

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

Councillors Councillors Bull (Chair), Browne (Vice-Chair), Basu, Ejiofor, Newton, Winskill and Engert

Apologies Councillor Alexander and Jemide (Co-optee)

Also Present: **Co-optees:** Yvonne Denny (Education Representative), Helena Kania (Local Involvement Network (LINK)), Sarah Marsh (Parent Governor Representative) and Sandra Young (John Loughborough Secondary School)

**Councillors:** Allison, Bevan, Reith

**Officers:** Margaret Gallagher (Performance Management Team Manager), Kevin Bartle (Lead Finance Officer), Peter Lewis (Director CYPS), Jan Doust (Deputy Director – Children’s Network), Martin Tissot (Headteacher of St Thomas More School), Andrew Williams (Interim Borough Director – NHS Haringey), Tamara Djuretic (Assistant Director of Public Health), Phil Harris (Assistant Director of Strategic & Community Housing), Nick Powell (Head Of Housing Strategy, Development & Partnerships), Rowann Limond (HfH Director of Finance), Jackie Thomas (HfH Executive Director – Housing Management), Rob Mack (Scrutiny Officer), Melanie Ponomarenko (Scrutiny Officer), Natalie Cole (Clerk)

**Also attending:** Emel Teymur (Coordinator, Haynes Relatives Support Group & Carers Unite Group at St Ann’s) and Mary Harvey (Haynes Centre Carer) and 4 members of the public

**MINUTE  
NO.**

**SUBJECT/DECISION**

<p><b>OSCO243.</b></p>	<p><b>WEBCASTING</b></p> <p>The meeting was webcast for live or future broadcasting on the Council’s website.</p>
<p><b>OSCO244.</b></p>	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Karen Alexander (substituted by Cllr Gail Engert), Marcelle Jemide (Co-opted Member), Cllr Pat Egan (Chair of Governors of St Thomas More School), Michael Thornton (Foundation Governor of St Thomas More School), Tony Hartney (Head Teacher of Gladesmore School).</p>
<p><b>OSCO245.</b></p>	<p><b>URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>The Committee agreed to two items of urgent business as follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Child Protection – raised by Cllr Rachael Allison</u> AGREED to consider this matter under item 8 – School Exclusions.</li> <li>ii. <u>Emergency Planning – raised by Cllr David Winskill</u> AGREED to consider this matter under item 9 – IVF Suspension Proposals.</li> </ul>

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

<b>OSCO246.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>  The Chair declared a personal interest in item 6 – Cabinet Member for Housing questions – during discussions on housing estates as he was a leaseholder and lived on a Haringey estate.
<b>OSCO247.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/PRESENTATIONS/QUESTIONS</b>  RECEIVED a deputation on the Council's proposals to merge the Haynes and Grange Dementia Day Care Centres and to close the Woodside Day Care Centre, presented by Mary Harvey (a carer at the Haynes Centre).  The deputation's main points included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The merging of the Haynes and the Grange specialist day centres would overcrowd facilities and reduce the quality of life for the current client.</li><li>• NICE (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence) guidance recommended a maximum of 16 people a day to maintain a reasonable atmosphere at day care centres. The Haynes had a design capacity of 15 people per day but there were currently approximately 80 people with dementia using the 3 care centres.</li><li>• The closure of Woodside Centre would mean a reduced standard of care to current day centre users.</li><li>• The proposed re-provision with personal budgets would mean care at home which would lead to isolation.</li><li>• The proposals would mean short term savings resulting in long term costs as the care centres provided preventative services.</li><li>• The deputation had taken part in consultations about the proposals and had written to the Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Services making the above points.</li><li>• The Committee was asked to recommend maintaining the care of people with dementia and request alternative proposals are sought to achieve the required savings.</li></ul> In response to questions from the Committee the deputation confirmed that the proposals presented potential for additional pressures on the health services. This included the Mental Health Trust, GPs, the NHS trust and the cost of medication for both carers (whose health was vulnerable) and additional medication for service users (who might be affected by the changes).  The Deputee agreed to provide the Chair with estimated figures of the financial impact of the merge of the Haynes and Grange Dementia Day Care Centres and to close the Woodside Day Care Centre, and a copy of the letter from the Cabinet Member for Health and Adult Services responding to the concerns of the Relatives Support Group (Action No. 247.1).  <b>RESOLVED</b>  i. That the Chair would write to the Cabinet Member reiterating the concerns of the Committee regarding proposed closures of day care centres and to request a full response to the concerns expressed by the deputation; and  ii. That the proposals for closure of the Council's older people's care centres

