Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4a

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Proposal to Remove Funding for the Floating Support Service from April 2027		
Directorate	Adults, Housing and Health	**Responsible Director/Assistant**	Maddie Watkins
Cabinet Member	Cllr Tammy Hymas	**Scrutiny Committee**	Housing Scrutiny
Affected Service:	Housing Demand - Housing Related Support	**Contact / Lead Officer:**	Zahra Maye

Value of the budget impacted	£7,573,410
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action?	Consultation
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	Housing
Type of Saving	Service Stopping

The Council currently allocates funding to the Floating Support Service, which provides housing-related support to residents with eligible needs. The current contract for the service is due to end in March 2027.
As part of the Council's budget planning process, approval is being sought to remove the budget currently allocated to this service from April 2027 onwards. If approved, funding for the Floating Support Service would cease from April 2027.
A review of service activity identified that a significant proportion of presenting needs relate to welfare benefits, debt, housing advice, disability support and homelessness prevention. These are areas where the Council already commissions substantial provision through the wider Information, Advice and Guidance network and specialist commissioned services. The review therefore concluded that many residents currently supported through the generic floating support pathway could access alternative forms of support through existing commissioned provision, with specialist interventions remaining available where required although these support mechanisms.
Separate to this proposal, the Council will undertake a wider review of Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) and housing-related support provision to consider future service needs, priorities and commissioning arrangements across the borough. This review will inform future decisions regarding service delivery and any subsequent procurement activity.
The proposal therefore represents the most sustainable option for delivering the required savings while retaining a range of support options within the borough.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
End of Riverside Supported Housing Contract	(477)					(477)
New Total net additional savings (shown as negative)	**(477)**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(477)**

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total			-	-	-	-

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	**Yes**
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	**Yes**

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total FTEs**
Nos (FTEs)						

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	Yes	**Details**	Possible extension of the Riverside Supported Housing Contract in March 2027 - March 2028, vary contracts and give notice
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital programme?	No	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*	n/a	Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	4/1/2027
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?	N		

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	**Mitigation**
Reputational damage	H		
Insufficient capacity to deliver transformation savings	H		Secure sufficient transformation and commissioning capacity to deliver planned savings and service redesign.
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? EqIA Screening Tool			No
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?			
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2			Yes

Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4b

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Removing General Fund Expenditure on Ethnic Minority Grants		
Directorate	Adults, Housing and Health	**Responsible Director/Assistant**	Maddie Watkins
Cabinet Member	Cllr Tammy Hymas	**Scrutiny Committee**	Housing Scrutiny
Affected Service:	Housing Demand - Housing Related Support	**Contact / Lead Officer:**	Zahra Maye

Value of the budget impacted	£7,573,410
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action	Y
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	Housing
Type of Saving	Service Stopping

This proposal to cease the Council's General Fund contribution to the Ethnic Minority Grants programme has been brought forward as part of the wider requirement to deliver significant savings through contract efficiencies across Housing Related Support.

The Ethnic Minority Grants programme has historically provided £270,000 per annum of funding to six voluntary and community sector organisations delivering culturally specific advice, advocacy and wellbeing support. The programme was historically jointly funded through £165,000 from Housing Related Support and £105,000 from the Resettlement Service. However, due to reductions in central government funding, the Resettlement Service has confirmed that it can no longer maintain its previous level of contribution. Continuing the grants at their previous level would therefore require a substantial increase in General Fund subsidy at a time when the Council is facing significant financial pressures.

The current grants programme ended in July 2026 and this proposal would remove the general fund budget for the programme for future years. The service has worked in partnership with the previous providers to offer support to explore alternative funding sources, including the Ending Homelessness grant programme.

The grants were previously awarded for a fixed two-year period and have now come to their natural end. The Council recognises that the funded organisations have delivered positive outcomes for residents, including housing advice, homelessness prevention, welfare support and advocacy. The decision is therefore not a reflection of service quality or provider performance. Rather, it reflects the difficult choices required to ensure the overall sustainability of service offer and the need to prioritise available resources towards statutory obligations and areas of greatest strategic impact for our most vulnerable residents. Whilst the provision was noted to deliver positive outcomes, there are concerns that the existing funding model does not consistently align with need:
1) Over-representation of some communities within homelessness cohorts
2) Under-representation at the statutory front door
3) Limited assurance that funding is reaching those experiencing the highest levels of unmet need
4) Many interventions were assistance in completing referrals into Housing services, rather than directly delivered interventions.

