

Chair:  
Councillor Charles Adje

Deputy Chair:  
Councillor Harry Lister

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This report covers matters considered by the Executive at our meeting on 5 July 2005. For ease of reference the Report is divided into the Executive portfolios.
- 1.2 We trust that this Report will be helpful to Members in their representative role and facilitate a fruitful dialogue between the Executive and all groups of Councillors. These reports are a welcome opportunity for the Executive on a regular basis to present the priorities and achievements of the Executive to Council colleagues for consideration and comment. The Executive values and encourages the input of fellow members.

## **ITEMS OF REPORT**

### **Finance**

#### **2. FINANCIAL PLANNING 2006/7-2008/9**

- 2.1 The Council's financial planning was based on a four-year strategy covering the period of this administration from 2003/4 to 2006/7. We were now in year three of the strategy and the planning horizon needed to be extended to 2008/9 so that a three-year view was maintained. The original four-year strategy was defined by the very poor settlement for 2003/4. This was the year of the last major formula review, which resulted in the Council losing £17.7m from the base level of annual resources. Largely as a result of this, the Council received only the 'floor' (lowest possible) increase in grant for the three years 2003/4 to 2005/6. The major challenge for our strategy had therefore been to deliver targeted investment in key service priorities, whilst managing Council Tax levels in the context of the Government's threatened use of capping powers.
- 2.2 National resource levels for the period to 2007/8 were defined by the 2004 Spending Review. On this basis, the Council set a balanced budget for the period 2005/6 to 2007/8 earlier this year. The Council Tax increases for the Haringey element, both actual and assumed in that budget, were as follows:

	<b>% increase</b>
2003/4 (actual)	17.4
2004/5 (actual)	7.2
2005/6 (actual)	4.9
2006/7 (planned)	2.5
2007/8 (planned)	2.5

- 2.3 Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget planning was based on a five-year period to 2009/10. The HRA faced a deteriorating underlying position as a result of the inter-relationship of stock reduction and subsidy issues. It was planned that this be managed from 2006/7 via as yet unspecified efficiency savings. There were also planned investment programmes over 2005/6 and 2006/7, in part underpinned by assumed improvement in the collection of service charges.

- 2.4 Education budget planning reflected the Council's current policy of passporting all education Formula Spending Share (FSS) resources. On this basis, the budget was balanced in 2005/6 but showed a potential deficit in the non-schools budget of £0.8m in 2006/7. It should be noted that this assumed the continuation of the Targeted Improvement Grant and external funding of sixth form centre transitional costs.
- 2.5 The capital programme was agreed for the period to 2007/8, based on the capital strategy and assumed levels of capital receipts. The programme was underpinned by the assumed disposal of part of the Civic Centre site and surplus residential homes capacity.
- 2.6 We considered a report which proposed a financial strategy for the period 2006/7 to 2008/9 and a process for consideration of the budget for 2006/7. Drawing on the matters set out in the report, we noted that the key strategy issues were as follows -

Although there was a possibility of some FSS formula changes in 2006/7, significant change in the local government finance system was more likely in 2007/8.

The pursuit of efficiency savings and improved value for money was a key factor in terms of maximising flexibility for service improvement and Council Tax restraint, meeting the Government's efficiency targets, and scoring well in the CPA judgement.

A period of relative constraint in public expenditure levels was likely to mean that further significant investment in service improvement would not be possible, and the emphasis would be on maximising performance from current investment levels.

When in due course the Council was required to enter into a Local Area Agreement (LAA), the Government would also participate more directly in the local planning process.

- 2.7 Our use of a business planning process at business user level to ensure that the strategic agenda was reflected in budget plans had, in recent years been supported by 'pre-business plan reviews' (PBPRs) to ensure that all options were considered, there were clear links to other internal strategies and service developments, that information could be shared fully with all stakeholders, and that performance expectations were clear. This process having proved successful in balancing strategic and detailed consideration of budgets and being well regarded by the various inspectors we report that we agreed that the PBPRs should again form the basis of the budget process.
- 2.8 The process to date had been based around targets for cashable efficiency savings of 2.5% per annum. We noted that current plans for 2007/8 were balanced on the basis that this target would be achieved, but that £2.5million was as yet not specified. It was proposed that 2.5% cashable savings targets be retained for the PBPR process, and that further consideration be given in due course to the possibility of further savings options being researched.

