourly as we rely on family for childcare and have no alternative means. It will impact us and our children hugely</i>
<p><i>I am opposed to Wards Corner being deleted and strongly support this rare initiative.</i></p> <p><i>Nothing here about the proposed massive increase in visitor parking charges which I realise</i></p>

are part of a separate consultation. But I hope that a change of mind on those increases has been factored in here.

I am broadly in agreement with the proposals. However, I add the significant caveat that I disagree with the linked proposal to remove the daily parking permits in all CPZs and replace them with concurrent hourly permits. I would hope that this isn't an attempt to gain support for this move indirectly, as this would undermine the consultation which was conducted by traffic services in which residents were asked to comment explicitly on the transport proposals.

I agree with the implied suggestion in Environment and Resident Experience 1 that rubbish and recycling collections should be brought back in house.

I am concerned that further deferral of the Wards Corner scheme under Placemaking and Housing will allow further deterioration of the structure(s), meaning that any eventual work done is likely to be more expensive and/or could lead to the eventual demolition of the building(s).

I agree with reducing spend on festive lights; this is unnecessary & bad for the environment apart from anything else.

I'm concerned about the reduction of the road repair programme. Many of the borough's roads and especially pavements are in an atrocious state, & elderly people could easily trip over the uneven paving stones. I myself have almost fallen over several times, although I'm not elderly!

I'm very concerned about Wards Corner; this needs to be prioritised before the year of culture. WHY on earth can't it be re-furbished so that the indoor market can return downstairs and the upper floors be used as studios ; galleries etc which would bring in an income? It's been many years since it closed and NOTHING has been done with it. It is shameful that you first tried to get it knocked down, yet it's a fantastic building and could be a source of serious pride for the borough, by showcasing the amazing communities we have here. You could hold exhibitions there during the year of culture; instead people will come to Tottenham & just see this wreck of a building. Shameful.

Get rid of unnecessary LTN schemes which are not supported by residents and cause traffic chaos and congestion.

Get rid of the place shaping. Good to see less spent on roads

Get more money from property developers who benefit from these plans

Fully support all

Festive lights are not important. Each shop has its own decorations which are quite enough. NOTE: Spending on maintenance of parks is unfairly raised by the damage done by Music Festivals. Council needs to balance money raised by them against the misery they cause to locals (Not being able to access while they are being set up, during and after, mess and noise). I believe relatively little is raised once this is taken into account.

Excellent plan to purchase properties instead of paying for temporary accommodation. IT only good investment if properly tendered to specify optimum improvements. Shame about excellent Wood Green Integrated Care hub. DEN should be scrapped with more spend on local community energy and retrofit. Is retrofit programme safeguarded?

Environment , specifically roads/disabled bays/Äighways projects; is it unreasonable to expect these activities to be paid for from the Millions received from parking fines by haringey Council.

Secondly where is the data that justifies the expansion of disable bays , Expecially when a blue badge holder can virtually park any where. Save the money for prosperous times.

Ensure that the leisure centres have a long term capital funding plan I.e at least 20 years

Impose more CPZs etc to increase revenue

Do not reduce funding funding to improve walking and cycling

Does it pay for the council to be maintaing a large estate??

Culture, strategy and engagement (CSE)

a) Alexandra Palace should not be a drain on the Council's resources. It should be run and maintained on the income it generates and if it cannot do this it should be disposed of so as to no longer be a burden on the Council.

b) Digital Investment. At a time of financial stress when everybody has to tighten their belts and many people are finding it difficult to put food on the table it is unacceptable for the Council to splurge out on unnecessary digital investment, the tired old solution thought up by managers chasing the elusive phantasm of reduced costs.

Culture Department

Ensure that Haringey Council funding does not go to organisations providing services to people who are not resident in Haringey. End general subsidy of charities and voluntary organisations that are based in Haringey but deliver activities for those who do not live in Haringey, e.g. Jackson Lane Arts Centre, Alexandra Palace Theatre.

Delay the proposed digital transformation expenditure until a clear strategy and plan for improvement is in place, and in the meantime use some of the funding to invest in libraries.

CSE

The Council should delay the planned spending on digital transformation until CSE has a plan in place which has the support of the majority of residents. Spending £3 million on digital transformation without clarity as to what the shape of services is going to be is incompetent and will be a waste of money. The technology might be unused or even binned. The Council should use some of this funding to invest in libraries and training staff. This will ensure that the Council has professionally qualified librarians as apparently there are none at present. The Alexandra Palace arts venue should be self-financing, as should Jackson Lane Arts Centre since they are national venues, e.g. for Darts and Circus. National and regional arts subsidy needs to come from central government, the Mayor of London and the GLA, not from scarce council resources in Haringey.

CSE

The Council should delay the planned spending on digital transformation until CSE has a plan in place which has the support of the majority of residents. Spending £3 million on digital transformation without clarity as to what the shape of services is going to be is incompetent and will be a waste of money. The technology might be unused or even binned. The Council should use some of this funding to invest in libraries and training staff. This will ensure that the Council has professionally qualified librarians as apparently there are none at present.

The Alexandra Palace arts venue should be self-financing, as should Jackson Lane Arts Centre since they are national venues, e.g. for Darts and Circus. National and regional arts subsidy needs to come from central government, the Mayor of London and the GLA, not from scarce council resources in Haringey.

Cranwood Nursing Home has been lost to (delayed) council housing development and the Osborne Grove Nursing Home development has been abandoned. Where are the rising numbers of elderly people needing nursing home residents to be housed? Why has the Wood Green Integrated Care Hub implementation been changed? I thought the Diagnostic Hub was a success. Is that just hype?

Bad idea to reduce spending on road resurfacing and pedestrian footpaths. As a wheelchair user I can tell you that some pavements are like a roller coaster, without any fun.

<i>Could a change of use to Osborne House, and any other buildings, be to turn it into some kind of temporary housing a that may mean savings from not using private landlords? A targeted homogenous group could perhaps share communal facilities in such a place?</i>
<i>Can reduce the amount in borough parking plan without material impacts on borough residents.</i>
<i>As I was involved in the coproduction process with regards to Osborne Grove , I feel that the way that the project was terminated should be urgently reviewed particularly as some of us involved thought that a cheaper version could have been developed at the start ! An opportunity has been lost as monies could have been brought into the borough by the development.</i>
<i>As I have already mentioned above, at a time when people are facing financial hardship, it is not appropriate for the Council to spend vast sums of money on digital investment. It is also not appropriate, in contrast to this for the council to stop putting up lights in front of the town hall in Tottenham at Christmas. The savings you would make by not having the lights and Christmas tree would be so little, compared to the pleasure they give. You would I believe just be turning off the lights at Christmas. Things are already bad enough as it is. The residents in Tottenham do not have access to their own town hall. It now mainly functions as a food bank and I believe some private organisations are located there. Turning off the Christmas lights would just be totally Scrooge-like behaviour in light of the tiny amount of savings that would be achieved.</i>
<i>Agree that we can cut the festive lights.</i>
<i>Agree re Osbourne Grove and Wards Corner: neither ever looked viable. I don't see how the £25.1m expenditure on refuse vehicles can be made in advance of knowing the outcome of the tendering exercise. Is this assuming the service will be brought in-house?</i>
<i>Absolutely no to reduces festive lights across the borough. These provide cheer to many residents and create a sense of positivity in a gloomy time.</i>
<i>â€˜Place making' is a shocking waste of public money and deserves to be cut. Road repairs however surely are funded by the appalling fines from the LTN cameras so I struggle to see how they cannot continue as those funds can only be spent on the roads? Or is it the councils aim to continue to raise revenue by scamming residents every way possible?</i>
<i>A shame to take the funding away from Ally Pally when it is doing so well and there is a risk that it regresses or that we lose key personnel. I'd like to know what is happening with the Penstock Tunnel. You should bring in external money for Wards Corner. A wasted opportunity when Grainger left.</i>
<i>A general observation: the Council should avoid reducing its investment program. Facilities that cater to the needs of the older population, as well as well-maintained roads and pavements, significantly enhance the area's appeal and contribute to its overall quality and reputation.</i>
<i>1. It is to be regretted that investment in Alexandra Palace has to be cut, though the logic is understandable. I hope this can be kept under review for the future.</i> <i>2. I don't have a car myself, but from observation i think the policy of trying to squeeze more and more from motorists has gone as far as it can. The amounts of money targeted to be raised will not compensate for the economic and social damage to teh borough caused by further impositions.</i>

Are there any changes or proposals you think we should considered which might save money or achieve better value from council spend?

Yes, we should coordinate council consultations so that all are done in-house at minimal cost. Similarly, a lot of studies and surveys currently farmed out can easily be done in-house.

Yes - local authority land and property should not be sold - it should be used as an investment to generate income for the borough and the people it serves. Too often local authority property is being sold for an uncompetitive rate. This is wrong.

The council has wasted a lot of money on creating a two tier system in the borough through LTNs - such arbitrary and/or discriminatory ideas need to be halted and our collective resources not wasted in this way. This was money better spent on the roads which are littered with potholes and drains which are blocked and flooding our roads. The council has a duty to all residents, not some. Also spending millions on changing a road name was irresponsible use of public funds during a pandemic and cost of living crisis.