The potential impact of ending the grants has been carefully considered through an Equality Impact Assessment. Residents will continue to have access to a range of commissioned information, advice and guidance services that provide preventative support and diversion away from crisis intervention and this proposal should also be viewed alongside broader transformation activity across Housing Demand where significant investment and programme activity is underway to reduce temporary accommodation use, improve move-on opportunities, strengthen homelessness prevention, and improve access to housing services. These improvements are intended to address some of the underlying issues that have historically driven demand for advocacy and support from grant-funded organisations. If any new grant funding becomes available the service will consider if it could be used to support commissioning models that are more needs-based, outcomes-focused and aligned to identified gaps in provision.

This proposal to remove the budget for the ethnic minority grants programme would deliver a recurring saving of £165,000 per annum to the council's general fund.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
GF Contribution to Ethnic Minorities Grant	(165)					(165)
New Total net additional savings (shown as negative)	**(165)**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(165)**

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total			-	-	-	-

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	**Yes**
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	**Yes**

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total FTEs**
Nos (FTEs)						

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	Yes	**Details**	Resettlement Service manages their proportion of the grant contribution via the grants they receive.
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital programme?	No	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*	n/a	Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	4/1/2027
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?	N		

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	**Mitigation**
Reputational damage	H		
Insufficient capacity to deliver transformation savings	H		Secure sufficient transformation and commissioning capacity to deliver planned savings and service redesign.
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? EqIA Screening Tool			No
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?			HRS will work with the Resettlement service as well as current providers to help source external grant funding to mitigate any loss in funding from the council
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2			Yes

Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4c

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Practice Improvement (Review of Direct Payments, Complex Cases, Double-Handed Care and Waking Nights)		
Directorate	Adults, Housing and Health	**Responsible Director/Assistant**	Jo Baty
Cabinet Member	Cllr Tehseen and Cllr Ward	**Scrutiny Committee**	Adults and Health
Affected Service:	Practice Improvement (Review of Direct Payments, Complex Cases, Double-Handed	**Contact / Lead Officer:**	Richard Stevenson

Value of the budget impacted	£154,058m (Placements Budget)
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action	Y
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	Cross Council Income Generation and Collection
Type of Saving	Efficiency

This cost avoidance proposal seeks to establish a robust framework and supporting processes that enable Adult Social Care frontline practitioners and social workers to systematically review, challenge and optimise care and support arrangements. The programme will focus on ensuring that care packages remain proportionate, outcome-focused and strengths-based, while maximising independence, improving value for money and reducing reliance on high-cost provision.

The proposal will support practitioners to:
-Introduce and embed a systematic review programme to ensure care packages remain proportionate, outcome-focused and strengths-based.
-Increase the appropriate use of Direct Payments to maximise service user choice, control and cost-effectiveness.
-Review high-cost care packages, complex placements, double-handed care arrangements and waking night support to identify opportunities for alternative and more sustainable models of support.
-Strengthen professional challenge, quality assurance and decision-making through multidisciplinary reviews and enhanced oversight.
-Deliver cost avoidance and sustainable savings through package optimisation, improved independence and a reduction in dependence on restrictive or high-cost services.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
New net additional savings (shown as negative)	**-500**	**-750**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**-1,250**

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total TBD as dependent on Legal advice	-	-	-	-	-	-

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	**Yes**
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	**Yes**

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	**2027/28**	**2028/29**	**2029/30**	**2030/31**	**2031/32**	**Total FTEs**
Nos (FTEs)						-

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	No	**Details**	Changes to financial assessment systems, letters, online information and reporting.
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	None identified.
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	None identified at this stage.
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	Legal, Finance, Communications, Equalities, Benefits and Customer Services input will be needed.
Are there any other interdependencies?	Yes	**Details**	Close working with social work, financial assessments, welfare benefits, advocacy, health ,carers and commissioned

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital programme?	No	**Details**	No capital programme link.

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*	01/10/2026	Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	30/06/2027
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?	No. Consultation and Member decisions are required before implementation.		

