

Appendix 6 - Cabinet Responses: Budget scrutiny recommendations 2024/25

Adults and Health					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Lead officer
<b>Recommendation 1</b>	General		The Panel highlighted the risk from the high level of additional pressures to the Council budget, particularly in relation to the extra £15.1m of pressures in the Adult Social Services budget.	Yes	Jo Baty
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 1</b>	Haringey provides social care to more than 3,700 adults – with the number rising. The cost of social care placements is rising too. We are regularly reviewing our care contracts and closely monitoring care budgets.				
<b>Recommendation 2</b>	General		The Panel highlighted the forecast pressures in Adult Social Services for 2026/27 as this was only £930k (Table 1 of the Cabinet report) compared with much higher levels in the other years of the MTFS. The Panel considered that there was some risk of the pressures being revised upwards at the Budget setting process next year, thereby increasing the budget gap at that time.	Yes	Jo Baty
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 2</b>	Projected increases in adult social care demand were built into the MTFS for 2024/2025-2028/2029 at an earlier stage, the £930k is a further addition to this. This will be kept under review in line with budget planning.				
<b>Recommendation 3</b>	General		The Panel expressed concerns about the higher level of proposed new savings in 2026/27 (Table 2 of the	Yes	Jo Baty

			Cabinet report) compared to other years of the MTFS and the potential risk of this impacting on the services that residents received.		
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 3</b>	There are a larger number of savings in 2026/27 in part because we have planned lead-in time for a number of transformational projects. Throughout the lifetime of MTFS we have committed to working with residents receiving care and support to shape future service delivery.				
<b>Recommendation 4</b>	General		The Panel expressed concerns about the details received about some service providers attempting to raise the cost of services commissioned by the Council at rates that were considerably higher than inflation. The Panel recommended that the Council should be robust in its approach to the procurement from service providers and vigilant against the risk of being overcharged for services, particularly when compared to the cost of services provided in similar neighbouring boroughs.	Yes	Jo Baty
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 4</b>	We have a robust approach in line with NCL (North Central London) neighbours in terms of market management - older people, residential and nursing and LD provision.				
<b>Recommendation 5</b>	Integrated Connected Communities		The Panel requested that local Councillors be consulted on the approach to integrated neighbourhood teams, in particular about local groups that could be linked into the teams	Yes	Jo Baty/Sara Sutton
<b>Cabinet Response Recommendation 5</b>	We are finalising the future ways of working and service design and we will ensure that the scrutiny panel and local councillors are appropriately consulted at the right point in the process.				

<b>Recommendation 6</b>	Integrated Connected Communities		The Panel recommends that relevant organisations in local community and voluntary sector should be made aware of the reduction in scope of the Connected Communities work (in areas such as employment, education and housing advice) as this could add further pressure to organisations that provided advice and support to residents.		Jo Baty/Sara Sutton	
<b>Cabinet Response Recommendation 6</b>	We acknowledge the importance of ensuring that VCS (voluntary and community sector) organisations are aware of any changes and plan to attend a VCS Forum as part of our engagement once our plans are finalised.					
<b>Recommendation 7</b>	Integrated Connected Communities		The Panel recommended that the details of this proposal be broken down and made more accessible when presented as part of the forthcoming public consultation on the Budget.	Yes	Jo Baty/Sara Sutton	
<b>Cabinet Response Recommendation 7</b>	We are finalising the future ways of working and service design and are ensuring that they are shaped in a way that is clear and accessible. While we were unable to provide further detail at this stage, we remain committed to transparency and will bring the proposed changes back to a future Scrutiny meeting for discussion.					
<b>Capital Programme</b>						
<b>Recommendation 8</b>	Osbourne Grove Nursing Home		The OSC welcomed the commitment by officers to meet with the Osborne Grove Co-production Group.  The OSC also recommended that the Osborne Grove Co-production Group should be provided with the opportunity to provide input to any future business case for the site.  The Panel will continue to monitor this issue.	Yes	Jo Baty/Sara Sutton	

<b>Cabinet Response Recommendation 8</b>	We meet regularly with the Osborne Grove Coproduction Group (OGCG), discussing both the short term use of the site and options for the long term. OGCG will of course be invited to input into the business case for the future.					
<b>Recommendation 9</b>	Locality Hubs		Given the limitations on the capital budget which meant that the development of additional new locality hubs could not go ahead, the Panel recommended that further efforts be made to join up services across the Borough and to include the existing locality hub in this.	Yes		Jo Baty/Sara Sutton
<b>Cabinet Response Recommendation 9</b>	Plans are already in place to take forward these ways of working.					