We also agreed the following timetable for the budget process:

<b>Activity</b>	<b>By whom</b>	<b>By when</b>
Consider overall strategy and process	Executive Advisory	21 June

	Board (EAB)	
Commence PBPR process	Chief Executive's Management Board (CEMB)	30 June
Consider budget scrutiny process	Overview and Scrutiny Cttee	4 July
Consider overall strategy and process	Executive	5 July
Agree release of PBPRs for budget scrutiny and consultation	Executive	1 November
Receive draft settlement	Officers	30 November
Consider draft settlement	EAB	6 December
Consider draft settlement	Executive	20 December
Consider product of budget scrutiny and consultation and draft budget package	EAB	10 January
Consider budget package	Leader's Conference	17 January
Agree budget package	Executive	24 January
Consider Executive's budget package	Council	6 February
Agree final budget and council tax	Council	20 February (subject to GLA timetable)

## **Organisational Development and Performance**

### **3. IMPLEMENTING ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT (IEG) 4.5**

3.1 The IEG4.5 was a return required by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), and was essentially a mid-term progress update based heavily on the format of the December 2004 IEG 4 Return. It recorded our progress in delivering Government targets on priority service outcomes and e-enabling services. We noted that good progress was being made. However, we were informed of a number of areas of concern in delivering 6 (out of 54) of the priority outcomes, compared with 7 which were reported to us in December 2004.

3.2 In approving the return for submission we noted that it had seven sections, viz:

The local context which was the only free form part of the return. Our concerns had been expressed about the Government's overall position on e-government. A brief summary of our overall arrangements had also been submitted, emphasising the three benefit classes (savings, performance improvement and perception improvement) which we were seeking to realise under the programme.

Section 1 set out our anticipated position against the priority outcomes. There were 6 outcomes which our current plans indicated we would not be able to meet. The reasoning was set out in the introduction to the IEG and we had made representations to ODPM officials. There were two broad reasons:

- the outcome specified was not deliverable or not economically deliverable in respect of outcomes R27 (Consistent CRM), G24 (CRM integration) and R28 (email handling);
- we were awaiting guidance and/or support from the Government which we did not believe would be forthcoming in sufficient time to deliver the outcome in respect of outcomes G8 (Single Business Account), G12 (integrated infrastructure in particular smart cards) and G16 (joined-up working for children at risk).

Section 2 sets out our position on change management issues. It was not mandatory to meet these requirements but we were are making reasonable progress.

Section 3 set out our position on BVPI 157 which we anticipated meeting.

Section 4 sets out our position on channel take up. These were largely a continuation of the data set out in previous IEG returns.

Section 5 sets out our expenditure on e-government.

Section 6 sets out the programme efficiency gains which were consistent with the Annual Efficiency Statement submitted in April 2005.

## **Housing**

### **3. DIRECTION AND STRUCTURE OF HOUSING STRATEGY AND NEEDS BUSINESS UNIT**

- 3.1 National guidance was clear that preparations for setting up an Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO) should include measures to enhance the Council's strategic housing ability and not focus exclusively on the needs of the ALMO. The way that Councils tackled homelessness, temporary accommodation and re-housing also continued to change. Choice-based lettings, long term temporary accommodation and an increased emphasis on prevention were viewed by the Government as imperatives. The Council's homelessness prevention and options project was an example of how we were addressing this. Large-scale sustainable development of affordable rented and intermediate housing was crucial to the economic and social well-being of Haringey and the Housing Service needed the ability to plan, agree and deliver future housing provision.
- 3.2 We considered a report which advised us that the Housing Strategy and Needs Division needed to develop in order to respond to the changing local/national housing agenda and proposed new senior management structure for that Division. The new Business Unit configuration would allow the service to focus on our main housing priorities and achieve the Unit's Business Plan objectives. The suggested structure, which we approved, would also help key areas of the Strategy and Needs service to improve to meet the two star standard required at the Council's ALMO inspection in Summer/Autumn 2006.