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	**Mitigation**
Income is lower or later than planned, or demand for DRE assessments is higher than	H	M	Use the £2.3m prudent net target, monitor delivery monthly and put enough assessment capacity in place before go-live.
The additional resource is not in place in time, or its cost reduces the net saving more	M	M	Confirm and cost the three-FTE model before the final decision, recruit or redeploy early, and monitor gross income,
Legal challenge or consultation does not meet the required standard.	H	M	Take legal advice, run a clear 12-week consultation and show how responses and the EqIA have shaped the final decision.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? The Screening Tool should be completed for all proposals at Stage 1. EqIA Screening Tool	In Progress A full EqIA is being prepared alongside the consultation and final decision report.
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?	Accessible consultation, advocacy and welfare benefits support; fresh financial assessments; individual DRE claims;
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2	Yes

Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4d

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Two options for reducing costs for the design and print of Haringey People		
Directorate	Culture, Strategy and Communities	**Responsible Director/Assistant**	Claire McCarthy
Cabinet Member	Leader	**Scrutiny Committee**	Overview & Scrutiny Committee
Affected Service:	Communications	**Contact / Lead Office**	Claire Powers and Eleri Salter

Value of the budget impacted	£60k
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action?	Y
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	
Type of Saving	Service Reduction

Currently Haringey People magazine costs approximately £20k per edition to print and deliver to everyone household. This is met from the communications budget. This is a net cost which is reduced from the full cost by the advertising space sold in the magazine of approx £6k per edition. The current budget is based on three editions per year. There are two options proposed. One option is to move to a community distribution model for Haringey People magazine which would remove the costs of borough wide distribution to every household. In this model a smaller number of hard copies would be distributed via libraries, community centres and customer services. This would save approximately £35k a year. Ceasing the design, printing and delivery of the magazine althogether would not only reduce revenue spending by £60k but also reduce the workload on communications staff in commissioning, writing and editing the magazine. This is resource that could then be re-allocated to other communications activites and priorities. We already have a weekly digital newsletter - Haringey People Xtra - which we will continue to encourage residents to sign up for as an alternative as well as a wealth of other communications activities and channels - albeit that they are primarily digital in nature. The maximum saving here is £35k due to £24k already earmarked as a saving for next year in a previous budget round.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
New net additional savings (shown as negative)	**(35)**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(35)**

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	**No**
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	**No**

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total FTEs**
Nos (FTEs)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	Yes	**Details**	

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital programme?	No	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*		Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	2027/28
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?			

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	**Mitigation**
	joh		
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? EqIA Screening Tool			
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?			There are risks that residents who are digitally excluded with see a reduction in information being proactively provided
Is +B2:L61a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2			Yes

Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4e

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Phased reduction of grant to Alexandra Palace		
Directorate	Culture, Strategy & Communities	**Responsible Director/Assistant**	Kenneth Tharp
Cabinet Member	Cllr Erin Wolson	**Scrutiny Committee**	
Affected Service:	Culture, Museum & Archives	**Contact / Lead Officer:**	

Value of the budget impacted	£1.75m
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action?	Y
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	
Type of Saving	Efficiency

There are pre-agreed reductions in grant to Alexandra Palace of £100k in 2027/28 and £125k in 2028/29. This proposal is for small uplifts to these targets, along with a new target for 2029/30. Overall, a phased reduction in the Alexandra Palace Grant is proposed, totalling:
2027/28 £120k
2028/29 £150k
2029/30 £180k

For many years the Council has given a revenue grant of £1.75m to Alexandra Palace to support its basic running costs. The grant represented 5.5% of the Trust's total income during 2025/26. In 2025/26, the Trust generated nearly £1m operating surplus, building on a trend of gradually rebuilding the proportion of earned (traded) income through continued efforts around events programming, marketing and investment in Ally Pally's facilities and offer to drive more visitors and trade, following the challenging years post-Covid.