Withdraw all LTNs and stop running ridiculous consultations which you ignore. Act on the requirements of the majority of your residents not a privileged and entitled few who do not care about their neighbours.

Wasteful spend on DEI positions in the council and unnecessary work

URGENT: Your library needs ðŸ˜µ you!

Haringey Council's 2025 Budget Consultation

The Council is planning to reduce Highgate Library opening hours from 57 hours per week to 32.5 hours per week.

The simplest way for you to respond to the Consultation is by answering just one question, Question 18.1 "are there any changes or proposals you think we should consider which might save money ...?"

<https://haringeybudget2025.commonplace.is/proposals/sample-questions/step7>

We suggest you answer:

a) I am opposed to the reduction in opening hours at Haringey's libraries and at Highgate Library in particular.

b) The Council has sufficient funds to maintain a full library service. (See FOHLSH February 2024 paper - LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY 2024-2025 BUDGET - suggesting savings and revenue enhancement of approximately £50 million)

Update some of the older properties that have not been part of the new homes updates like for example Arundel court Yet you are going to build new flats and not look after the properties that you already have

Turn Ally Pally into a community share holding trust concern and that would raise money to invest in the building.

The Placemaking and housing (P&H) funding for wards corner should end now. The aging council plan has just caused planning blight for years in order to satisfy an out of date vision of shopping centres. Release all compulsory purchase and re-let the 4 council owned buildings to raise income from today

The paper - LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY 2024-2025 BUDGET - from Friends of Highgate Library Shepherds Hill was circulated to every Haringey councillor in 2024 and, the Director of Culture and the Chief Executive. The paper demonstrate that the Council has funds to maintain a full library service across all 9 libraries and the £46 million identified should help to fund other services as well.

In addition, the Council has become increasingly inefficient and unresponsive over the last 25 years. In 2000 all councillors' contact details including address and phone number were published on the Haringey Council website. Councillors were only able to claim expenses rather receiving an allowance. This meant that a councillor who was inactive received no payment but now allowances are paid regardless. The allowances for Cabinet members and the Leader of the Council are substantial and greater than average salaries. This raises the question of whether Cabinet members who are in full-time work are delivering value for money in terms of their allowances. Are they really working 80 hours per week?

Lastly, local government responded to the Local Government and Finance Act 2001, the Audit Commission and the requirements to bid competitively for funding, e.g. Decent Homes, by adding layers of management and support services. Senior managers have had vast increases in salary with no improvement in performance. This has depleted resources from frontline services. We have a situation where the Council has closed every children's home and is now paying £1 million for one child in care for one year. Haringey is not unique in having done this but clearly more managers and paying managers more isn't working. The senior managers - in Post Office Paula Vennells style - do not understand their services because they have so little or no contact with their services and service users. De-layering and expanding the span of control of managers to the private sector average of eight FTE would save significant money. The current situation where most members of the public can get no further than the Haringey call-centre when they need to speak to someone is counter-productive. Managers cannot comprehend how to improve their services in these circumstances. Those services with direct contact with staff have far greater satisfaction rates. Many organisations have a virtual call centre, e.g. Nationwide, where a phone goes to customer-facing members of staff in a branch. This would avoid the current 'pass the parcel' found in Haringey Council's call centre.

The paper - LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY 2024-2025 BUDGET - from Friends of Highgate Library Shepherds Hill was circulated to every Haringey councillor in 2024 and, the Director of Culture and the Chief Executive. The paper demonstrate that the Council has funds to maintain a full library service across all 9 libraries and the £46 million identified should help to fund other services as well.

In addition, the Council has become increasingly inefficient and unresponsive over the last 25 years. In 2000 all councillors' contact details including address and phone number were published on the Haringey Council website. Councillors were only able to claim expenses rather receiving an allowance. This meant that a councillor who was inactive received no payment but now allowances are paid regardless. The allowances for Cabinet members and the Leader of the Council are substantial and greater than average salaries. This raises the question of whether Cabinet members who are in full-time work are delivering value for money in terms of their allowances. Are they really working 80 hours per week?

Lastly, local government responded to the Local Government and Finance Act 2001, the Audit Commission and the requirements to bid competitively for funding, e.g. Decent Homes, by adding layers of management and support services. Senior managers have had vast increases in salary with no improvement in performance. This has depleted resources from

frontline services. We have a situation where the Council has closed every children's home and is now paying £1 million for one child in care for one year. Haringey is not unique in having done this but clearly more managers and paying managers more isn't working. The senior managers - in Post Office Paula Vennells style - do not understand their services because they have so little or no contact with their services and service users. De-layering and expanding the span of control of managers to the private sector average of eight FTE would save significant money. The current situation where most members of the public can get no further than the Haringey call-centre when they need to speak to someone is counter-productive. Managers cannot comprehend how to improve their services in these circumstances. Those services with direct contact with staff have far greater satisfaction rates. Many organisations have a virtual call centre, e.g. Nationwide, where a phone goes to customer-facing members of staff. This would avoid the current 'pass the parcel' found in Haringey Council's call centre.

The council should seriously consider investigating possibilities and options to cooperate with adjoining Boroughs of Enfield and Barnet for sharing the provision of services.

Support for young people services - youth clubs and mental health services should not be cut - vital to future of civic society

suggestions that could help the council achieve savings or better value from its spending:

1. Greater Collaboration with the Voluntary Sector

The voluntary and community sector (VCS) often provides services that align closely with the council's objectives, particularly in areas like social care, housing, and community engagement. By deepening partnerships with VCS organisations, the council could access a network of services at a lower cost, leveraging the goodwill and expertise of non-profit organisations. This could also help reduce reliance on expensive external contractors.

2. Expand Shared Services with Neighboring Boroughs

The council could explore opportunities for shared services with other local authorities, especially in back-office functions like HR, IT, finance, or legal services. By pooling resources, councils could reduce administrative costs and benefit from economies of scale. This is particularly relevant for areas where there's a significant overlap in service delivery (e.g., waste management or public health).

3. Increase Use of Digital Services

While the council is already making strides with digital transformation, there could be further opportunities for savings by expanding the use of technology across a wider range of services. For example, developing more robust online platforms for residents to access services (e.g., applying for permits, renewing benefits, or reporting issues) could reduce the demand for face-to-face interactions and call-center support, leading to cost reductions in staffing and resources.

Additionally, investing in digital platforms for community engagement (virtual consultations, surveys, etc.) could reduce the costs associated with physical events and increase the participation of residents who may not be able to attend in person.

4. Review External Contracts and Supplier Agreements

Regularly reviewing the terms and conditions of contracts with external suppliers could reveal opportunities for renegotiation or switching providers to more cost-effective options. This includes contracts for cleaning, security, or facilities management. Tendering processes should prioritize both cost efficiency and quality to avoid over-reliance on a single provider at the expense of better alternatives.

5. Implement More Energy-Efficient Measures

Investing in energy efficiency for the council's buildings and services could yield long-term savings. This could include improving the insulation of council properties, upgrading lighting to more energy-efficient options, and investing in renewable energy sources like solar panels. Reducing energy consumption would lower operating costs, particularly in the council's larger buildings or community centers, while also helping the council meet sustainability goals.

6. Consolidate and Streamline Service Delivery Models

A thorough review of service delivery models could help identify areas where consolidation or restructuring could lead to cost savings. For example, the council could look at merging overlapping services across different departments (e.g., housing support, adult social care, or community outreach) to reduce redundancy and improve efficiency.

A more integrated approach could provide better support for residents, reduce administrative complexity, and allow for a more streamlined allocation of resources.

7. Explore Alternative Revenue Streams

The council could explore innovative ways of generating additional revenue without putting additional strain on residents. For example, if there are underutilised public assets, such as council-owned land or buildings, they could be used to generate income through development, leasing, or other commercial activities. The council could also explore introducing fees for services that are currently free, provided this doesn't negatively impact vulnerable groups.

8. Reassess Council Staffing and Temporary Positions

Reevaluating staffing levels, particularly for non-frontline positions, could help the council achieve savings. There may also be opportunities to reduce the number of temporary or agency staff, especially if there are long-term roles that could be filled with permanent staff at a lower cost. However, this should be approached carefully to ensure that service quality doesn't suffer, particularly in areas like social care and community support.

9. Targeted Support for Vulnerable Groups

Redirecting resources to provide more targeted, preventative services for vulnerable groups could reduce long-term costs. For instance, investing in early interventions for mental health, substance abuse, and housing stability could reduce the need for more costly crisis management or emergency interventions down the line. The council could also explore creating more community hubs or outreach services that address multiple needs in one place, reducing duplication of services and improving residents' access to help.

10. Review and Streamline Capital Projects

While some capital projects are essential (e.g., road and bridge maintenance, housing), the council should regularly assess the viability of larger infrastructure investments, ensuring they align with the council's long-term strategic priorities and financial capabilities. Projects like the Decentralised Energy Network and Wards Corner should be re-evaluated to ensure they provide the best value for money and are not overly reliant on external funding or borrowing.