Children & Young People					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Lead officer
<b>Recommendation 10</b>	General		The Panel request that Cabinet provide a response on what their plans are for income generation, rather than savings, to close the residual budget gap. The Panel also seek assurances from Cabinet that they have explored every opportunity for income generation.	Yes	ALL

<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 10</b>	<p>The service generates income across a number of areas as a full cost recovery model, including for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pendarren Outdoor Education Centre</li> <li>- Education Welfare Service</li> <li>- Music Service</li> <li>- Educational Psychology services for schools</li> <li>- Letting out space in Rising Green Youth Hub</li> <li>- Early year training and childcare</li> </ul> <p>The service will continue to look for opportunities to generate income wherever possible, being mindful of the budgetary pressures and competing demands on our schools.</p>				
<b>Recommendation 11</b>	General		In reference to the residual budget gap of around £32m, the Panel request assurances from Cabinet that they will seek to minimise the impact of further savings on children and young people in the borough.	Yes	ALL
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 11</b>	We have focused our budget savings on management actions to find efficiencies, rather than cuts to frontline services, in children's services and across the board.				
<b>Recommendation 12</b>	<p>Budget Pressures relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education, Health &amp; Social Care Plans</li> <li>• Home to School Transport</li> <li>• High Cost Placements in Children's Social Care</li> </ul>		<p>The Panel are concerned about forecast budget pressures on these service areas growing further and seek assurances from Cabinet around the modelling used to calculate the forecast pressures.</p> <p>The Panel would like assurances that the forecasts will continue to be reassessed going forward, including in reference to updated in-year budget monitoring figures for Quarter 2 and beyond.</p>	Yes	Dionne Thomas Jackie Difolco
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 12</b>	Social care and SEND modelling of demand is monitored monthly and informs the budget forecast.				
<b>Recommendation 13</b>	Children's Social Care (High Cost Placements).		The Panel requested that Cabinet give assurances around the fact that they will monitor the costs of placements closely going forwards, and also give	Yes	Caroline Brain

			<p>assurances around how the Council will ensure that none of our providers use unsuitable placements, such as caravans and Airbnb sublets.</p> <p>Further assurances were requested about how we will monitor providers charging excessive rates for placements.</p>		
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 13</b>	<p>Our quality assurance team are in place, and they continually monitor, review cost and quality of any provision ensuring best value and maximum impact on service provision.</p> <p>We would not consider providers who use unsuitable placements such as caravans or Airbnbs</p>				
<b>Recommendation 14</b>	Pendarren		The Committee urged that all options for income generation from Pendarren are considered, with due regard given to the health & safety requirements that were specified.	Yes	Jane Edwards
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 14</b>	<p>All options are being considered for income generation including rental to private sports bodies and corporate use. Safeguarding and health and safety requirements are always considered before agreeing to lettings.</p>				
<b>Recommendation 15</b>	Reducing placement costs through effective management of the market (£200k)		The OSC requested clarification on whether this reduction in costs would impact on the ability of young people approaching the age of 25 to complete education courses that they were undertaking.	Yes	Caroline Brain Dionne Thomas
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 15</b>	<p>Soft market engagement events are taking place with providers, to reduce spend and manage the market. This will not impact on young people and their education.</p>				

Housing, Placemaking & Development					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Lead officer
<b>Recommendation 16</b>	Housing Related Support Contracts		<p>The OSC noted that discussions were still ongoing with providers regarding service impacts and requested that details of the outcomes be provided to the Housing Panel when available.</p> <p>Clarification was also requested on the anticipated timescales for these details to be available.</p>	Yes	Sara Sutton
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 16</b>	An update for the Housing Panel is being prepared and will be submitted by the next meeting.				
<b>Recommendation 17</b>	Capital Investment of £13.247m in Asset Management of Council buildings.		The OSC expressed concern about the ongoing disuse of some Council-owned buildings and urged that all possible opportunities for interim uses be considered to maximise income generation.	Yes	Jonathan Kirby/Andrew Meek
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 17</b>	<p>This is a very high priority for the Capital Projects and Property team and work has been ongoing as part of delivering on the MTFS proposals submitted for the 23/24.</p> <p>We continue to work to make progress on the improvement journey, set out in the Strategic Asset Management and Property Improvement Plan (SAMPIP), to deal with a legacy of underinvestment. A list of all void or potentially surplus properties is maintained.</p> <p>All properties that are no longer needed operationally will be transferred to the investment portfolio, for repurposing to maximise income, redevelopment (e.g. for housing) or disposal. This work generated £400K in additional revenue in 2024 and over £4M in capital receipts.</p>				