While the Council's core funding has fallen by £143m in real terms since 2010/11, the grant to Ally Pally was £2.3m in 2010 and following an initial reduction of £0.55m earlier in the period has remained static at £1.75m for a number of years, representing the Council's long term commitment to Ally Pally. In 2010, the AP Trading company was contributing just £200k in gift aid, whereas last year it was able to gift aid £2.6m to the Trust. Given the Council's financial position and in view of AP's success at income generation and growth, it is right that the grant is looked at again. A phased reduction is proposed over the three year period, giving Allexandra Palace time to adjust to the new level of grant. It is proposed that capital funding is maintained on the same basis as currently to enable AP to continue to invest in its significant assets and facilities to maintain safety and regulatory compliance and to improve the audience offer to drive continued growth in turnover.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
New net additional savings (shown as negative)	**(20)**	**(25)**	**(180)**	**0**	**0**	**(225)**

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	**Yes**
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report?	**Yes**

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total FTEs**
Nos (FTEs)						

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital	Yes	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*		Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	2029/30
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?			

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	**Mitigation**
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? EqIA Screening Tool			
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?			
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2			Yes

Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4f

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Review of operating models for the Broadwater Farm Community Centre leisure spaces		
Directorate	**Environment & Resident Experience**	**Responsible Corporate Director/Director:**	Barry Francis/Zoe Robertson
Cabinet Member	**Cllr Erin Wolson**	**Scrutiny Committee**	
Affected Service:	**Active Wellbeing**	**Contact / Lead:**	Laura Crouch

Value of the budget impacted	£1,232,547
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action	Select Y/N
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	
Type of Saving	

Leisure services were insourced in October 2024 including leisure centres at Park Road, Tottenham Green and New River, and a community gym and sports hall at Broadwater Farm.

The Broadwater Farm building is a HRA building and operated as a shared site, with a sports hall, small gym, changing rooms and a community cafe space downstairs, and office space upstairs which is occupied by Housing. Housing pay Leisure a £60k/year 'rent' for the upstairs office space.

The leisure offer at Broadwater Farm is limited and not financially viable. The centre has a small membership base of 139 people, 54% of which are over 65s and get free access. Only 63 members pay for membership by Direct Debit and these are valued at £21k for 2026/27. Further income is made from events and clubs through the hire of the sports hall. Overall, the centre is subsidised by the council by £150k per year. The current centre and the current model is not fit for purpose as a leisure centre or an effective community space.

This proposal is to change the delivery model for the the gym facility to either provide it differently or cease operating it making a saving of £150k/year. Any subsequent organised public events/club uses would be funded by hire fees. This proposal also presents an opportunity to manage the community spaces differently for example a community ownership / community asset model.

The team at Broadwater Farm is 7 FTE at a cost of £284k as per P4 2026/27. The HRA contribution could be used for a caretaker role to help manage/clean the facilities. The Council's policy is to minimise redunancies as far as possible and alternative positions in the organisation would be sought through this process.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
New net additional savings (shown as negative)		(75)	(75)	0	0	(150)

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total (redundancy costs)	52	- 52	-	-	-	0

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total FTEs**
Nos (FTEs)	7					7

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	Yes - the building is a HRA asset and would be managed by Housing going forwards.
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	Yes - community access to the building and event hire would be managed by Housing. This could be paid for by income from events/hire, and the saving of the 'rent' paid to Leisure for their use of the building.
Are there any other interdependencies?	Yes	**Details**	

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital	No	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*	4/1/2027	Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	10/1/2027
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N*; any constraints?	No - once the decision to implement this saving was confirmed, a staff consultation exercise would commence.		

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	**Mitigation**
Loss of gym facilities for local residents	L	L	The existing customer base (paying membership fees for use of the Broadwater Farm gym) could be offered memberships at either Tottenham Green or New River leisure centres. Membership prices could be matched for this group.

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? EqIA Screening Tool	
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?	
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2	Yes

Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4g

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Outsource the Leisure Centres to a specialist provider		
Directorate	**Environment & Resident Experience**	**Responsible Corporate Director/Director:**	Barry Francis/Zoe Robertson
Cabinet Member	**Cllr Erin Wolson**	**Scrutiny Committee**	
Affected Service:	**Active Wellbeing**	**Contact / Lead:**	Laura Crouch

Value of the budget impacted	£1,232,547
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action	Y
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	
Type of Saving	

Leisure Services were insourced in October 2024 and require a subsidy from the General Fund of £1.232m per year. The service has a £7.2m income target a year and is currently experiencing a shortfall of £1.1m which is adding to the budget pressures of the council. The council has invested heavily in the centres and membership numbers are improving. A harmonisation exercise has moved the workforce onto Haringey terms and conditions and payscales. This has further increased the budget pressure for the service.