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

	<p>would be considered by the Committee using pre-decision scrutiny powers (Action No. 247.2).</p>
<b>OSCO248.</b>	<p><b>CABINET MEMBER QUESTIONS - CABINET MEMBER FOR HOUSING</b></p> <p>RECEIVED the briefing from the Cabinet Member for Housing, Councillor John Bevan, and the questions and answers submitted in advance of the meeting. The Cabinet Member presented the report, as laid out, and highlighted that since April 2011 introductory tenancies (consisting of a 12 month trial period in order to discourage anti social behaviour) were now operating and would be monitored and reviewed.</p> <p>NOTED the following in response to supplementary questions.</p> <p>Q1 – Affordable Housing – the Committee asked how much funding Haringey had received through the National Affordable Housing Programme in the last 3 years. The information would be provided (Action No. 248).</p> <p>Q2 – Housing Development on Tottenham Lane – The Committee was informed that the Planning Committee did not have powers to prescribe how much social or private housing should be built on developments of less than 10 units.</p> <p>Q12 – Illegal Subletting – The Council identified on average 28 properties each year as being illegally sublet. It was suspected that there were many more than this and additional funding would allow more targeted exercise. Comparisons of the various databases such as council tax and electoral registers were made during the National Fraud Initiative annual check, however, most illegal sublets were made known to the Council by word of mouth.</p> <p>Q15 – Delays re-letting void properties – In addition to repairs causing delays if no tenants bid for an advertised property the process of advertising started again which extended the re-let times. In response to questions it was noted that approximately 40% of properties were rejected – out of up to 7 tenants invited to view a property many will not turn up, a proportion will reject the property and others will have been offered alternative properties. Some sheltered housing went through 6 cycles of re-letting before being taken-up. The auto-bidding process had improved re-lettings and the auto-bidding register was topped-up with tenants who had been on the register for a long time once tenants dropped off the list when re-housed. Officers were confident that performance figures for void turnaround times will improve.</p> <p>Some members raised concerns about contractors (using incorrect entrances to properties and not displaying identification) and it was noted that the Council would exercise more control over contractors in the future.</p> <p>In response to concerns raised about rubbish collections and dumping on housing estates it was noted that the new contractor, Veolia, was in place and one team was now responsible for housing estates and surrounding areas. Officers recognised that the maintenance of gardens and green areas on estates was poor and funds had been made available for tenants to identify areas to be cleared of weeds and replanted and there was also an estate improvement budget for matters such as broken fencing to be dealt with.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

	<p>Q17 – Squatters - In response to questioning officers reported that security measures such as boarding up possible entrances and working with neighbours were put in place and the employment of security guards was being considered.</p> <p>A member expressed concern that the number of rough sleepers was not accurate if compared to the number of people attending soup kitchens. The Assistant Director of Strategic and Community Housing highlighted the importance of not assuming that all who attended soup kitchens were homeless people but recognised that whilst the official number of rough sleepers was 9 there were more rough sleepers in Haringey. The Cabinet Member explained that rough sleepers were counted on a particular night each year using Government guidance, which had recently changed and could mean a rise in numbers.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> to note the briefing and answers to questions.</p>
<p><b>OSCO249.</b></p>	<p><b>PERIOD 11 COUNCIL PERFORMANCE - EXCEPTIONS REPORT AND COUNCIL BUDGET MONITORING - EXCEPTIONS REPORT</b></p> <p>RECEIVED the Council’s Performance Report for February 2011 (Period 11) and the advance questions and responses, presented by Margaret Gallagher (Performance Manager) and Kevin Bartle (Lead Finance Officer). It was noted that officers were in the process of closing the Council’s financial accounts for the year and expected a balanced position.</p> <p>The following was noted in response to supplementary questions and discussions.</p> <p>Q1 – Self Directed Support – The number of existing clients who had moved to personalised budgets including people receiving direct payments was increasing from 219 in February to 276 currently.</p> <p>Q2. – Closure of drop-in and day centres – officers emphasised that all service users will be re-assessed during the closures. Members recognised that carers and their needs would be affected and highlighted that young carers should be identified and supported. The Deputy Director – Children’s Network highlighted that young carers were identified by schools, children’s and adults services and the Safeguarding Children Board was conducting some work on young carers.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.4 of the report – In response to its questions the Committee was assured that, despite the 7.4 million temporary growth provision for the department in 2012, Children’s Services was doing all it could to reduce the budget and had contributed £10 million to the Council’s £41 million of savings.</p> <p>Re. NI 156 – Number of households living in temporary accommodation – a Member asked if this target was realistic and officers explained that the target of 2,678 had been set in previous years but the Council was aiming to maintain a target of 3000 but due to the current climate was achieving 3,305.</p> <p>Re. paragraph 15.5 - the Committee asked what was being done to increase occupancy at the Technopark and requested Action 176.1 (copied below from the OSC meeting held on 21 February 2011) be chased (Action No. 249).</p>