## **Social Services and Health**

### **4. OLDER PEOPLE'S INSPECTION (CSCI) OUTCOME**

4.1 The Commission for Social Care Inspection (CSCI) was a relatively new Government inspection which had three key roles:

To inspect local services such as residential homes and to report to the Local Authority on their findings measured against agreed and published standards;

To accredit social care agencies; and, more strategically

To inspect an area of social care delivery such as, in this case, Haringey's Older People's Service, taking soundings from service users, partners and staff as to their opinion of the service and then to produce an evaluation of, in their opinion, where they believed the service stood in terms of quality and future possibility.

4.2 We considered a report which formed part of a series of themed Older People's Inspections which had taken place recently and we noted that the judgement of our service was that Haringey was serving some older people well and that capacity for improvement was promising.

4.3 The Inspection Report had captured a snapshot of how our Older People's Service had been operating at the time (October 2004) and contained many positive comments. There were 18 key recommendations and we noted from the Improvement Plan which had been produced that a great deal of work had been done in these areas since the time of the Inspection. There were also some areas of criticism with which we disagreed.

4.4 We remained committed to on-going improvement in our Older People's Services and we were pleased to see that the CSCI had so many positive comments to make in particular in relation to the strong and clear strategic direction which had been developed. We endorsed the Improvement Plan which clearly indicated that the Service was aiming for excellence and did indeed have promising prospects.

### **5. EXPERIENCE COUNTS: HARINGEY'S STRATEGY FOR IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR OLDER PEOPLE'S**

5.1 The Government's Green Paper (Independence, Wellbeing and Choice) and the All Our Tomorrows policy paper (Local Government Association/Association of Directors of Social Services) on adult social care for older people both suggested that such care should be seen in whole life terms rather than on a service by service basis. This paralleled the approach for children's services in the Children Act 2004. In addition, the Audit Commission (2004) had identified the need for an overarching strategy to improve quality of life for older people.

5.2 The Comprehensive Performance Assessment 2005 had emphasised the role of local government in promoting healthier communities and services to improve the quality of life for older people and the most recent Government strategy on ageing, 'Opportunity Age', highlighted the need to deliver two objectives:

To prepare effectively for the age shift, which would gather pace between now and the middle of the century; and  
To help meet everyone's aspirations for better later lives for themselves and their families.

- 5.3 As part of the development of our Community Care Strategy we gave a commitment to develop a wider strategy for older people by April 2005 and the report we considered proposed a strategy which would honour that commitment.
- 5.4 The strategy aimed to create better services to improve the quality of life for older people in Haringey and to promote positive attitudes towards ageing. It encouraged older people to be seen in whole life terms rather than on a service by service basis and covered all aspects of life including active retirement, volunteering, housing, employment, life long learning, transport, safety. It also encouraged people to take more responsibility for their personal health and well being and aimed to ensure that the diversity of Haringey's communities and the aspirations of older people were valued and responded to appropriately keeping services relevant to people's changing needs.
- 5.5 It was Haringey's first five-year strategy covering the period 2005 to 2010 and it described our priorities and commitments to people over 50. The central vision and guiding principles of the strategy would be applied to any service with which an older person in Haringey was likely to come into contact. In agreeing the strategy we noted that it met the requirements of Level 3 of the Key Lines of Enquiry for Comprehensive Performance Assessment 2005.

## **6. SOCIAL SERVICES ANNUAL REPORT 2004/05**

- 6.1 We approved the 2004/05 Annual Report which identified the key improvements that had taken place within the Service last year. It also outlined where the service needed to improve and it's plans for the future. Following our approval of the contents, the Report was intended for publication and consultations on all of the initiatives would take place with the Haringey NHS Primary Care Trust, the voluntary sector and a range of partners.
- 6.2 The key issues of Independence Well-being and Choice, Community Care, Better Living for Older People and User and Carer Involvement were essential considerations for our delivery of equalities objectives. We noted that we had exceeded targets on the number of black and minority ethnic adults being helped to live at home (a total of 420) for the second year running. This was also the case for women (521). We had exceeded targets on helping black and minority ethnic adults (69%) and women (70%) who received direct payments. We had also exceeded targets for assessing and providing services for black and minority ethnic older people. This demonstrated our continuing commitment to ensuring that equalities issues were a golden thread running through all the services we provided.
- 6.3 For both Children's and Youth Offending Services the challenge had been to set realistic targets to try to bring down the disproportionately high numbers of children from certain black and minority ethnic groups represented within the service profile. We had also worked hard to address these issues with our strategic partners, and achieved some success including by equalising some sentencing outcomes for young offenders, and

ensuring black and minority ethnic young people in care obtained good exam results at GCSE and A-level.