In addition to the budget highlighted above, the Leisure Service also requires significant resource input from cross-council services including HR, Finance, Comms, Facilities Management, Corporate Landlord and Capital Projects. These costs are not quantified in the cost above but place additional resource burden on these teams.

This proposal is to outsource the Leisure Centres to a specialist provider in the industry. This would ensure the future sustainability of the centres and their provision of services for the community.

This saving is estimated to be approximately 5% of the cost of the service per year, based on a new provider achieving efficiencies in centralised HR, finance, shared management structures and more flexible staffing arrangements. It would take at least a year to commission a new provider and transfer the service. It would also write off future savings targets from the service, which assume the service can close the £1.1m income gap and generate another £500k in the next three years.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
New net additional savings (shown as negative)	**0**	**(135)**	**(75)**			**(210)**

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total FTEs**
Nos (FTEs)						**3**

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	Yes	**Details**	

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital	No	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*		Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	2028/29
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?	No		

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	**Mitigation**
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? EqIA Screening Tool			
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?			
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2			Yes

Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4h

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Introduction of new parking options either through the expansion of CPZs, where local support is significant, or through new locations with paid for parking bays.		
Directorate	Environment and Resident Experience	**Responsible Director/Assistant**	Eubert Malcolm
Cabinet Member	Cllr Gio Iozzi	**Scrutiny Committee**	
Affected Service:	Parking Services	**Contact / Lead Officer:**	Abdul Sahed

Value of the budget impacted	-26.509m
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action?	Y
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	Cross Council Income Generation and Collection
Type of Saving	Income Generation

Description of Option

Development of a programme of new and expanded chargeable parking arrangements to better manage parking demand and generate potential additional income.
The programme represents a pipeline of potential schemes rather than committed savings. New CPZs are particularly dependent on consultation, with current policy requiring a minimum 51% support before implementation.
•New CPZs / CPZ extensions - rolling programme of potential CPZs within currently uncontrolled areas.
•Hampstead Lane - new PayByPhone bays.
•Queen's Wood Road - new PayByPhone bays.
•Additional paid-for parking locations - further locations to be identified following feasibility and demand assessment.
•Finsbury Park - new parking restrictions.
•Markfield Park - new parking restrictions.
•Muswell Hill Playing Fields - new parking restrictions.
•Bull Lane / Selby Centre - reconfigured parking associated with new development.
•Estate Parking Management Scheme (EPMS) - review of an amended permit/PCN revenue model, subject to agreement with Housing.

Financial Implications Outline
For CPZ programmes, initial modelling identifies potential permit income of £105k-£141k, and PCN income of £90k-£120k.
For paid for parking programmes, Hampstead Lane and Queen's Wood Road indicate potential income of £120k and £20k respectively, with a further £103k currently identified across the parks/housing proposals. PCN income is still to be modelled.
These are indicative gross income assumptions and not confirmed net savings. A robust income model will need to be developed and evidenced for each scheme, covering demand, permit/pay-to-park take-up, potential PCN income, income phasing and implementation/ongoing costs.
Delivery will require significant upfront investment and additional programme capacity. Typical CPZ design and implementation costs are estimated at £100k-£250k per scheme, alongside resources for feasibility/design, consultation and statutory processes, project management, physical works, system changes and communications.
The overall investment requirement and funding source are not yet established and will need to be confirmed before a net saving can be validated.

Implementation Details
A phased programme would be required, commencing with feasibility and demand assessment, formulation and validation of the income model, identification of investment/resource requirements and prioritisation of schemes. Individual schemes would then progress through the necessary public/stakeholder engagement, statutory consultation and approvals before implementation. New CPZs are currently envisaged as potentially forming a rolling four-year programme. Delivery is dependent on sufficient programme/project capacity, availability of implementation funding, consultation outcomes and relevant approvals.