In particular, it may be beneficial to consider phased implementation of large capital projects to spread costs over time, rather than committing large sums upfront, especially during periods of financial uncertainty.

11. Encourage Shared Ownership Models for Housing

Instead of solely focusing on building or purchasing homes for temporary accommodation, the council could explore mixed models such as shared ownership or part-rent, part-buy schemes. This could help support residents who are struggling to access affordable housing while also reducing the overall cost burden on the council's housing budget.

By considering these proposals, the council could generate savings while improving the efficiency of service delivery and enhancing the quality of life for Haringey residents.

stop wasting resources on printed materials nobody is taking them in public places

Stop wasting money on social housing projects and associate people, if you want to do something that improves the area then key worker housing would be better. Focus on productive people, not scroungers and those who won't help themselves.

Stop wasting money on cycling lanes and use it for NHS services. Police.

Stop using agency workers, wasting money on poorly attended cultural events.

Stop producing haringey people and avoid actions which cost money but produce little benefit for local people like street name change. increase parking permit prices for the most polluting vehicles and introduce charges for motorbikes to park for both residents and visitors

Stop printing and distributing the People magazine. It is an utter waste of money.

Stop paper copy of Haringey People

Stop building project in Muswell Hill

Stop allowing private vehicles to be stored on public streets for small sums of money. Charge the full rate for land usage.

So much money is wasted as a result of poor management, and departments no liaising effectively with each other. Get decent managers in who know what they're doing. Prioritise what people need most, such as property repairs and maintenance.

See the February 2024 paper from Friends of Highgate Library Shepherd's Hill suggesting revenue enhancement and savings amounting to £46 million. This paper was produced with the aim of showing the Council that funds could be found to maintain a full library service across all 9 libraries, but £46 million would help to fund other services as well. The paper - LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY 2024-2025 BUDGET - was circulated to every Haringey councillor.

See previous comment. Also more proposals need to go into thinking about reducing costs of adult social care considering the proportion of the budget spent here. It feels unsustainable based on current trajectory.

See above regards intro more CPZ LTNS MORE cameras to enforce 20 mph ETC

Review all contract, work farmed out that could be completed in house

Restructure council organisations and staffing. I know you are doing this already, but after being a resident of Tottenham for 5 years and engaging with many council staff across many areas, I don't get the impression they are proactive, and are simply too comfortable in their roles for many years. They don't want to change and feel that Tottenham is 'fine' as it is, despite being one of the most deprived areas in London and the country at large.

We need fresh sets of eyes in the council and making staffing more efficient is a great way to do this. I would advise however that the council needs to hire new people that are much more in tune with current trends and the way the world works.

Reshuffle your Departments, so where you have different offices that deal with the same policy issue they are under same Supervisors leading to same Directors. And are on same floors so they know each other and can talk to each other and get work done faster with improved synergy.

<i>Remove the LTNs to allow residents access to facilities and businesses to recover lost custom- it will encourage growth and in term council tax payments.</i>
<i>Reduce the use of expensive interim senior managers and management consultants.</i>
<i>Reduce senior management posts and merge responsibilities. There are too many people employed to cover bureaucracy like the overview and scrutiny committees</i>
<i>Reduce or remove completely all the financial benefits.</i>
<i>Reduce mismanagement? Reevalue council tax banding?</i>
<i>Reduce drastically the number of senior managers. Having been employed by LBH in the past we need more frontline staff to do the work needed and far fewer high paid managers.</i>
<i>reduce carbon foot print have more IT</i>
<i>Reduce car parking and through traffic drastically, make cycling safe on all major roads with protected cycle lanes and floating bus stops. It's a win-win situation: quicker and safer active travel, better roads, cleaner air, fewer injuries and deaths and NHS health costs, better quality of life, achievement of Net Zero transport within 15 years -by 2040. It will also attract TfL funding and support.</i>
<i>Reduce excess employers</i>
<i>Rationalise Street and drain cleaning, tree cutting so it is done where and when needed.</i>
<i>Stop inventing, replacing, renewing street furniture</i>
POTENTIAL SAVING AND REVENUE GENERATION FOR THE COUNCIL
<i>NB The amounts of Saving or Revenue shown below are conservative estimates which the Council's Finance Officers would certainly be able to refine.</i>
1 Financial Management
<i>1.1 The 2024-2025 revenue budget over-inflates the borrowing costs for capital expenditure. The capital programme of £800 million is too ambitious and cannot be achieved, partly because of market conditions, but also because the Council's track record shows that full capital expenditure has never been achieved in recent years - for example with the libraries refurbishment programme. Reducing the capital programme from e.g. £800 million to £600 million would save £12 million: £200 million x 6%. Saving: £12 million</i>
<i>1.2 Implement Treasury Management and Financial Management Best Practice, for example by Pooling Business Rates. Saving: £500,000</i>
<i>1.3 Stop offering discounts to registered charities e.g. charging half the rate for charities that is charged for ordinary Haringey residents. Revenue: £100,000</i>
2 Property
<i>2.1 Riverpark House - five floors of this prime office space with 24-hour security opposite Wood Green tube station are completely empty. The Council has not advertised the office space on its website or engaged an agent to market the empty floors. See: Commercial Properties to Let Haringey Council. Revenue: £4 million</i>
<i>2.2 The Education Building and Cumberland House off Station Road are substantially empty. The Council's use of the offices could be rationalised and the surplus rented. Revenue: £2 million</i>

2.3 The Council has renewed its lease on the Green Room Hotel and Bar although this is a loss-making enterprise. Discontinue the lease. Saving: £1 million

2.4 The Blue House Yard space which is suitable for a market or similar use is unused and not marketed. Revenue: £1 million

3 Contract Management

3.1 The Council contracts unfortunately leak council-tax-payers' money. There are no systems in place to recover the cost of work that is paid for but not carried out or not carried out satisfactorily.

3.2 Manage and enforce the problematical contract for Haringey Homes which continues in operation 15 years after the Decent Homes programme ended and has a senior management team costing close to £1 million pa. As residents have seen on the Hillcrest Estate in Highgate there has been no maintenance on the drains for over 15 years despite the Council paying Haringey Homes for maintenance - with the result that tenants and leaseholders have been regularly flooded by leaking sewage. Saving: £3 million

3.3 Manage and enforce Veolia's contract which is also problematical. As many residents who live in blocks of flats will know, collections are frequently missed and blocks of flats that should be receiving additional collections are not receiving those collections, a situation that sometimes obtains for 10 years or more. When residents ask what the Council has done to recover the money spent on the collections that didn't take place they get no response. The same situation applies to public waste bins many of which are under-utilised and only emptied on rare occasions, but their regular collection is still paid for by council-tax-payers. Some bins are placed in private car parks and are emptied at council-tax-payers' expense although the car park franchisee, e.g. at the Highgate Station carpark, has the legal obligation to deal with any rubbish. Saving: £2 million

3.4 There are numerous other problematical contracts because there are no systems in place to recover money paid for work that is not done, that is not completed or is not completed to a satisfactory standard. Saving: £2 million

4 Other Saving

4.1 Stop paying unnecessary fees by ending the use of recruitment agencies. Saving: £2 million

4.2 Stop the use of consultancy contracts. Saving: £2 million

4.3 The Council Procurement (Purchasing) is not fit for purpose. For example, the only 'approved' contract for furniture provided £400 rocking chairs for libraries and not a single chair suitable for disabled people. Saving: £3 million

4.4 Freeze spending on corporate credit cards. Saving: £2 million

4.5 Freeze spending on non-essential contracts. Saving: £2 million

4.6 Limit staff and councillor travel outside the borough to staff on core business such as

social workers. No officer or councillor should be asking the council-tax-payers to pay for their parking in a Swansea carpark. The Council should use video conferencing as other councils do. Saving: £1 million

4.7 End the subsidy of £100,000 per year to JLAC in Highgate. Neighbourhood caf  s, restaurants, and arts venues receive no subsidy and pay business rates without needing a subsidy from the Council and they don't want unfair competition. JLAC pays no business rates and it received grants of millions of pounds and the JLAC building for free from the Council. Saving: £100,000

4.8 Carry out a review of all back-office services and all management. Protect front-line services. Realise savings by delayering management levels, scaling back top salaries, and rationalising back-office services. Saving: £3 million

4.9 Stop using staff resources to apply for housing and other awards. Saving: £200,000

4.10 Use libraries as polling stations instead of hiring rooms in other buildings e.g. use Highgate Library instead of paying to use JLAC. Saving £10,000

5 Other Revenue

5.1 Increase the rate of CIL for multi-million pound developers. Revenue: £4 million

5.2 Increase the CPZ charges for SUVs, other disproportionately large vehicles, and second or third vehicles. Revenue: £1 million

5.3 Charge those in paid employment £10 per hour per court for the use of the tennis courts in the 6 parks currently offering free tennis. Revenue: £100,000

5.4 Increase the licence fee for caf  s & restaurants with tables on the public pavement and apply a fee relative to a property's business rates. Revenue: £100,000

6 CONCLUSION

6.1 This paper has been produced to address the Council's reported £16 million shortfall for its 2024-2025 budget.

6.2 We have shown that the budget gap of £16 million can be bridged by making savings and increasing revenue in some of the areas specified above.