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

	<p>The Committee asked for a briefing note on the low occupancy of the Technopark (paragraph 15.5 – Period 9) including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. How many units there were?</li><li>2. How many units were let (what %) and to what sort of businesses, how many people were employed in them and what income they yielded?</li><li>3. How many units (%) were used by council services?</li><li>4. How many units (%) were occupied by the community and voluntary sector and were these provided for free or at a reduced rent (detail to be provided)? (Action No. 176.1).</li></ol> <p>Re. Paragraph 14.8 – Complaints – in response to concerns about the lack of information the Committee noted that a separate more detailed report about complaints was available on request.</p> <p>L0568J – Satisfaction with repair of roads and pavements – a Member asked whether the figures were based on resident satisfaction that works had been conducted or about the actual quality of the work. Officers explained this was dependant on how the individual perceived the wording of the questionnaire in the yearly resident survey.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> to note the report.</p>
<p><b>OSCO250.</b></p>	<p><b>SCHOOL EXCLUSIONS</b></p> <p>RECEIVED the report on the Analysis of Fixed Term and Permanent Exclusions – Academic Year 2008/9 and Academic Year 2009/10, introduced by the Deputy Director – Children’s Network and Avi Becker (Business Intelligence Manager).</p> <p>The Committee welcomed Martin Tissot, Headteacher of St Thomas More School, which had a high number of exclusions during 2009/10 in comparison to other schools and noted the responses to advance questions on the report. A discussion followed.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In response to an urgent matter raised by Cllr Allison in relation to a child protection case it was agreed that the Director of Children’s Services would circulate a legal briefing to the Committee and Cllr Allison detailing how sensitive child protection information was shared on a “need to know basis” (Action No. 250.1).</li><li>• The Committee requested that in future the exclusions data be analysed by the nature of the offences committed (Action No. 250.1).</li><li>• Members suggested that best practice in dealing with exclusions in schools be streamlined across all schools and were informed that, although schools had to comply with national guidance, each school set its own boundaries for behaviour and consequences of poor behaviour. The local authority provided head teachers with the forums to come together to discuss good practice and advise schools on how other schools have dealt with similar incidents.</li><li>• The Headteacher of St Thomas More School explained that a school’s Governing Body determined the school’s behaviour policy/exclusions policy although the head teacher had the ultimate responsibility. A school’s governing body could overturn a head teacher’s decision to</li></ul>

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

	<p>exclude a pupil, particularly if national guidance had not been followed. Some schools might not exclude a child for fighting but if a child was found to be the perpetrator of a fight more than once at St Thomas More School they would be excluded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In response to concerns raised by the Committee officers recognised that there was an issue around the high proportion of children from ethnic groups being excluded from school and highlighted that these groups were also over represented in other areas such as youth crime. There was a general consensus that more work with these groups was required and that those children who failed at school were likely to be part of statistics for youth crime and such other areas in the future as well as having a budgetary impact as children not in education, employment or training (NEET).</li><li>• The academic impact of exclusions on pupils was recognised but Members were reminded that schools had a duty to protect the other children in schools from harm and distraction from learning. Excluded children attended pupil referral units as soon as possible during exclusions.</li><li>• Mr Tissot explained that his school worked on trying to avoid exclusions through mentoring and managed moves to other schools. He explained that he had recently taken over as head teacher at the school and there had been a high number of exclusions in the autumn term as new expectations of behaviour were being set. The numbers of exclusions were expected to reduce rapidly in the current term.</li><li>• The Committee noted that the Council tracked children in other boroughs who had previously been excluded from schools in Haringey and children in care who and those with statements who were likely to experience difficulties in schools. The Council worked closely with these children putting plans in place to ensure that they attended and remained in school.</li></ul> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> to note the report.</p>
<p><b>OSCO251.</b></p>	<p><b>IVF SUSPENSION PROPOSALS</b></p> <p>RECEIVED the document on NHS Haringey proposals to introduce a one year suspension of the provision of fertility treatments introduced by Andrew Williams (Interim Borough Director – NHS Haringey), Tamara Djuretic (Assistant Director of Public Health). A discussion followed.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Committee emphasised the need to consult with hospitals and GPs and the voluntary sector through HAVECO (Haringey Association of Voluntary and Community Organisations), as well as potential service users. The Council’s consultation department could provide assistance with this.</li><li>• Committee Members expressed concerns that the impact of the proposals would fall on lower income and black and minority ethnic residents who could not afford private treatment.</li><li>• The Committee noted that whilst treatment would be suspended the initial “work-up” for finding reasons for infertility would still be provided.</li></ul>

