

Summary of priority 3 (Environment & Neighbourhood) budget reduction proposals

| | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | Total |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Title | Budget Reduction |
| | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 | £'000 |
| Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO | - | 400 | - | - | - | 400 |
| Review and Extension of CPZ coverage | 500 | - | - | - | - | 500 |
| Waste, CS & Enforcement: Efficiency Savings on Veolia Contract | 100 | - | - | - | - | 100 |
| Increase in Moving Traffic Enforcement | 260 | 40 | - | - | - | 300 |
| Healthmatic Toilets | 30 | - | - | - | - | 30 |
| Extending parking enforcement | 350 | - | - | - | - | 350 |
| Litter Enforcement | - | 100 | - | - | - | 100 |
| Soft FM Efficiency | 25 | 25 | 50 | - | - | 100 |
| Leisure centre concessions | - | - | 50 | 70 | 70 | 190 |
| London Construction Programme Revenue | 200 | - | - | - | - | 200 |
| Flexible Police Resourcing | 200 | - | - | - | - | 200 |
| Waste Service Programme | - | 500 | - | - | - | 500 |
| Parking Transformation Programme | - | 500 | 500 | - | - | 1,000 |
| Place Totals | 1,665 | 1,565 | 600 | 70 | 70 | 3,970 |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|-------------|
| Ref: PL1 |
|-------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Title of Option: | Additional HMO Licensing Scheme for HMO | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Lynn Sellar |
| Affected Service(s): | Community Safety & Enforcement | Contact / Lead: | Lynn Sellar |

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation is a Mandatory Function. Owners of eligible properties have to pay a fee of £208 per habitable unit to licence with the local authority.

As of April 2018 the definition of a Mandatory HMO has changed and now includes properties regardless of the number of storeys. This will expand the number of properties within our borough which will require licensing as previously they would have fallen outside this definition. This scheme became operational as of 1st October 2018.

Licensing of Mandatory HMO accommodation is a statutory function within Housing Act 2004.

The licensing of smaller HMO accommodation is a discretionary power that Haringey has adopted the use of. Additional HMO licensing exists within 5 wards of Tottenham and will end in May 2019.

Plans to extend Additional HMO Licensing across the borough and introduce selective licensing is proposed in 29 hot spots. The aim is to have both schemes in place by the end of 2019-20. These schemes have a 5 year lifetime and can be renewed at the end of this period.

HMO Licensing includes the inspection of property to ensure that it meets all legal standards. The aim of licensing is to improve living conditions for those tenants residing within this property type and to reduce the impact that this type of property can have on the local community.

Where it is a legal requirement of the property owner to licence, the onus is on the landlord or managing agent to ensure they fulfil their legal obligation. The aim of HMO Licensing in Haringey is to ensure that this property type is safe and well maintained for the tenants living within it. The property will be inspected for standards based on risk. Any property failing to meet standards will be prosecuted as per the legislation pertaining to this. Properties which are found to have failed to licence will be enforced against.

Additional fee income will be used to cover the costs of related services.

Mitigation to avoid negative consequences of the HMO licensing scheme

Through Migration Impact Funding (MIF) we are seeking to recruit 3 housing needs advisors who will sit within the Housing Improvement Team (HIT) and work alongside HMO Licensing officers and well as Homes for Haringey housing needs advisors. The aim of their role is to provide early intervention in cases where there may be displacement following our interventions or cases of tenants being negatively affected by their living conditions. Advisors will ensure that tenants understand their responsibilities as well as those of the landlord. This intervention aims to reduce landlords' use of section 21 eviction powers to evict tenants.

| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | | 400 | | | |

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?
List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)

POSITIVE IMPACTS

Positive impact for tenants who reside in poorly maintained /managed HMO accommodation.

Properties found to be in use without a licence can have Rent Re-Payment Orders (RRO) placed on them if prosecuted and found guilty. The tenant can take his or her own RRO claim. Tenants are also protected from sec 21 housing evictions.