Risks
High delivery and financial risk at this stage. Income remains indicative. There is a risk that implementation costs materially reduce the net benefit.
Delivery is also dependent on consultation outcomes and statutory processes and could be delayed or schemes may not proceed. Insufficient capital/revenue investment or project capacity would further affect delivery.
There are also risks of lower-than-assumed demand, parking displacement and wider resident/business impacts.
The saving should therefore not be treated as fully deliverable until scheme feasibility, the income model, investment requirement and delivery timetable have been validated. **The financial values represent indicative opportunities and are not confirmed net savings. Delivery is subject to formulation and validation of the underlying income/savings model, detailed feasibility, confirmation of investment and resource requirements, consultation and relevant approvals. Inclusion within the MTFS should not be interpreted as approval to implement individual proposals or confirmation that the indicative gross financial benefit is fully deliverable.**

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	2027/28 £000s	2028/29 £000s	2029/30 £000	2030/31 £000	2031/32 £000	Total £000s
New net additional savings (shown as negative)	(140)	(103)	(45)	(110)	0	(398)

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	2027/28 £000s	2028/29 £000s	2029/30 £000	2030/31 £000	2031/32 £000	Total £000s
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs (Note Investments taken from existing scheme (reverses before implementation of scheme))	2027/28 £000s	2028/29 £000s	2029/30 £000	2030/31 £000	2031/32 £000	Total £000s
Total	-	-	250	250	-	500

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	2027/28 £000s	2028/29 £000s	2029/30 £000	2030/31 £000	2031/32 £000	Total FTEs
Nos (FTEs)						

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	Yes	**Details**	BAU implementation of comms / webpage changes
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	Yes	**Details**	Highways - engagement and statutory consultation processes;

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital programme?	No	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*	N/A	Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	2030/31
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?			

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
High delivery and financial risk at this stage. Income remains indicative and in some areas, particularly PCN income,	H	M	Undertake full project scoping and analysis; establish detailed
Delivery is also dependent on consultation outcomes and statutory processes and could be delayed or schemes may	H	M	Without policy change, mitigation is limited given scheme
Risks of lower-than-assumed demand, parking displacement and wider resident/business impacts.	H	M	Undertake further analysis to establish further confidence in
Reputational / political risk associated with expanded parking controls	H	M	Mitigated through current policy - where CPZ schemes
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?			
Is a full EqIA required? Full EqIAs to be undertaken at Stage 2			Yes

Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4i

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Introduction of a surcharge for high volume requests for paper visitor permits to encourage expansion of Digital Parking permits and vouchers		
Directorate	Environment and Resident Experience	**Responsible**	Eubert Malcolm
Cabinet Member	Cllr Gio Iozzi	**Scrutiny Committee**	
Affected Service:	Parking Services	**Contact / Lead Officer:**	Abdul Sahed

Value of the budget impacted	-26.509m
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action?	Y
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	Cross Council Income Generation and Collection
Type of Saving	Efficiency

Description of Option (internal):

Description of Option

Paper Visitor Permit Surcharge

Introduce a surcharge for higher volumes of paper visitor permits to encourage further migration to digital permits while retaining access to paper permits where required.
The current proposal provides an example of an 80% surcharge above two booklets of paper permits, subject to development and statutory consultation.
Visitor permits are already 92.1% virtual and 7.9% paper, therefore the remaining financial opportunity is relatively limited and should primarily be considered an incremental digitalisation and efficiency measure.

Financial Implications Outline

The programme identifies an indicative financial benefit of £10k. The wider financial benefit of reducing paper permits is based on reduced back-office processing, printing and postage costs.
The £10k assumption requires validation against existing paper-permit volumes and the proposed charging structure. The financial model should also account for anticipated migration to digital permits, reduced processing/printing/postage costs and any system or implementation costs.
Some resource will be required for analysis, consultation, system configuration/testing and communications. Given the relatively modest financial benefit, implementation should only proceed where a positive net saving can be demonstrated.

Implementation Details

Validate the existing paper-permit baseline and evidence the financial model supporting the £10k saving, followed by development of the surcharge structure and assessment of equality/digital-exclusion impacts.
Subject to the outcome, the proposal would progress through statutory consultation, system configuration/testing and customer communications before implementation.
Appropriate arrangements would need to remain available for customers unable to reasonably access digital services.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
New net additional savings (shown as negative)	**0**	**(10)**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(10)**

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	**Yes**
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	**Yes**

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total FTEs**
Nos (FTEs)						

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	Yes	**Details**	
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	Yes	**Details**	

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital programme?	No	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*	N/A	Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	2028/29
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?			