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

- The Committee recommended that the age limit of women who would be not be subject to the suspension of IVF/ICSI treatment be brought down to 38 from 40 in order to maximise their chances of success (Action No. 251.2).
- The Committee agreed that a formal response to the proposals to suspend IVF treatment be sent to the NHS (Action No. 251.1).
- In response to questions it was noted that one other borough (Kingston) had completely suspended its IVF treatment.
- A member expressed concern that the treatment might not be re-instated after the one-year suspension and was informed that whilst the suspension might start later than planned and will therefore run into the next financial year, it was a suspension and not a cessation of the service.

**RESOLVED**

- i. To note the briefing.
- ii. To recommended to NHS Haringey that the age limit of women who would not be subject to the suspension of the service be brought down from 40 to 38 by 31 March 2012 in order to maximise their chances of success.
- iii. That a formal response to the proposals to suspend IVF treatment be sent to the NHS by the Committee.

Urgent Item – Emergency Planning

RECEIVED the responses provided to the advance questions posed by Councillor Winskill on the Council and NHS joint responsibility to respond to serious incidents since the creation of the North Central London (NCL) cluster. A discussion followed.

**NOTED**

- Robust systems were in place and the NHS was committed to responding to emergencies.
- NHS North Central London including the NHS Haringey Borough Director had conducted it's own stress test and there were plans to conduct a joint a stress test with other agencies in the next 4 to 6 weeks.
- There would always be a rota covering the NCL cluster areas at senior management level.

**OSCO252. HOMES FOR HARINGEY PERFORMANCE REPORT**

RECEIVED the Homes for Haringey (HFH) Performance Report for April 2010 to February 2011 presented by Nick Powell (Head Of Housing Strategy, Development & Partnerships), Rowann Limond (HfH Director of Finance), Jackie Thomas (HfH Executive Director – Housing Management).

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

	<p>NOTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The performance target for the payment of invoices (Page 112 of the agenda pack) had not been met and it was explained that this was down to the system used where HfH invoices were passed on to and processed by the Council's accounts payable department. Discussions were being held to consider HfH withdrawing from the service level agreement with the Council and processing payments in-house.</li><li>• A Member expressed concern that many of the performance targets for lettings (page 97) were not being met. The HfH Director of Finance explained that it was a priority to ensure that HfH was meeting lettings standards. Practices were in place such as phoning all tenants one week after they have moved in to a property to ensure they were satisfied. There had been a 10% in tenant satisfaction in February 2011. Some issues with properties were dealt with after a tenant had moved in.</li><li>• Void turnaround times were affected by the number of individuals who were required to access a property to carry out tasks. Officers recognised the need to improve the process and HfH was going through a process of reducing the number of sub-contractors it used and was training employees in order to put an in-house team in place to carry out some of these works.</li></ul> <p><i>Clerk's note: The Chair left the meeting at 20:45 hrs. The Vice-Chair took over the chairing of the meeting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In relation to a member's concerns that targets for stage 2 and members' enquiries were not being met (page 110) it was noted that a new system for complaints and feedback had gone live in January 2011 and would be reviewed.</li><li>• Officers recognised the length of time taken to provide people with sheltered housing and highlighted that people often changed their minds about the accommodation they wanted. HfH work with these people and will still support them to move into alternative schemes.</li></ul> <p><i>Clerk's note: The Chair returned at 20:50 hrs.</i></p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> to note the report.</p>
<p><b>OSCO253.</b></p>	<p><b>CORPORATE PARENTING SCRUTINY REVIEW</b></p> <p>RECEIVED the tabled, updated cover report on the Corporate Parenting Review which included comments by the finance and legal teams and the final scrutiny review report, introduced by Cllr Ejiofor, Chair of the review.</p> <p>NOTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The following amendments to the recommendations were agreed: Recommendation 5; That this be extended to include reference to other Council committees with a role in relation to children's issues and Recommendation 8; That the scrutiny review proposed in this</li></ul>