6.3 The total potential savings and increase in revenue laid out in this paper amount to £46,110,000.

Political posturing

Other Comments

We suggest that Haringey People folds and that this spend is transferred to local spaces for cultural and other activity including libraries.

We recognise the need for targeted support, but this is currently not delivered across all areas of Haringey in a consistent manner.

We note the proposed reduction in repairs to pavements and street architecture. Given the

unsafe condition of some pavements, we are concerned that there will be a resultant increase in compensation which will impact on this saving.

There are few comments about how different services and organisations can work together to help deal with the huge difficulties people are facing.

What are the possible solutions of poor housing, lack of money and lack of decently paid jobs?

How can the Council help prepare for the impact of climate change we are facing?

We do not expect increased expenditure in funding, nor assistance to meet the difficulty of increased support for vulnerable adults, nor ways of dealing with AI and its inevitable toll on decent jobs.

We ask that open forums are held across Haringey with a discussion with local people about these areas of major concern and how the council can best meet their duties when faced with intolerable financial pressures.

No except that constant review is important. Partnerships with non profit organisations can be valuable but need volunteers and funds so relationships need to be carefully managed and nurtured, These Organisations should not be taken for granted.

No

My experience of Haringey is the Labour Council runs the borough like a fiefdom to do as it pleases. Turning Black Boy Lane into La Rose Lane was an un-necessary cost, translation services need to be removed, people have google translate if they really need to understand something. DEI- complete waste of money.

Much money has been wasted on unused cycle infrastructure this could be removed and the road space reallocated. A line of parking spaces will generate income an unused cycle way is nothing more than political posturing.

Removing the unwanted LTNs will save cost on this expensive and unwanted infrastructure that is currently degrading the lives of residents trapped in them.

Much as I dislike areas such as Finsbury Park and Ally Pally being fenced off for concerts etc, perhaps a time limited (perhaps three years) extension of these events could generate revenue targeted for parks, pavements and roads?

Money from the Council should go to help organic food consumption and socially oriented people

Maybe use volunteers effectively, I volunteer with The Conservation Volunteers (TCV) which does work in Haringey's woodlands, open spaces, and parks. Basically we're doing council work for nothing but because it's well organised and enjoyable it serves everyone including the borough.

Maintain funding to the Haringey library service and better advertise the services provided to encourage engagement and use especially in areas struggling economically.

The Council should study FOHL-SH's February 2024 paper - LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY 2024-2025 BUDGET - suggesting savings and revenue enhancement of approximately £50 million so as to find sufficient funds to maintain a full library service.

Look into relatively low-cost solutions for cycling with the aim of getting more motorists out of their cars and on to a bicycle, e.g. installing modal filters to create safer cycle routes to connect areas in the borough. We wouldn't need to spend so much money on fixing poor carriageway surfaces if everyone wasn't bombing around in their heavy 4x4s all day. We'd also have a healthier borough if everyone just decided to get out and do some exercise now and again (walking or cycling) instead of relying constantly on their motor vehicle.

Less investment in EHCP's and SEN transport in particular. There are plenty of families who use the system and know how to use it extensively to maximise income. Let the kids walk; the streets are now increasingly safer thanks to school streets and ltn's etc, if able bodied they should walk. Also less investment in adult social care. Working people who are already hard done by should not pay extra on top of NI etc to provide for the elderly population.

Keep pressing government for a better settlement.

Keep Highgate library open and do not cut hours. Find budget savings elsewhere.

Keep Connected Communities and expand the team so that residents can have in person assistance with a range of issues that will save the council money and also assist residents with more benefit income equating to more income to be spent in the borough. The CC is a bridge between all the council back office services - preventing a swathe of corporate complaints and arrears escalating.

It is illogical to tell residents the council are providing the same level of services when it is cutting swathes of funding.

In-sourcing Park Road Leisure Centre appears so far to have been a big mistake. Shorter opening hours, poorer service, lido cold much of the time - could it not have gone to an actual leisure centre provider with an excellent track record like Better? Library closures, losses of staff and reduced hours is a terrible idea.

Increase CPZ in west of borough

In February 2024, the Friends of Highgate Library Shepherds Hill circulated a paper suggesting revenue enhancement and savings amounting to £46 million. This paper was produced with the aim of showing the Council that funds could be found to maintain a full library service across all 9 libraries, but £46 million would help to fund other services as well. The paper - LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY 2024-2025 BUDGET - was circulated to every Haringey councillor. However, the Council, despite constantly reaching out to residents asking for suggestions appear to have taken the decision to ignore the paper. They have not responded to the Friends of Reading and Education or any of the individual library groups which is really shocking!

Improved public transport links might bring more people into the area, plus Haringey borough of culture should be invested in.

Improve website and digital facilities, with addition of chatbots

If the council worked with the Friends of libraries groups on developing a libraries strategy with capital spend projects that actually support this strategy, while at the same not cutting opening hours, then Haringey, residents and suppliers would all work to a common goal and there would be considerable benefits to all.

I THINK THAT INDIVIDUALS ON THE COUNCIL NEED TO BE MORE TRANSPARENT ON EXPENSES AND COSTS INCURRED WHICH ARE OFTEN EXCESSIVE

I know you are in a difficult position and I sympathise.

I know the name of Elon Musk and his recent actions might cause some stir, but we can learn from him when it comes to saving money. For the benefit of the Council I would like to quote his 5 step algorithm to cut internal bureaucracy and costs:

1. Question every requirement

Each requirement should come with the name of the person who made that requirement.

Once that clarity is achieved - that is, when every requirement has the person's name attached - then you must question whether these requirements make sense. No matter how smart or how 'powerful' that person is.

Remove every requirement that does not make sense.

2. Delete every part of the process that you can

Delete not only excessive requirements but also unnecessary steps or parts of the process.

Feel free to delete too much, you can always reinstate

3. Simplify and optimise
requirements and parts of the process that survived steps 1 and 2

4. Accelerate cycle time
Speed up your bureaucratic processes

5. Automate
This is where the digital transformation comes in!

I do not believe that the library services should be reduced through cutting staff and opening hours. The various services offered by the libraries is of immense value to a wide range of users in the community but is very difficult to quantify on a balance sheet exercise.

I definitely agree with the proposal to reduce the use of agency workers. If there is a high demand for more ad-hoc work, could there be a small team who are employed on a permanent basis who receive a normal salary for their level but who operate as a sort of 'floating' resource and can be booked by other teams when they have some ad-hoc work that they require extra hands for?

I would also be interested to know how much is spent on recruitment/ training due to the high turnover of staff more generally and whether anything is being done to reduce this. Tangentially related, could the three optional volunteering days per year be better organised/promoted? This could help with staff morale as they get to spend some time involved in their community, and could also be a way of ensuring adequate support at local events/ helpers for activities if Haringey staff were encouraged to volunteer.

I attend numerous meetings where long reports that are inaccessible are produced . I believe that AI if used could produce reports / administrative tasks more effectively.

I am strongly opposed to the reduction in opening hours at Highgate Library. This will hurt users. The Council should study FOHL-SH's February 2024 paper - LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY 2024-2025 BUDGET - suggesting savings and revenue enhancement of approximately £50 million so as to find sufficient funds to maintain a full library service.

I am strongly opposed to the reduction in opening hours at Highgate Library. It is ridiculous that the Council wants to reduce opening hours having just invested in a lift at Highgate Library.

I am opposed to the reduction in opening hours for Highgate Library.

*I am opposed to the reduction in opening hours at Highgate Library
The Council should study FOHL-SH's February 2024 paper - LONDON BOROUGH OF HARINGEY 2024-2025 BUDGET - suggesting savings and revenue enhancement of approximately £50 million so as to find sufficient funds to maintain a full library service.*

I am opposed to the reduced opening hours at Highgate Library. This should remain accessible to the public at the current opening level. All Harringay Libraries should. They are so important to so many people.

I am opposed to anything that reduces the opening hours of the Highgate library.

Having more synchronised systems that will assist in time management of assistance for a resident. Often, many staff will be working with the same person, causing duplication. Additionally, not having access to information often leads to financial risk to the resident and subsequently Haringey Council

*HARINGEY HUB- A CENTRAL HUB (WOOD GREEN, MARCUS GARVEY & HORNSEY)
Abolish Councillors, NO payments for them: Have three councillors or Hybrid service*

Get rid of the monthly printed magazine which is hand delivered. Put relevant useful information on the website. We don't need endless articles celebrating this, that and the other.