Those living in the local community should be positively impacted if they live in an area where this property type is not managed effectively. Licence conditions last for 5 year period, so landlords remain responsible for this duration.

Licensing produces a register of licence holders who have to be fit and proper persons. This allows tenants and Haringey officers to have direct contact details of the person they need to contact if things are failing.

Landlords and letting agents can advertise their properties as being licensed with the council, as a means of showing they meet standards and are compliant, good landlords in our borough.

NEGATIVE IMPACTS

Landlords have to pay a licence fee, although this is not burdensome with the average cost equating to £4 per week based on a 5 room HMO. That is 80p per week per tenant.

Some landlords have claimed to pass this cost on to tenants so tenants are concerned their rents will rise.
Mitigation/management – Landlords can claim this expense back from Inland revenue.

Landlord has to meet conditions and have works done to the property to meet statutory requirement.
Mitigation/management – Licensing conditions only ask for what is already a legal requirement for HMO accommodation. If they do not have these elements already then they have always been non-compliant.

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?
List both positive and negative impacts.

Positive Impact.
 Makes identifying responsible owners of property easier for staff as there is a register of their contact details.
 Provides a database of known HMO accommodation for the borough
 Greater joining up of resources and service delivery.

Negative Impacts.
 Increase in workload for officers in Housing improvement Team and other services.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

Licensing is a statutory function which supports the other statutory functions around enforcement response, fly tipping, noise and anti-social behaviour.

Properties are often identified through licensing that do not have planning permission, or which are failing to declare habitable units to Council Tax.

Licensing and early intervention will assist with the Homelessness Reduction Act and the impact of identifying non-compliance within HMO accommodation and the impact this can have on evictions etc.

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| Extension to Licensing will not be agreed by cabinet | H | L | New Cabinet administration fully advised on its advantages. |

| | | | |
|---|----------|----------|---|
| <p>Landlords fail to license upfront, consequence is fee income will be stunted</p> | <p>H</p> | <p>M</p> | <p>Offer early bird, discount incentive to landlords who licence early.</p> <p>Prosecutions early on against those who have failed to licence to show that it is not an option to be tolerated.</p> |
| <p>Fail to recruit adequately trained officers to carry out HMO Licensing Function.</p> | <p>H</p> | <p>M</p> | <p>Re-examine delivery structure, look at alternative means of employment type/background, re-negotiate starting salaries to reflect competitive market in this area.</p> |

DRAFT

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|-------------|
| Ref: PL2 |
|-------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Title of Option: | Review and extension of CPZ coverage | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Ann Cunningham |
| Affected Service(s): | Operations | Contact / Lead: | Ann Cunningham |

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

This is an invest to save bid.

At present approximately 80% of the borough is subject to parking controls. Those controls not only ensure road safety and the free flow of traffic, but support the delivery of Borough Plan objectives as well as the Transport Strategy objectives. The parking account also delivers an annual surplus of approximately £10m, which is ring-fenced for spending on transport-related services.

There is an increasing demand for parking controls as residents struggle to park near their home, with many areas waiting years for measures to be implemented. Additional pressures arise this year due to the opening of the new Spurs Stadium.

This increased demand exceeds what we can deliver annually through current funding levels. In addition, our incremental approach generates further displacement, resulting in new pressures arising in other roads, and new demands for interventions.

We therefore propose an accelerated programme this year to 'catch up', which will allow us to deliver to resident and Member expectations, make appropriate provision for running costs, dealing with current budget gaps, while generating a surplus. This will require an additional £495k capital, with revenue generated next year. This business case sets out the proposed programme, and expected income levels.