<b>Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee (Culture, Strategy &amp; Engagement).</b>		
--	--	--

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Lead officer
Recommendation 18	Digital Services		That this item be referred to the Cabinet as an area of concern due to the risk of further future pressures that could be caused by the need for unforeseen technological updates or cyber-security measures. The Committee also noted that this was an area where future savings were also proposed, leading to further potential pressures.	Yes	Nathan Pierce
Cabinet Response to Recommendation 18	<p>Digital Services has two key savings targets to deliver:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Direct Budget Savings</b> - The first target relates to staffing and contract savings within the Digital budget itself. These must be managed strategically, as Digital underpins the effective operation of the entire council. Further budget reductions risk negatively impacting services across the organisation, including cyber security. To address this, we have requested additional investment to strengthen our cyber security capabilities and ensure timely system upgrades. It is important to note that these costs will continue to rise annually, and proactive contract management alongside strategic planning (Enterprise Architecture) is essential to mitigate long-term financial pressures.</li> <li><b>Service Modernisation Savings</b> - The second set of savings, previously referred to as Digital Transformation, now falls under the <b>Service Modernisation Portfolio</b>. These savings are realised from service budgets through reductions in FTE, contract savings, or lower licence fees. However, this is not solely about digital solutions—it also involves business process redesign, new ways of working, and structural changes in service delivery.</li> </ol> <p>Unlike previous approaches, which relied heavily on agency staff and operated in isolation, this work is now being co-designed and delivered by a team of permanent experts in collaboration with service teams. This ensures a more sustainable and impactful transformation.</p> <p>Current activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing service roadmaps that place <b>residents at the centre</b> of service redesign, followed by officer needs.</li> <li>Identifying and eliminating outdated practices.</li> <li>Providing detailed insight into cashable savings.</li> <li>Establishing governance, benefits realisation, and delivery structures for the Service Modernisation Portfolio.</li> </ul> <p>Finally, the <b>digital restructure goes live on 1st March</b>, strengthening our permanent capabilities to drive this work forward in the long term.</p>				
Recommendation 19	General - Format of Budget Papers		The Committee noted the feedback from the Scrutiny Panels that the descriptions for many of the specific budget items (pressures, savings and capital items) in their agenda papers had been very limited and that detailed conversation had been required in the meeting in order to understand them. The Committee recommended that significantly more detail	Yes	Josephine Lyseight



			should be included in future budget reports, particularly for items that involved significant sums of money.		
<b>Response to Recommendation 19</b>	The general comment made by the Committee regarding the level of detail published for proposals has been noted and will be considered as part of future budget setting processes, subject to sensitive and commercial restrictions. This will include the publication of a provisional EQIA at the point of publication of any budget proposals for consultation, options considered and the value of the total budget impacted.				
<b>Recommendation 20</b>	General		It was requested that, in the future, any specific funding allocated to organisations be itemised in the budget scrutiny report. This would help clarify which funds would be applied earlier or later, allowing for a better understanding of the proposals. This comment emerged from the discussion on the Culture Review savings item which involved discretionary budgets used to fund local organisations. However, this recommendation applied as a general point for any relevant future item.	Yes	Kenneth Tharp/Josephine Lyseight
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 20</b>	The general comment made by the Committee regarding the level of detail published for each savings proposal has been noted and will be considered as part of future budget setting processes, subject to sensitive and commercial restrictions. This will include the publication of a provisional EQIA at the point of publication of any budget proposals for consultation, options considered and the value of the total budget impacted.				
<b>Recommendation 21</b>	Review of the Council Tax Reduction Scheme.		The Committee noted the commitment for any proposals to go through the full democratic decision-making process before implementation in 2026/27 and requested further details on when this information was expected to be available to Scrutiny.	Yes	Kari Manovitch
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 21</b>	The proposals will be available to Scrutiny later this year. We are working on the detailed timetable and will share it once ready. The final scheme will be considered by the Full Council that approves the Budget in March 2026.				

Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested if appropriate	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Lead officer
<b>Recommendation 22</b>	HRA Business Plan		The Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted the mitigations and actions that had been put in place to manage the increasing number of housing disrepair cases, and the high number of housing voids. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee felt that these areas were ongoing risks to the HRA budget. They agreed that there be ongoing detailed reporting to the Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel during the financial year, to provide assurance that the costs were being managed and reduced. The Committee further recognised that there was currently a high churn of residents moving to new Council properties, as a result of new Council housing coming available and through the Neighbourhood Moves scheme but felt that the movement between Council properties needed to be quicker to ensure that Voids numbers were reduced.	Yes	Jahed Rahman
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 22</b>	<p>A specific report on the new disrepair operating business model, its effectiveness, number and spend on legal disrepair cases will go to the Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel to monitor spend against the 25/26 budget and future budget provisions made for disrepair claims and mitigations in place to reduce future spend.</p> <p>A voids position statement and overview of key improvement milestones will be provided to the Housing, Planning and Development Scrutiny Panel.</p>				
<b>Recommendation 23</b>	HRA Business Plan		The Committee agreed that there was a continuing risk to the HRA account as the forecasted revenue contribution to capital outlay (RCCO) was currently substantively below the set minimum of £8m and that this should be continue to be carefully monitored by the Cabinet.	Yes	Taryn Eves
<b>Response to Recommendation 23</b>	Monthly internal finance monitoring of spend and income will continue into 2025/26 with quarterly reporting to Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny Committee.				
<b>Recommendation 24</b>	General – Exceptional		The Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted that the Council is not in a position to set a robust balanced budget for 2025/26 without an assumed £37m Exceptional Financial Support.	No.	

	Financial Support				
<b>Recommendation 25</b>	General – Exceptional Financial Support		<p>The Committee discussed the other options available to the Council when reaching the decision to seek Exceptional Financial Support from the government. This included Council Tax increases above the 5% threshold and significant cuts to service. The Committee commented that they were broadly supportive of the approach taken to seek Exceptional Financial Support, in light of the alternatives. There had been some incorrect external press reporting about the type of support that EFSA was, and it was clearly understood by the Committee, in the discussion, that this was not a government grant but the ability to draw down a loan which had interest payments together with the ability to use capital receipts to support the revenue spend on key services.</p> <p>In light of the continual increases seen in the budget gap in recent months and the fact that ongoing use of EFSA beyond 2025/26 was unsustainable, the Committee recommended to Cabinet that there be robust and careful monitoring of the use of the EFSA funds through in-year budget monitoring. Future budget monitoring reports should clearly set out the areas of Council revenue spend that have been drawn down from the EFSA. The financial monitoring report will also need to highlight any unexpected increases in the use of this particular funding above the assumptions that have been used to seek the particular sum of £37m EFSA support.</p>	Yes	
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 25</b>	Monthly internal finance monitoring of spend and income will continue into 2025/26 with quarterly reporting to Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This will include very specifically and in a transparent way, any use of the £37m of EFS if it is agreed by MHCLG at the end of February.				
<b>Recommendation 26</b>	Monthly internal finance monitoring of spend		<p>The Committee noted that work was currently being undertaken to develop the format and content of the budget quarterly monitoring reports and recommended that Overview and Scrutiny be consulted on the final format to ensure that it allowed them to access the necessary detailed</p>	Yes	

	and income will continue into 2025/26 with quarterly reporting to Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny Committee.		financial information on the revenue and capital budget, including risk, so they are able to confidently carry out their financial scrutiny responsibilities. The Committee agreed to meet with Director of Finance to agree how the Committee would scrutinise in-year budget monitoring for 2025/26.		
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 26</b>	The Section 151 Officer will be reviewing the finance, performance and risk reporting to Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny Committee in 2025/26 and feedback from OSC is welcome in terms of the detail and structure of the reports to support their scrutiny process. This will be discussed with the committee before April 2025.				
<b>Recommendation 27</b>	New Savings Proposals in Adults – Format of Reports		<p>The Committee considered the new savings proposals on the community support model, reablement services and supported living contract. Although, there was further information provided at the meeting, on how the savings figures had been arrived at and the financial modelling behind these savings, the Committee felt that there was much more detail required by them, which needed to be included in the papers, in order to properly consider, challenge and scrutinise these savings in a meaningful way, and be able to make recommendations. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data/evidence for the Developing Community Support Model item</li> <li>- Data/evidence for the Review of the Council's Reablement model item including expansion of the model and any financial projections on invest to save (i.e. by reducing the need for long-term social care packages)</li> </ul>	Yes	

		- Data/evidence for the Supported Living Contract item, including details on the involvement of the co-production group.		
<b>Cabinet Response to Recommendation 27</b>	We acknowledge the Committee's request for further detail about the Community Support Model, Reablement Services and Supported Living Contract savings and will collate the information for presentation to the Committee as and when it is available.			