Get rid of the LTNs they aren't helping anyone

Everyone needs to make some contribution to council tax regardless of their income. Stop producing information in other languages except English and stop supplying free translators.
<p>Eliminate Christmas lights.</p> <p>Eliminate any funding for fireworks</p> <p>Restrict spend on traffic management schemes to those affecting public safety or the easing of notorious traffic bottlenecks</p>
Don't leave empty council buildings unused for years. Relax rules on development of flats above shops - much better use of flats is possible when a row of shops is owned by one firm, or council. Give permissions for utilities (stairs, water etc.) to be shared or run throughout and flats developed horizontally. Piecemeal development leads to poorer housing.
Don't use agency workers.
Consultations need to be more focussed with resident groups utilising council properties to get residents together.
Community transport scheme. More community management of parks and libraries. More multipurpose accessible community hubs to streamline interface between service providers and users. More in-house services including social care. Better procurement and control of any contractors. Streamlining repairs service.
Collaboration with Public Health and voluntary sector organisations to reduce costs on statutory services through prevention and early intervention.
Can you share services eg procurement with neighbouring local authorities?
Bring as many services as possible back in house. Continue to ensure staff are properly trained.
<p>Better monitoring of Sub contractors</p> <p>Better grading on voluntary schemes</p> <p>Look , get managers Directors to come and see the issues residents have .</p> <p>There is an historical lack of funding in the housing area .</p> <p>Better training from the Top down .</p> <p>Out-of hours service- is it really value for money - bring it in house , if your already looking at having your own vehicle (veolia)</p> <p>Customer service centres . Make it A ONE STOP SHOP ?</p> <p>MUCH BETTER COMMUNICATIONS</p> <p>STOP WASTING MONEY ON SHORT TIME PROJECTS . WE NEED LASTING ONES , THAT WILL BE VALUE FOR MONEY - BUT NOT CHEAP .</p> <p>HARINGEY NEED TO BUILD ITS CREDIBILITY BACK UP .</p> <p>SO FOR GOODNESS SAKE SORT OUT THE REPAIRS . ITS LETTING RESIDENTS/ VULNERABLE RESIDENTS DOWN DREAFULLY .</p> <p>MORE RESIDENTS ENGAGEMENT, RESIDENTS PANEL INDEPENDENTLY RUN.</p> <p>MUCH BETTER PROCUREMENT POLICY</p> <p>KNOW YOUR TRADE , KNOW YOUR AREA</p> <p>USE ALREADY ENGAGED RESIDENTS MORE</p>
Better collaboration with local businesses to promote culture and wellbeing as well as a sense of community.
As stated at the start of this survey i believe government is all about priorities and efficiency. Why therefore spend on reviews (e.g. parking, cycle lanes, rubbish collection) which though desirable are not of immediate concern? Am also concerned that having reported a street light not working over a month ago nothing has been done. Having contributed a tree for street over 18 months ago nothing has been done apart from being invited to water a non existent tree? These are small things but if replicated across the council add up to a lot more.

<i>Allow community groups and self help groups access to underused council premises at little or no cost</i>
--

<i>I am strongly opposed to the reduction of library opening hours</i>
--

If you were making the decision about savings or income for the council what do you think it would be most important to consider? What would you prioritise to protect spending on? What do you think is less important?

You should protect services aimed at homeless people, like night shelter and soup kitchens. It's to their shame that these services are mostly run by voluntary organisations. You should for example provide support to Pastor Alex's Highway House at Fountayne Road, Tottenham. Also, provisions for people with mental health issues shouldn't only be protected but improved!
You should protect public places and keep them open to everyone. Work out ways of making more money instead of cutting budget,
You should be able to do both simultaneously with proper management. Prioritise low hanging fruit first than are high impact and low effort with quick time to realise. Leisure, environment and education are all vital to protect. Cultural items less so as they should be funded more by the third sector or voluntary contribution.
WOW: Walk to work schemes generate funds Carbon reductions: generate funds Environments shemes: Climate control:
While I think targets are very important, I worry that sometimes people can become so fixated they lose the bigger picture. In some cases, one team making a saving from their budget is actually just passing on the costs (and sometimes increasing the costs) for another team. I'm not sure how to avoid this other than ensuring lots of joined-up working and avoiding putting too much pressure on individuals to meet targets if they're not realistic or ultimately beneficial.
What the residents want and not ideology and parasitic middle class ideology and mysticism such as the LTN debacle.
Waste management/street cleaning & lighting Education Social care
These are all TOP priorities: CULTURE HOUSING CARE for elderly and disabled residents.
The council should reverse its decision to cut library hours and should protect libraries as they provide substantial benefits to the community as detailed on last year's consultation response.
The Council has sufficient funds to keep a full library service.
The council appears to have forgotten its responsibility towards the vulnerable and in particular those who were impacted by COVID either because they became very unwell or because they lost a close family member. These people need to be supported. They currently are not, which is regrettable. These people have suffered traumatic loss and financial hardship and have received no support from the local council or Government. They need support to ease the pressures on them.
Sustainability re travel also trees parks etc
Prioritise children will from poor and difficult backgrounds and other vulnerable
Stop spending money on outsourcing and waste time and money with Commonplace consultations. Invest in our libraries, stop cutting librarians jobs and give them a pay rise. Cut the salaries of the overpaid Haringey cabinet.

Spending - on vulnerable people focus
spend on enforcement and charge for everything. All spend should only happen if it generates a return - investing in people who choose not to help themselves is wasted money
Social Care, housing, older people, people with disabilities, children's services
Services to young and less well-off people should be a priority. Maintenance of open spaces should not be reduced
Residents first! Always!
Relationships with staff and all residents and businesses because they are the council.
Reducing the number of buildings. Having everyone moved back to Haringey.
Reduce spending on roads. Maintain or increase spending on ill-health prevention and social services support to those that need it.
Raise council tax each year on 2 percent plus inflation. Start buying land changing its use through planning and then selling it to developers at a profit.
Protecting services for low income and disabled residents.
Protect spending on infrastructure, education, culture and youth. This is our future.
Protect spending on education. Spend more on potholes
Protect frontline services, including key preventative services, with particular emphasis on those most vulnerable in our community.
Protect frontline services, including key preventative services, with particular emphasis on those most vulnerable in our community.
Protect children services and focus on parks in the poorest areas. Use volunteers more. Help people to manage their own social care and give them individual budgets.
Priority spending 1. Support for victims of domestic abuse. 2. Social care and care of the elderly. Support for local tradespeople who's journey times to visit clients have made travel times and hours worked to assist local people impossible.
<p>Priority services -(danger to life , property)</p> <p>Supporting those services</p> <p>Domestic violence Asb</p> <p>Safeguarding Adults / children</p> <p>Education</p> <p>Maintaining programme</p> <p>Fostering</p> <p>Repairs</p> <p>Housing - building maintaining</p> <p>Supported Housing</p> <p>Highwaysx- lighting</p> <p>Estates services</p> <p>Stop the time waisting ,</p> <p>Boost moral up , value staff</p> <p>Nothing Is less important . But really all has to be carefully considered . On say a points bases</p>
Prioritize vulnerable people
Prioritise Schools and improving healthy transport (cycle pathways and pavement maintenance)

Prioritise mental health, physical health and green spaces. And prioritise income generation over cuts.
priorities libraries and social spaces that we have, increase rent for shops and also residents, stop accommodating people at temporary acomodation
No need to build new houses
NHS services. Old people should get priority. Less important cycling lanes.
Net Zero and Vision Zero initiatives, obviously. The more is spent the more is saved.
My priority is serving vulnerable residents, making sure developers pay properly towards local infrastructure, and keeping green and public spaces clean and safe to attract investment into the borough.
Most important: Keep Connected Communities and expand the team so that residents can have in person assistance with a range of issues that will save the council money and also assist residents with more benefit income equating to more income to be spent in the borough. Least important: more digital infrastructure, creating a council back office culture being dethatched from residents in real time, with their real time issues of not being digitally excluded and not able to engage in the way the council wishes creating more backlog of arrears and court costs to rectify / putting further costs on the council and also residents.
Most important is healthy and safe living conditions for children, young people and the elderly. A proper investment into preventing health and social inequality and the costly results would reduce the spending needed later down the line.
Most important are services to protect the most vulnerable people, especially children, the elderly, the disabled, the homeless etc. High priority in the interests of the mental health and general wellbeing of Haringey residents should also be given to sports, leisure and cultural facilities.
Most important are services to protect the most vulnerable people, especially children and young people, the Black and minority ethnic communities, the elderly, the disabled, the homeless etc. The levels of mental health in communities is on the rise and so cultural and leisure activities can no longer be regarded as luxuries as they improve people's physical and mental well-being and ultimately mean that in the longer term councils and the health service will be saving money, rather than having to spend money dealing with problems caused by the lack of these services.
Make the best effort possible to protect the most vulnerable in our communities; dont generate additional income by penalising current residents with poor decisions like removing the daily visitor parking permits. Make sure that your decisions are EQUITABLE acrosss the borough; charging folks in the east of the borough 6 x more than those in the west for the same service (having a visitor to your home) is not demonstrating respect and care for the residents you represent
Library staffing at Alexandra Park Library. A lot of money has been spent on updating this library, which is well used and houses the only usable community spaces - the upstairs rooms - in this area. The proposals to close it on some days are ridiculous, as this would reduce access to the library itself, and to the lettable rooms, thereby also preventing ppporunities for community use and profitable rentals to other organisations, such as Barclays Bank which currently rents a day a week and provides a valuable service.
Libraries, waste collection, drain management.
Least important are things which produce little benefit for local people so collect and analyse outcome data and base decisions on that info
Keeping streets/ parks clean and safe is priority.
Keep health social care environment. Grants, support for destitite and disabled. Spend travel generate moneys on transport infrastructure.. Stop there

Join up your thinking on digital strategy, socio economic impact and place making.