CPZ – Background Statistics

- Full existing CPZ coverage - 741 streets
- 8 New Schemes – 99 streets (13% increased coverage)
- 12 Review Schemes – incl. disabled bays and waiting and loading bays
- Reactive Maintenance – Lines and Signs to enable enforcement

Model Assumptions – revenue costs from Year 2

For illustration purposes the business case presents a straight line model that averages out the expected income evenly over a 10 year period. It is likely that enforcement contraventions are at their highest in earlier years, with an expected increase in compliance in later years.

The business case sets out the total capital cost of £795k, the required capital funding is £495k, the service will fund £300k from its existing parking plan capital budget.

The revenue costs (year 3 onwards) required to sustain the operation is £500k per year that will be funded from the projected income (Permits and PCN) of £1m per year, giving a net projected income over expenditure of £500k.

The business case model illustrates a payback period of 2 years - income over expenditure £73k. Subsequent years (year 3 onwards) income over expenditure of £500k.

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | 500 | | | | |

| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
|--|
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> |
| <p>This will ensure that the Council meets its obligations in terms of enforcing the parking restrictions and will make roads safer for all.</p> |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> |
| <p>This proposal will offer a more robust parking enforcement offer, supporting Businesses and residents.</p> |
| <p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> |
| <p>This growth in enforcement will help the Council meet its statutory obligations in terms of managing the road network. It will support the delivery of P3 and transport strategy objectives.</p> |

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| There are difficulties in recruiting Civil Enforcement officers at present. | H | L | We will work with Recruitment to make the offer look attractive and encouraged interest in working with us. We will also start the recruitment process early allowing for any delays in attracting suitable candidates. |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|-------------|
| Ref: PL3 |
|-------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Title of Option: | Waste, CS & Enforcement: Efficiency Savings on Veolia Contract | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Stephen McDonnell |
| Affected Service(s): | Waste | Contact / Lead: | Ian Kershaw |

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

These are efficiency savings secured in recent contract negotiations with Veolia. They will be delivered with no impact on services or performance. National legislation has meant the contractor is unable to meet recycling targets. This efficiency has been negotiated with the contractor. The contractor will make payments to offset the shortfall in targets and increased disposal costs.

There is no further impact on Council objectives.

Recycling collection is part of the wider integrated waste management contract with Veolia. The overall contract value is approximately £17m. Waste collection (including fortnightly residual and weekly recycling and food waste amounts to approximately £7m of that cost.

Although these savings are associated with the recycling rate they will not be impacted by other measures. They reflect the contractor's inability to meet the recycling targets set at the outset of the contract. The contract still retains financial penalties for failure to meet recycling targets. If the contractor improves performance by lower disposal costs. If performance falls there will be increased penalties.

There are no specific existing savings associated with the recycling collection however there are savings associated with the wider waste contract largely around charged services.

Net New Savings - £100k in first year

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | 2019/20 £000s | 2020/21 £000s | 2021/22 £000s | 2022/23 £000s | 2023/24 £000s |
| New net additional savings | 100 | | | | |

| |
|--|
| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> |
| None |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> |
| None |
| <p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> |
| No impact. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Risks and Mitigation | |
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | |
| Risk | Mitigation |
| These savings are dependent on the current contractual arrangement with Veolia. Change of supplier would likely lose these savings. | Ensure any new contract or delivery takes account of these savings in baseline costs. |
| Savings will cease entirely at the end of our contract with Veolia in 2024/25. | |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|-------------|
| Ref: PL4 |
|-------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Title of Option: | Increase in Moving Traffic Enforcement | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Ann Cunningham |
| Affected Service(s): | Parking and Traffic Enforcement | Contact / Lead: | Ann Cunningham |

| |
|--|
| <p>Description of Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the proposal in essence? What is its scope? What will change? - What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs) - How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements? - How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined? <p><i>[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]</i></p> <p>The parking and traffic enforcement service enforces moving traffic contraventions at a number of locations. This project proposes the relocation of some existing unattended cameras to locations requiring enforcement, as well as introducing additional cameras at a new location.</p> <p>It has been identified that the junction of Wood Green High Rd / Station N22 would benefit from the implementation of a yellow box junction, to aid vehicular movement as well as reducing road casualties. This will require the installation of 3 CCTV cameras, due to the layout of the junction, as well as the yellow box markings.</p> <p>It is estimated through surveys previously undertaken that in the region of 5,800 PCNs would be issued at the proposed new locations, generating in the region of £300k in fines. This additional income will need to be ring fenced to fund transport related services, for instance contributing to concessionary travel costs.</p> <p>One off Growth Required: £40k Capital 2019/20</p> |
|--|