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	**Mitigation**
Reduced financial benefit - 1) With only 7.9% of visitor permit issuance remaining paper, the available financial opportunity is limited and could	M	M	Undertake full project scoping and analysis; establish
Reputational / political risk associated with reduced paper permit availability; public acceptability, equality/affordability impacts	M	L	Appropriate consultation and engagement processes to
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? EqIA Screening Tool			
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?			
Is a full EqIA required?			Yes

Savings Proposal

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal 2027-2032

Appendix 4j

Title of Proposal (For Public use):	Workplace Parking Levy		
Directorate	Environment and Resident	**Responsible**	Eubert Malcolm
Cabinet Member	Cllr Gio Iozzi	**Scrutiny Committee**	
Affected Service:	Parking Services	**Contact / Lead Officer:**	Abdul Sahed

Value of the budget impacted	-26.509m
Saving for Consultation or a Management Action?	Y
Does this deliver on one of the eight priorities?	Cross Council Income Generation and Collection
Type of Saving	Efficiency

Description of Option (internal):

The introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy would enable the council to deter and reduce unnecessary car usage and instead promote more sustainable modes of transportation. The Levy has been implemented successfully in Nottingham City and if brought to Haringey would apply to employers based in the borough with 11 or more liable workplace parking spaces. This places a requirement on businesses meeting the criteria to pay a per space fee. Employers with 10 or less spaces must obtain a license from the Council but receive a 100% discount. A workplace parking place is generally a place occupied by a vehicle used by an employee, pupil, student or regular business visitor. The spaces do not necessarily have to be formally marked or lined. A separate WPL licence is required for each premises where workplace parking is provided, although employers can deal with multiple premises through a single application. An employer can choose to pass some or all of the cost on to employees, but this is a decision for the employer. The licensing year runs from 1 April to 31 March, and the charge is adjusted in line with inflation. Revenue from the WPL must be invested in improving transport in line with the Mayors Transport Policy. Nottinghams charge is £592 pa, per space. There are associated administration costs anticipated to be 1.5FTE. The borough does not have a large number of business that are expected to meet the criteria but it is anticipated that St Annes Hospital, a number of primary and secondary schools and Tottenham Hotspur will apply. It should be noted that sites with parking spaces open to the public are not liable for the charge unless there are 11 or more spaces reserved for staff only. There is also a requirement for us to apply the charge to ourselves and a recharge to property will be required to be made. This has not been factored into income generated however, but it will become ringfenced once transferred. Savings have been calculated on an assumed charge of £592 per space applied to an estimated 150 spaces less the costs of processing via an increase in FTE.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	2027/28 £000s	2028/29 £000s	2029/30 £000	2030/31 £000	2031/32 £000	Total £000s
New net additional savings (shown as negative)	0	(88)	0	0	0	(88)

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	2027/28 £000s	2028/29 £000s	2029/30 £000	2030/31 £000	2031/32 £000	Total £000s
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	2027/28 £000s	2028/29 £000s	2029/30 £000	2030/31 £000	2031/32 £000	Total £000s
Total	20	-	-	-	-	20

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	**Yes**
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	**Yes**

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	2027/28 £000s	2028/29 £000s	2029/30 £000	2030/31 £000	2031/32 £000	Total FTEs
Nos (FTEs)	1					1

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	Yes	**Details**	
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	Yes	**Details**	

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital programme?	No	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*	N/A	Est. completion date for implementation *DD/MM/YY*	2028/29
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?			

Risks and Mitigation

What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	Mitigation
Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? EqIA Screening Tool			
What mitigations will be taken to minimise negative equality impacts (if relevant)?			
Is a full EqIA required?			Yes

Savings Propos

Business Planning / MTFS Proposal
2027-2032

Appendix 4k

Title of Proposa	Introduction of surcharges to pay and display and visitor voucher tariffs for larger and more polluting vehicles.		
Directorate	Environment and Resident Experience	**Responsible**	Eubert Malcolm
Cabinet Membe	Cllr Gio Iozzi	**Scrutiny**	
Affected	Parking Services	**Contact / Lead Offi**	Abdul Sahed

Value of the	-26.509m
Saving for Cons	Y
Does this delive	Cross Council Income Generation and Collection
Type of Saving	Income Generation

Description of Option
Development of additional differential parking tariffs based on vehicle emissions, size and weight, extending principles already used within existing permit charging.
The proposals remain subject to further analysis, development of the charging/income model, consultation, system feasibility and appropriate approvals.