In making decisions about savings or income generation, the priority should always be vulnerable residents' health and safety, especially for mental health and adult social care services. Any savings or income-generation measures should seek to preserve the social safety net and enhance the quality of care for individuals who rely on these services, while focusing on efficiency and integration to get the most value from the resources available. Non-essential capital projects, luxury amenities, and non-urgent cultural spending could be revisited or reduced, as these do not have the same immediate impact on residents' quality of life.

If I were making decisions about savings or income for the council, the most important factors to consider would be maintaining and improving critical services that directly impact vulnerable residents, especially in adult social care and mental health services. These areas are crucial for the wellbeing and independence of individuals and have a direct impact on people's quality of life. Here's a breakdown of what I would prioritize and what I believe could be approached differently:

Key Considerations:

Ensuring Continuity and Quality in Adult Social Care:

Why It's Important: Adult social care services are essential for the most vulnerable members of society, including elderly residents, individuals with disabilities, and those who need ongoing support due to physical or mental health conditions. Disrupting or reducing these services can lead to worse health outcomes, increased hospital admissions, and greater costs in the long term.

What I Would Prioritize: I would prioritize protecting funding for adult social care services, especially those providing home care, residential care, and mental health support. Focus should be on enhancing access to high-quality care services and improving the support system for carers, as they play an integral role in the community.

Example: Protecting funding for services like dementia care, physical rehabilitation, and mental health care for adults with serious needs, ensuring that people can live independently and in their communities as much as possible.

Investment in Accessible and Integrated Mental Health Services:

Why It's Important: Mental health issues have a profound impact on individuals' ability to engage with work, social life, and family. Increasing access to mental health services—especially for vulnerable adults—is essential to prevent long-term social and economic costs, such as homelessness, unemployment, and dependency on more costly emergency services.

What I Would Prioritize: Expanding access to mental health services, especially for low-income residents and those with complex needs (e.g., dual diagnosis, learning disabilities, etc.). This includes improving community-based mental health services, better outreach, and providing more early intervention options.

Example: Enhancing digital mental health services to reach people who may have difficulty accessing traditional in-person care, while also ensuring personalized care pathways for those with complex conditions.

Efficiency and Integration of Services:

Why It's Important: A more integrated approach across adult social care, mental health services, and housing can improve outcomes for residents and reduce duplication. This could include more collaboration with voluntary and community sector organizations that can deliver more flexible services.

What I Would Prioritize: Ensuring that services work together seamlessly to support individuals holistically—combining adult social care, mental health support, housing needs,

and community outreach under a more unified model.

Example: Making use of technology to coordinate services, tracking an individual's health and support needs across agencies, improving service delivery and reducing costs through shared resources.

Areas of Less Priority:

Non-Essential Capital Projects:

Why It's Less Important: While investment in infrastructure is crucial, it's more important to focus on services that directly support the wellbeing of residents. Large-scale capital projects, like new buildings or non-essential developments, can be delayed or scaled back without significantly affecting day-to-day services.

What I Would Reduce or Postpone: I would review or delay funding for certain capital projects that do not directly impact vulnerable populations, such as non-urgent infrastructure developments or luxury amenities, and focus on maintaining current service levels and improving efficiency.

Example: Postponing or scaling back some of the larger capital investments in non-essential infrastructure like decorative festive lights or less critical building projects.

Non-Critical Cultural and Leisure Services:

Why It's Less Important: While cultural activities and public leisure are valuable, protecting vital services such as mental health care and social care should take precedence when facing financial pressures. Non-essential services like high-end cultural programs can be scaled back without compromising the core wellbeing of residents.

What I Would Review or Reduce: I would consider reducing or refocusing resources for some non-essential cultural and leisure services, while ensuring that basic community wellbeing activities—such as local parks, libraries, and community spaces—are maintained.

Example: Reducing funding for large-scale, expensive events while focusing on smaller, community-based cultural and recreational programs that have more direct benefits for residents.

Other Considerations:

Digital Transformation and Data Utilization: I would also prioritize making intelligent use of technology to improve service delivery in both adult social care and mental health services. Investing in digital tools, telehealth, and data analytics to improve service coordination and reduce inefficiencies could help save costs in the long term while providing more accessible care to residents.

Collaboration and Partnerships: In areas like mental health and adult social care, I would look for ways to build partnerships with local charities, social enterprises, and non-profits. These organizations often have the agility to deliver high-impact services at lower costs.

Improving the roads and streets. Investing in more street cleaners and ensuring residents money is being spent in a transparent way on things that improve ALL communities. Council tax in Haringey is very high.

Important: People safety in public areas, CCTV, infrastructure and clean streets.

NOT important: benefits, financial support, social care, culture

I'm aware that we don't live in a Utopia, but some of the main problems in Haringey boil down to this bizarre culture of obsessing over making every single journey by car. I applaud some of the work the council has done to make cycling safer, such as the LTNs, but more needs to be done. Making it safe to cycle leads to people being healthier and happier; safe cycle routes connect up areas of the borough, which can help trade and lead to better socialising; making it easier to cycle now will encourage younger generations, who are not yet stuck in their ways, to see the benefits and hopefully lead to them shaping things for the future.

If services need to be reduced, let the reduction impact people with greater need less.

I would want to protect spending on the East of the borough, rather than make it about a particular service or area of spend.

It should prioritise protection of LIP funding from TfL and catch up with the rest of the world on increasing cycle lane provision and infrastructure that makes our open and public spaces more comfortable for active travel.
I would review the number of councillors you have - not one of them listen to residents so why have so many ? I'd also do a thorough performance review of your officers - many of them are at the top of their paycales but delivery does not warrant that.
I would protect placemaking and transport, because a lot of the issues start and end with clean and safe neighbourhoods which are walkable. I would give people a lot more personal responsibility to take care of themselves and their families.
I would prioritise spending on housing for the poorest families. In terms of what impacts me most as a resident the amount of rubbish on the streets compared to other boroughs is really noticeable and off-putting. Fly tipping in my area is one of the worst things about living in Tottenham. I would protect existing spending on maintaining regular rubbish collections and making it easy to dispose of waste, while increasing the regularity of street cleaning.
I would prioritise housing homeless people, health and social care, dealing effectively with environmental waste and educating people to take better care of themselves. Rebranding as the 'cerebel borough' is not important.
I would look at staff performance, attendance and accountability.
I think the Council should try and generate more income, Council Tax revaluation and speeding fines are the most immediately obvious. Priority spending should be on children and youth. this would have positive benefits, for health, crime, and social well being.
I need to see what you are spending stuff on. When you look at a something, ask these questions: 1) What is your motivation for doing something? 2) How is it to be done? 3) What benefit is it to the borough? People are quite disillusioned with Haringey Council because they perceive it rightly or wrongly to be inefficient. I appreciate that the works above are a necessity to a community but Haringey doesn't seem to realise that they have to be seen to be efficient. The LTN fines may be a great source of income, but it riles a lot of people because you haven't put something better in its place. People don't see the payback just a massive inconvenience to them.
I am passionate about decent housing because it impacts so heavily on people's lives. Generally, I would focus on income generation opportunities.
Housing, health and social care are the most important services they need to be protected from cuts the most.
Housing, health and social care and sustainability most important.
housing
less important: enviornmental programmes
Housing , Adult Social Care and SEND need to be prioritised.
Health, safety and well-being of residents.
Health and social care important, but also the lving environment.
Health and safety - local culture are important for wellbeing of residents
Good access to health care and living assistance for those who need it Safe access to all areas at all times
Get the roads moving again, low traffic networks, clogged the archers and leave the borough having a stroke

From experience of working with residents - the key services to the most deprived people in the borough need to be focussed on - social care, housing and services for vulnerable people. Need to
<p>Ensuring contracting out of services is a rigorous process with strong requirements and oversight.</p> <p>Having a cost benefit analysis of agency staff vs more council employees. Perhaps having your own team of experienced staff who can fill in where necessary on any giving day/week but who could also help with any areas of backlog when not needed to fill day to day vacancies.</p>
Education the very young and elderly first. Reduce everything else such as disable bays, cultural expenses and items that can be provided by others, interpreters transportation for those who can walk.
Easier said than done. Cutting staffing or back room work can make things worse for residents. I agree that our most vulnerable residents need to be protected but for those other residents, it's the state of the pavements, potholes, rubbish collection, parks etc which they notice and use. I do think the Council does a decent job with some unfortunate exceptions.
Don't prioritise reducing people's access to visitors and support - it impacts the disabled, elderly and people with young children the most, the very people in the borough who need the most help
<p>Digital services can be transformational if executed well; a money pit if executed badly. Whoever manages digital project should be well-versed in the potential pitfalls and the tricks contractors play to maximise take from public sector projects where there is no profit-imperative. Involve citizens/those who work in the borough to volunteer for consultation, advice and user-acceptance testing.</p> <p>A bad example is Haringey's parking permit digital tool, which was not developed as mobile-first because the developer told the Council mobile was difficult and would cost more. That was a fundamental error.</p>
Difficult, but try and put the needs of the poorest, most deprived, and disadvantaged first.
Decent managers who will iron out the wasteful unnecessary spending and get staff working efficiently. The priority for spending should be on housing; building more council homes, and repairing and maintaining existing ones.
Consider impact on poorest and most vulnerable.
COLLECT UNPAID DEBTS AND REDUCE COUNCIL WORKERS EXTRAVAGANT SPENDING PLUS NEVER EVER REPEAT THE RIDICULOUS SALE AND REPURCHASE OF COUNCIL PROPERTY AS HAS TAKEN PLACE IN RECENT YEARS. TOTALLY OUTRAGEOUS.
Clean and safe streets/parks.
CEO and officer wage bill. It is ridiculous that the most complained-about council in the UK has the highest-paid chief officer.
care services most important to protect
<p>All statutory services e.g. social care must be maintained, and high priority should be given to leisure and cultural services, especially libraries. Employing large numbers of senior Council officers on 6-figure salaries is less important than having competent well-paid full-time staff at the coal-face. The Council should aim to have 80% of its expenditure on operational frontline service delivery and 20% of its expenditure on overheads, management and back office, not the other way around.</p> <p>Efficiency in spending income first. Most important, need and social cohesion. I think cultural spending should be high priority. Less important, all those surveys which do no more that kick</p>

Do you have any other thoughts on the council's budget that you would like to share?