**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

	<p>recommendation also include consideration of the financial impact and that work be conducted to see how the presentation of statistics for children in care could be made more transparent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee asked that the following action arising from the meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2011 be chased (Action No. 253). The Committee, the Cabinet Member and the Chair of the Safeguarding Policy &amp; Practice Advisory Committee all recognised that there was duplication of work among committees. The Committee asked that the Children &amp; Young People’s Service provide a short report on the roles, remits and composition of the different committees which consider the safeguarding of children including the Children’s Safeguarding Policy and Practice Advisory Committee, Local Safeguarding Children’s Board and the Children’s Trust, for future consideration by the Committee. (Action No. 235.1).</li> </ul> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. That recommendation 5 be extended to include reference to other Council committees with a role in relation to children’s issues.</li> <li>ii. That in relation to recommendation 8 the scrutiny review proposed in this recommendation also include consideration of the financial impact.</li> <li>iii. That the scrutiny review report on Corporate Parenting be approved subject to the amendments above.</li> </ol>
<p><b>OSCO254.</b></p>	<p><b>HEALTH INEQUALITIES SCRUTINY REVIEW</b></p> <p>RECEIVED the tabled, updated cover report on the Health Inequalities Scrutiny Review which included comments by the finance and legal teams and the final scrutiny review report, introduced by Melanie Ponomarenko (Scrutiny Officer).</p> <p>NOTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department of Health National Support Team had used Haringey as an example of good practice guidance for addressing inequalities.</li> <li>• In response to a concern that the review did not result in many recommendations it was noted that a cross party working group would be taking forward many of the issues in the review.</li> <li>• A member commented that, in relation to recommendation 3 (page 51 of the second document pack), the report should be distributed at draft stage, including local businesses who should be encouraged to respond detailing how they could contribute towards reducing health inequalities.</li> <li>• It was suggested that partners be encouraged to provide workplace screening for depression and anxiety disorders (page 61)</li> </ul> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> to approve the scrutiny review report on Health Inequalities.</p>
<p><b>OSCO255.</b></p>	<p><b>PRE-SCRUTINY UPDATES</b></p> <p>None.</p>

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 MAY 2011**

<p><b>OSCO256.</b></p>	<p><b>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>As detailed under minute numbers OSCO250 and OSCO251.</p>
<p><b>OSCO257.</b></p>	<p><b>MINUTES</b></p> <p><u>Minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2011</u> Cllr Engert requested that the following be included in OSCO 190 – Q16 &amp; Q22:</p> <p>In response to questioning on whether the Planning Committee hearing the application would consist of new members the Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration and Economy stated that this would be the case as far as was possible.</p> <p><u>Minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2011</u> The attendance list omitted Cllr Engert and would be amended.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> that subject to the amendment detailed above the minutes of the meetings held on 14<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> March be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.</p>
<p><b>OSCO258.</b></p>	<p><b>REFLECTIONS ON THE PAST YEAR</b></p> <p>The Committee had a brief discussion about the past year and agreed that a protocol for departments to complete actions arising from Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee meetings was required.</p>
<p><b>OSCO259.</b></p>	<p><b>FUTURE MEETINGS</b></p> <p>To be announced.</p>
<p><b>OSCO260.</b></p>	<p><b>SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ACTIONS REQUESTED</b></p> <p><u>Action 207.4 (page 132 of the agenda pack)</u> The Committee noted that a letter had been sent to the Chief Executive of the Bridge Renewal Trust requesting information on how the service worked but a response had not yet been received.</p> <p>The meeting ended at 21:30 hrs.</p>

COUNCILLOR GIDEON BULL  
Chair

SIGNED AT MEETING.....DAY  
OF.....  
CHAIR.....