## **7. SOCIAL SERVICES ANNUAL COMPLAINTS REPORT FOR 2004/05**

- 7.1 We considered a report which outlined the performance of the Social Services complaints handling procedures and practices for the period 2004/5 against the two statutory complaints procedures. Both sets of regulations required that for monitoring purposes the Local Authority must make annual reports on the operation of their complaint procedures. We noted that the report provided recommendations for improving complaint handling and ensuring early resolution and that the local manager had resolved 89% of complaints.
- 7.2 The decreased volume of complaints indicated that lessons had been learnt and we were resolving issues before they escalated. Haringey residents had a greater awareness of the complaints' procedure and increased confidence in the Council's ability to resolve issues. The 'Listen Up' initiative was encouraging children and young people with learning disabilities to complain.
- 7.3 With regard to initiatives for 2005/06, we noted that there were a number of steps that Social Services were taking to improve performance including the need to learn from complaints as a strategy to minimise the likelihood of failings reoccurring, thus enabling benefits for service users. The development of this aspect was continuing to develop including by increasing relationships with the Independent Review Officers and Advocates to ensure earlier resolution, thereby eliminating complaints proceeding to stage two. In addition, the new structure of the complaints' policies and procedures, which incorporated resolution meetings and mediation, had helped minimise the escalation of complaints. Social Services Management teams were committed to the Council's vision of high performance and improvement and continued monitoring was taking place to ensure that recommendations were implemented which would in turn ensure service improvement.

## **Environment and Conservation**

### **8. EXECUTIVE RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW OF GREEN AND OPEN SPACES**

- 8.1 The Scrutiny Review of Green Open Spaces was undertaken between December 2004 and March 2005. The aim was to examine in broad detail how the Review could contribute to the development of the Council's draft Open Spaces Strategy. The Review was undertaken in parallel with the development of the Haringey Open Spaces Strategy which set out the Council's vision and key strategic objectives for the future management and development of open space for the next 10 years. The majority of the recommendations from the Review had been incorporated within this Strategy.
- 8.2 We considered a report which advised us that the Review had identified 24 recommendations which, for the benefit of our consideration had been summarised into the following 10 key themes:

Developing a more co-ordinated approach to the management of green space;  
Improving safety, access and diversity of usage for green open spaces;

Improving the quality of management;  
Land use policy;  
Funding issues;  
Monitoring;  
Biodiversity and nature conservation;  
Events in parks;  
Representations to Central Government concerning the protection and importance of open space; and  
Recommendations for future reviews.

A number of the recommendations had implications for more than one of the above themes.

8.2 We agreed that the key themes together with the recommendations to which they related and our responses thereto be allocated a proposed priority rating of high, medium or low and that our responses be incorporated within the Recreation Service's Business Planning process for 2005/6-2007/8. The draft Open Spaces Strategy which was also the subject of our consideration and which was included elsewhere in this report reflected the priority rating and would be the subject of public consultation.

## **9. OPEN SPACES INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME**

9.1 The strategic importance and role of good quality open space was acknowledged in the Community Plan which referred to 'improving the environment' and in our draft Open Spaces Strategy which referred to 'safe, attractively designed, well used, and well maintained open spaces'.

9.2 Action and improvement were driven by the Better Haringey programme which alluded to 'cleaner, greener, safer,' and more specifically by the Recreation Service Business Plan which undertook 'to replace and upgrade', whilst at a local level specific proposals were developed and reflected in individual site Management Plans. At the heart of this agenda was the maintenance and enhancement of our public open space assets, which incorporated the replacement, refurbishment and renewal of physical infrastructure and facilities.

9.3 We report that we approved the proposed improvement programme for 2005/6 and in so doing noted that it had two strands of work which focussed on planning for major renewal and general improvement respectively, and was informed by external standards and assessment, condition audits, surveys, and 'Friends' feedback. The total programme spend was £1.77million of which 8% (£137,000) was committed to feasibility work on 4 major renewal sites, and 92% to refurbishment works across 26 sites.