These comments are made on behalf of the campaign group Haringey Defend Council Housing.

We recommend that the Council should limit council tenants' rent and service charge increases as far as possible.

Service charge proposals

The proposed tenant service charges in the pre-budget statement include unexplained excess increases for the Sheltered Housing Cleaning Service +10%, Caretaking +21%, and Converted Properties Cleaning +29%. No explanation for any of these increases has been offered there is nothing to suggest that these charges are 'reasonable and transparent' as they need to be. The Caretaking service charge is paid by 7,000 tenants, and the proposed increase would wipe out the effect of partial remission of some other charges because of external energy price changes.

Breaches of government guidance

The above increases all breach the Government's policy statement on social rent setting (in both its current form, and its proposed revised form) which says this:

Registered providers are expected to set reasonable and transparent service charges which reflect the service being provided to tenants. Tenants should be supplied with clear information on how service charges are set.

Service charges are not governed by the same factors as rent. However, registered providers should endeavour to keep increases for service charges within the limit of CPI (as at September in the previous year) plus 1 percentage point, to help keep charges affordable.

This means that individual service charges should not increase by more than +2.7% in the current year but that is what is being proposed here and ten times over for residents affected by Converted Properties Cleaning, the notorious service charge for cleaning the entrance lobbies of flats in converted Victorian and Edwardian street properties.

The government policy statement means that the average resident should be advised of the proposals before any decision takes place - but that is not what is being proposed.

The government policy statement means that tenants should be provided with an explanation for the amounts of the proposed charges - but that is not happening either.

No to rent convergence

The Cabinet Member's comments reported in the minutes of the Cabinet's pre-budget discussion on 10 December, sets out the rationale for the Council's current approach to rents, referring to 'a move in government for rent convergence which would see rent levels brought back in line with where they should have been' the Cabinet Member cautiously welcomed this proposal,

In fact, council rents and charges are already too high, based on the ability of tenants to pay, the impact of welfare benefit restrictions, and the impact on the welfare of children. 47% of

food bank users are social housing tenants.

The standards crisis in council and social housing is such that no amount of increase in rents for some of the poorest people in society could hope to solve it. We should all lobby this new government for public investment instead.

The Council should reject additional rent increases under the rubric of rent convergence, and refuse to implement them if government mistakenly decides that they should be permitted.

Consultation is a human right

There should be specific consultation of tenants and leaseholders over all proposals for rent and service charge increases, as used to be the case. The council has argued that we have no such right, we disagree with this because there is a moral right to consultation nothing about us, without us, and no taxation without representation.

The headline rent increase is a maximum, not an obligation for providers, and every year there are some councils and even a few housing associations which decide not to charge the maximum amount. Therefore this is a policy choice, and therefore those affected (the tenants) should be informed about the options and consulted about it.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Just days after the election of this government, dozens of local authorities launched a campaign for more housing resources, They were right to do so. Now this Rebel Borough should lobby the new government, publicly and alongside tenants and anti-poverty campaigners, for direct investment in council housing without rent increases. There should be management and maintenance allowances and fire safety allowances from government to improve standards in council housing, which is an essential public service.

This means scrapping unaffordable Affordable Rent and pressing government for effective regulation of service charges.

Paul Burnham
Secretary
Haringey Defend Council Housing.

Your citizens have not had an increase in their wages to substantiate your budget.; this is only for the few in this community.

You have my heart-felt sympathy, serving the vulnerable of the borough and keeping Haringey running on ever-reducing funds. I'd hoped, despite campaign rhetoric, a Labour government would raise income tax to fund council-level services. (Disclosure: I'm a higher-rate tax payer) What's the point in being personally wealthy but publicly impoverished?

You are being underfunded by central government. Of the 7th richest country on the planet. A central government that gives billions to bankers and cronies, and commits genocide in Palestine. And all other local authorities are being underfunded too. And this has been going on for decades. When will it end? You should team up with other local authorities, all spend what your constituents deserve regardless of your budgets, and DEMAND the extra money

from our corrupt, criminal, shameless, negligent central government. The country can afford it. The country would benefit from it. Grow some backbones. Make your constituents proud. Serve your people. Do something that you will be proud of when you look back on your lives. Otherwise you are just getting paid to preside over intentional collapse. Use your power.
yes see attached
Yes libraries are a vital resource for parents, children and the elderly.. They're some where warm and sociable to go to escape their own cold homes. They can work on projects use a pc, practice poetry, writing and many other things good for mental health.
Widen your communications efforts to ensure residents and business owners across the borough understand what the circumstances are, what the council can and can not do about it, what is doing, what its effects are.
Well done for conducting the consultation at all.
We are opposed to the Council's proposals to reduce library hours and to continue to threaten to cut the library budget in future years. Capital spend on refurbishments and digital technology on libraries is a good thing ONLY if linked to a libraries strategy, and not as an excuse to make further cuts cuts.
We are opposed to the Council's proposals to reduce library opening hours.
Too much going to Mr Khan
Rather it went to haringey
This survey contained far too little information to be able to give an informed response
There was a lot of information but it was still too high level for me to feel like I had anything meaningful to say. I'm not sure this consultation felt a good use of time.
The Placemaking and housing (P&H) funding for wards corner should end now. The aging council plan has just caused planning blight for years in order to satisfy an out of date vision of shopping centres. Release all compulsory purchase and re-let the 4 council owned buildings to raise income from today
The funding formula for London urgently need to be addressed !
<p>The focus of the council's budget should ultimately be on prioritizing services that support vulnerable populations, while also adopting a mindset of efficiency, adaptability, and innovation. By investing in preventative care, integrating digital services, and collaborating with external partners, the council can achieve better outcomes with fewer resources. Transparent decision-making and ongoing engagement with the community will also be key to ensuring that residents feel confident and supported in times of financial constraint. Balancing cost-cutting with compassionate care will be essential in maintaining a fair and equitable borough:</p> <p>When considering the council's budget, there are several additional thoughts and perspectives I'd like to share, especially regarding ensuring that funds are allocated effectively to support vulnerable residents while also making the most of limited resources:</p> <p>1. Investing in Preventative Services:</p> <p>One of the most cost-effective ways to address the growing need for adult social care and mental health services is to invest in preventative measures. Services that help residents maintain their independence or receive early mental health support before their needs escalate can lead to significant long-term savings. Early intervention, such as mental health awareness campaigns, accessible counseling services, and social support networks, could prevent individuals from needing more intensive, costly services down the line. For example, community-based outreach services for mental health can help people get support before a crisis occurs, reducing the demand for expensive emergency care and hospital admissions.</p>

2. Better Use of Technology and Data:

Given the pressure on public funds, there's a growing opportunity to make use of technology to streamline services, improve accessibility, and ultimately reduce costs. The digital transformation of adult social care and mental health services could include things like telehealth for consultations, digital care plans that follow residents from one service to another, and data-sharing between agencies to avoid duplication and improve outcomes. Ensuring that services are digitally accessible for residents who may face challenges with mobility or are socially isolated would also be important. Investment in digital literacy programs for vulnerable groups (older people, those with disabilities) could also help them take full advantage of available services.

3. Collaboration with the Voluntary and Community Sector:

The council could consider enhancing partnerships with local charities, non-profits, and social enterprises to support delivery of services, especially in areas like mental health and adult social care. These organizations often have specialized knowledge and experience in working with marginalized or vulnerable groups and may be able to deliver services more cost-effectively.

The voluntary sector has strong ties within communities, which helps to reduce barriers to accessing care. With proper investment in collaboration, this sector can help reduce council expenditure while delivering high-quality services.

4. Flexibility in Budget Allocation:

As needs evolve, it is crucial to ensure that the budget is flexible enough to adapt to unforeseen circumstances, particularly in areas like mental health where demand can fluctuate, especially in times of crisis (e.g., post-pandemic recovery). While it's important to make savings, there should be room for the budget to respond quickly to emerging needs or issues, such as a rise in mental health referrals or the need for additional care due to demographic changes (aging population, for example).