•RingGo CO2 surcharge - emissions-based surcharge for paid-for parking.
•RingGo vehicle-size surcharge - vehicle-size surcharge for paid-for parking.
•Visitor Permit CO2 charging - emissions-based charging for visitor permits.
•Visitor Permit vehicle-size charging - vehicle-size charging for visitor permits.
•Vehicle-size surcharge review - review of the existing 5%/10% surcharge for medium and large vehicles.
•Weight-based permit charging - potential simplified charging structure using vehicle weight as a proxy for vehicle impact.

Financial Implications Outline
Initial estimates identify approximately £300k potential additional income from RingGo CO2 charging, plus £20k from Visitor Permit CO2 charging and £20k from Visitor Permit vehicle-size charging. Income from several of the remaining surcharge options is currently TBC.
These figures represent indicative gross income rather than confirmed net savings.
A detailed income model will need to establish the affected transaction/vehicle baseline, proposed tariff levels, customer behavioural response, potential impact on existing parking income, implementation costs and income phasing.
Investment and additional resource will be required for financial/policy analysis, statutory consultation, equality assessment, parking and permit-system development/configuration, supplier support, testing and communications. These costs have not yet been quantified.
The net financial benefit cannot therefore be confirmed until the income model and implementation costs have been validated.

Implementation Details
Initial activity would comprise formulation and validation of the income and charging model, detailed policy and financial analysis, assessment of customer/equality impacts and confirmation of technical and system requirements.
Subject to the outcome of this work, proposals would progress through the required consultation and approval processes, followed by system development/configuration, testing and implementation. Visitor permit options specifically require system development.
Implementation would require dedicated policy/project resource together with Finance, parking systems and supplier support.

Financial Benefits Summary

Revenue Impacts *All figures shown on an incremental basis*	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
New net additional savings (shown as negative)	**0**	**(315)**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**(315)**

Initial One-Off Investment Revenue Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

Initial One-Off Investment Capital Costs	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total £000s**
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**

Is this a change in Council policy (Y/N)	**Yes**
Does it require a Member decision in addition to the budget report? (Y/N)	**Yes**

Add in FTE (post) number changes by year (both additions and deletions)	**2027/28 £000s**	**2028/29 £000s**	**2029/30 £000**	**2030/31 £000**	**2031/32 £000**	**Total FTEs**
Nos (FTEs)						

Interdependencies

Is there a Digital interdependency?	Yes	**Details**	
Is there a Property interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Is there a Procurement interdependency?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	No	**Details**	
Are there any other interdependencies?	Yes	**Details**	

Link to Capital Programme

Does this saving link to a scheme delivered within the capital	No	**Details**	

Indicative timescale for implementation

Est. start date for consultation if relevant *DD/MM/YY*	N/A	Est. completion date for implementation	2028/29
Is there an opportunity for implementation before April 2026? *Y/N* ; any constraints?			

Risks and Mitigation
What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?(Add rows if required)

Risk	Impact (H/M/L)	Probability (H/M/L)	**Mitigation**
Medium/High delivery and financial risk. Several income assumptions remain TBC and implementation/system costs are currently unquantified.	H	M	Undertake full project scoping and analysis; establish detailed implementation costs / timeframes in coordination with Highways; establish systems configuration / development costs & timeframes through engagement with suppliers
Higher tariffs may change customer behaviour, potentially reducing	H	M	Undertake further analysis to establish further confidence in projected income
Technical/system limitations	H	L	Early engagement with suppliers to establish feasibility of proposals
Consultation outcomes	H	L	Mitigation is limited given statutory consultation process; Highways engagement to ensure appropriate scheme consultation.
Insufficient delivery capacity	H	L	Undertake full project scoping and analysis including implementation costs, establish and secure internal/ external delivery capacity
Reputational / political risk associated with expanded parking controls; public acceptability, equality/affordability impacts	H	L	Appropriate consultation and engagement processes to mitigate risk

Has the EqIA Screening Tool been completed for this proposal? EqIA Screening Tool	No