## **10. EXECUTIVE RESPONSE TO SCRUTINY REVIEW OF HARINGEY'S TRANSPORT STRATEGY**

10.1 The Scrutiny Review of Haringey's Transport Strategy was established as the Member Steering Group to guide the development of the Local Implementation Plan [LIP] in Haringey. The LIP set out how the Council would implement the Mayor's Transport Strategy. We considered a report which advised us that the Scrutiny Review had taken a



broad look at the local transport issues from their perspective as local community representatives and as pedestrians, cyclists, bus public transport users and drivers. During the review evidence had been heard from key stakeholders such as representatives from older people, car drivers, cyclists, pedestrians and environmental and transport organisations. A Stakeholder Forum had been held on 10 December 2004 to gather views on key transport themes in the Mayor's Transport Strategy.

- 10.2 We noted that the Member Steering Group [Scrutiny Review Panel] would be reconvened to consider if any changes were necessary for the final draft of the LIP. The draft LIP was to be the subject of consultation between mid June and 29 July and was to be sent to Transport for London and the GLA for comments. The timetable for the LIP was to redraft following consultation by October with formal approval expected by the Mayor within about 3 months of resubmission. Formal adoption by the Council would be expected in early 2006.
- 10.3 We report that we approved responses to the twenty five recommendations of the Scrutiny Review of Adaptations Service and in so doing we recorded our thanks to the Scrutiny Panel for their assistance in the development of the Transport Strategy and also to the Stakeholder Panel for it's active participation in the Review.

## **11. BOROUGH SPENDING PLAN**

- 11.1 The Council was required each year to submit a bid for funding transport projects. The context for the Borough Spending Plan (BSP) was the requirement for the Council to prepare its Local Implementation Plan [LIP]. The LIP was required to set out how the Council would implement the Mayor for London's Transport Strategy at the local level. The draft LIP prepared had included a Borough Policy Statement, Parking and Enforcement Plan, Road Safety Plan and a School Travel Plan strategy. The LIP provided details of projects and programmes for the 4-year period from 2005/6 to 2008/9 with indicative proposals for 2009-2011. However, the LIP was not a bidding document and it was the BSP, which was linked to the LIP, which would remain as the mechanism for obtaining funding for transport projects and programmes from Transport for London (TfL).
- 11.2 We considered a report which advised us that this year TfL required the BSP to be submitted by 22 July 2005. The submission process was to tie in with the development of TfL's Business Plan. TfL had provided details of estimated allocations under the BSP until 2009/10 which showed that future allocations including for 2006/7 would reduce over this period in real terms and hence would not match the record allocation for 2005/6. TfL had changed the process whereby boroughs could submit bids for area-wide schemes. Under the new process there was a 3-step method of obtaining funding for schemes for town centres, station access and streets for people schemes. Boroughs could submit an initial bid at any time, not just at the time of submitting the full BSP, to obtain initial support and funding for developing a scheme. The second stage was the development of a scheme in detail and the third was the implementation. TfL would provide funding for the second and third stages subject to the availability of funding.
- 11.3 The BSP had to be based on the Transport Topics as set out in the guidance. These areas were: principal road maintenance, bridge strengthening and maintenance, local

safety schemes/20mph zones, school travel plans, Controlled Parking Zones, travel awareness, walking, cycling, area based schemes, regeneration area schemes, freight, environment, accessibility, local bus priority measures and bus stop accessibility works. The aim of the BSP was to obtain funds for broad areas of transport projects. The details of each project would be developed and consulted upon once the allocation had been decided by Transport for London in November 2005. There was scope within the funding mechanism to reallocate funds within the same transport areas and between transport areas if particular problems were encountered during the design/consultation stage which meant that there was some flexibility in allocating funds to meet the Council's overall transport objectives.

- 11.4 We report that we approved the submission of a Borough Spending Plan bid of £8.3 million to Transport for London. We also noted that sub-regional schemes were still being developed for North London through the North London Transport Forum by Enfield Council and so we authorised the Director of Environmental Services to approve the final bid following consultation with the Executive Member for Environment and Conservation.

## **12. DECRIMINALISATION OF MOVING TRAFFIC OFFENCES**

- 12.1 This matter was the subject of a report to the Council meeting on 18 July 2005.