5. Resident Engagement and Transparency:

Ensuring that the budgeting process is transparent and that residents feel involved in decision-making can help build trust and a sense of shared responsibility. Holding regular consultations with residents, especially vulnerable groups (such as those who use adult social care or mental health services), will ensure that their voices are heard and can help identify areas where services may be underfunded or require improvement.

Offering residents clear information on how cuts or changes may affect them could also foster a greater understanding of the difficult choices the council is facing.

6. Sustainability and Long-Term Planning:

In addition to focusing on immediate savings, the council should consider the long-term sustainability of services. For example, green initiatives in adult social care (e.g., eco-friendly homes or energy-efficient assistive technology) could help reduce costs over time, while also addressing the borough's environmental goals. Additionally, creating sustainable funding models for services like adult social care could help reduce reliance on council funding in the future.

7. Alternative Models of Service Delivery:

As mentioned previously, alternative models of care (like shared care, or even more in-house services) could help reduce costs while still providing quality support. It would be worth considering exploring partnerships or outsourcing some services to non-profits or other entities that can provide better value. Services like the Connected Care Service could be a good candidate for this type of reevaluation, focusing on community-based care and preventative measures as alternatives to more intensive support.

8. Revenue-Generating Opportunities:

The council should also continue to explore ways to generate revenue in a responsible manner. For example, charging for certain non-essential services (e.g., gym memberships at

leisure centers, parking schemes) can help offset the costs of essential services. However, these charges should always be structured carefully to ensure they do not place an undue burden on low-income residents. The council could also look into sponsorships or grants to support cultural activities or other services where applicable, such as partnerships with local businesses, organizations, or philanthropists.
The council would not be in this position if it hadn't funded so many ridiculous vanity projects and ignored its basic function- the councils job is to provide basic services- not to dictate lifestyle choices, not to engage in party-political policies, not to try to force businesses and residents out to pretend it's a higher-class neighbourhood.
The Council should reverse its decision to cut branch libraries by 50% and main libraries by 25%.
The Council has been blaming the Conservative Government for cutting budgets year on year. It makes me laugh that the 'wonderful' Labour Party is now in power and is still cutting annual Council budgets but nothing is said about that.
Thank you for providing the opportunity to contribute to this.
Stop wasting money on agency workers. Encourage private investment.
Stop wasting money on PC projects .May have been good 10 years ago , but not now . Don't hold events telling the residents one thing then go and do the opposite. HC needs money to be found . Showing g of it not the thing . Sensibility Accountability and Transparency are the buzz words . That costs money.
Stop pandering to loud individuals who criticise you for bands and events in parks - particularly Finsbury Park. You HAVE to exploit the financial opportunities available to you. You will always have people who disagree. Accept it and press ahead. You need that income to support other areas where you have less budget. Ditto parking. Charge more. You don't have a choice.
Services should be brought in-house as far as possible
See above.
PLEASE DIVEST PENSION MONEY FROM GENOCIDE!! I gather Haringey is still investing its Pension Fund in companies that are complicit in Israel's violations of international law and Palestinian human rights. Israel has murdered over 45,000 Palestinians and is currently attacking Yemen and Syria - ALL in violation of international law. Until you divest from arms companies supplying weapons to Israel, Haringey council is complicit in genocide. I have no doubt there are more ethical companies you could invest in.
Plant SUGI forests - urban mini forests that will be fully funded by sugiproject.com Retrofit houses. Have communal heat sources. Stop funding fireworks events at Ally Pally, they're an environmental disaster.
Parking enforcement is not done well and the staff don't issue fines. This could be an income generator and will not hurt the poorest who don't have cars.
Outsourcing has typically been a waste of money, but providing services in-house can be just as bad without decent management.
No.
No, although I know you're in an impossible position and admire your efforts to provide a good service for the people of Haringey. I just wish the current government understood that local investment pays off for the national interest.
No
No
No

Needs budget put into encouraging EV adoption. Allowance for on street charging via lampposts or grants for installing chargepoints which cut gulleys into pavements.
My own experience is that effective project management and quality control process have yet to be taken up within the operating culture of the borough service delivery. Working to a BSI accredited system will of its self reduce waste and improve efficiency.
Keep in touch with other councils and Audit Commission re value for money
Keep Connected Communities. It is one of the few services that are visible and work in person with residents and bridge the digital exclusion and back office services.
It's all about efficiency. there needs to be experienced economists in the council, looking at where money can be saved through, sensible planning and being more efficient
It is difficult and the LAs must collectively work to get more from central government Likewise council tax should be overhauled so that those in massive expensive homes pay substantially more. More like the previous previous rates system
It could be reduced by 1 million.
I understand the need to make cuts however I believe the removal of daily parking permits will have a detrimental effect on peoples well being.
I think the Council should get together with other Councils and the GLA, who in turn should work with other Local Authorities, to pressure the government to increase spending at the local level. There, relatively small amounts can have major effects and leverage.
I have two major points I would like to make. 1. As already mentioned above, reducing library opening hours will diminish opportunities for cultural and economic enrichment by limiting the time people can spend using the library resources and participating in cultural/social/economic activities at the Library. In addition, reducing access to libraries will also have a disproportionate impact on the most vulnerable members of the community who depend on free access to cultural activities. 2. It is disappointing that that the consultation period is so short and that it takes place over the Christmas holiday period when people are least likely to respond to it because so many other things are going on. Haringey you really need to pull your socks up if you wish to be taken seriously by residents. We are increasingly aware, that these consultations are basically tick-box exercises. I would have liked to have submitted a response from the Friends of Marcus Garvey Library - this response is an individual one from myself- but there simply has not been enough time available because of the shortness of the consultation period to call a meeting to discuss the proposals. I will however bring it up at our next meeting which is due to take place on January 18th.
I don't think the Council should sell properties if it can be avoided. The more properties that are owned by commercial/ private landlords the more prices in the area will increase with knock-on effects for residents. I think the usage of properties should be maximised as much as possible but ownership retained.
I appreciate the opportunity to read the plans and proposals. Thank you.
I ACCEPT IT IS A DIFFICULT TASK.
How can Wandsworth charge half what you do yet deliver a better service? Political mismanagement has made Haringey one of the worst councils
Have a good bid writer to look at your strategies, where have you deviated last year eliminate it this year. Capital funding: Asset funding: Other: increase revenues in all these areas

Given the situation I understand decisions need to be made that are not necessarily going to be popular, Suggestions seem on the face of it fair

Given the latest budget and the government decision to raise employers National Insurance contributions, this will have a devastating effect on smaller businesses, which proportionally employ a much higher ratio of people. Unless these businesses can be kept going, the council will have to pay far more unemployment benefit. Employment also keeps people happier and healthier (so cheaper). Keeping the business rates or council tax lower would help smaller businesses...or any other ways the council can manage to help.

Given growth in population and size, lobby hard with other organizations for central government to designate Haringey is an inner borough with appropriate funding.

Cut the big fat salaries

As I said, I need to see what you're spending things on and why. You need to address what is causing such a downward pressure and why. Then make a submission to Central Government explaining the situation. What happens upstream, will affect downstream.

The woman on the Youtube video blamed the Tory government and austerity for Haringey's problems. As money from the government comes from the tax-payer, she is essentially blaming the tax-payer for Haringey's woes. Will she be so critical of the current Labour Government? This is an absolution of responsibility. My experience of Haringey is the Labour Council runs the borough like a fiefdom to do as it pleases. I personally think the situation will get worse for Haringey because of huge population changes/increases and demographics, there will be a continuous downward pressure on the services and resources. I'm already seeing this where it where I live. This is to do with planning by central government. Putting council tax up is like flogging a dead horse, they'll be a point when people can't or won't pay it. We're heading for recession. This time next year, I expect they'll be another consultation on how to save money as Haringey goes further into debt and I look forward to the Youtube video where Haringey Council blames the Labour government.

As I mentioned previously, moving to use more digital solutions is an excellent strategy but also needs to be executed in a way that you're not getting taken advantage of. Give visibility to everyone on which contracts are available and who eventually is rewarded them and on what merits. This will force more competitive pricing from suppliers and more assurance to residents that the council is running efficiently.

Consider how you can both reduce costs and raise income through initiatives protecting the environment and providing a better place to live (ie fly tipping and noise pollution).

Feel free to contact me if you want with any further questions.

As above.

The council appears to have forgotten its responsibility towards the vulnerable and in particular those who were impacted by COVID either because they became very unwell or because they lost a close family member. These people need to be supported. They currently are not, which is regrettable. These people have suffered traumatic loss and financial hardship and have received no support from the local council or Government. They need support to ease the pressures on them.

Any left overs from a yearly budget should be rolled over to the next year's budget. At the moment there're all kind of road- and pavement works, many completely unneeded, going on all over the borough giving the impression that the Council is frantically trying to spend any money left over from the current budget.

£50,000 has been budgeted as new revenue from changing daily parking permit provision to hourly provision only. How can you include this revenue in your budgeting process before that consultation has actually concluded?