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | 260 | 40 | | | |

| |
|---|
| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
| What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i> |
| Those proposals will aid road safety and support the delivery of corporate priorities and Transport strategy objectives. |
| What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i> |
| Fewer casualties and improved flow of traffic |
| How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements? |
| Yes. It supports our road network management and road safety obligations. |

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| Surveys undertaken a while ago indicated levels of contraventions and driver behaviour may have changed. | H | L | Monitoring and evaluation |
| Resource levels and demands may influence delivery timescales. | H | L | Scheduling of works. |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|-------------|
| Ref: PL5 |
|-------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Title of Option: | Waste, CS & Enforcement: Removal of Healthmatic Public Toilets | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Stephen McDonnell |
| Affected Service(s): | Waste | Contact / Lead: | Ian Kershaw |

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

Removal of two automated WCs (one near Finsbury Park, one on Wood Green High Road) and direction of customers to alternatives local facilities.

The toilets are poorly used, unattractive and there are alternative facilities of a higher standard nearby.

Removal may be perceived by some as an improved look to the streetscene. Others may see withdrawal as a loss.

Pavements will need 'making good' and utilities capping after removal which would require a one-off capital outlay.

In 2017 the Wood Green facility was visited 1185 times and the Finsbury Park facility 4603 times. This equates to approximately £5 per use. For the Finsbury Park facility, peaks occurred when major events were taking place in the park, when numerous other toilets are also available and supplied at the expense of the event provider.

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | 30 | | | | |

| |
|---|
| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> |
| <p>Most customers will likely perceive this as an improvement on the streetscene. Some customers may need signing/directing to alternative provision.</p> |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> |
| <p>Most customers will likely perceive this as an improvement on the streetscene. Some customers may need signing/directing to alternative provision.</p> <p>No discussions have taken place with other stakeholders. The Wood Green BID should be consulted on the withdrawal of the Wood Green High Road automated convenience.</p> |
| <p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> |
| <p>No impact on statutory requirements.</p> |

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| Some customers may see this as a withdrawal of a service particularly for those more vulnerable/elderly | L | L | Signposting to alternative provision and promotion of community toilet scheme |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|-------------|
| Ref: PL6 |
|-------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Title of Option: | Extending parking enforcement | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Ann Cunningham |
| Affected Service(s): | Parking and Traffic Enforcement | Contact / Lead: | Ann Cunningham |

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

This is an invest to save bid.

The parking enforcement operation consists of two enforcement streams; on-street and car parks, and CCTV enforcement. This involves an establishment of 60 on-street CEOs and 13 CCTV operators plus management structures.

Changes to regulations in 2014 significantly reduced the enforcement of on-street parking restrictions by CCTV cameras. This enforcement reverted to the on-street operations, without resources increasing.

Over the past two years year we also rolled out 8 new CPZs, without increasing enforcement capacity. We now need to increase staff numbers to provide an adequate enforcement service and deal with the growing demand in North Tottenham.

See also proposal PL2 – Review and Extension of CPZ coverage

This will involve a one off capital allocation for handheld devices and other essential equipment. Any additional income will need to be ring fenced to fund transport related services, for instance contributing to concessionary travel costs.

One off Growth Required: £450k Revenue in 2019/20; £40k Capital in 2019/20.

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | -350 | | | | |

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

| |
|--|
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> |
| <p>This will ensure that the Council meets its obligations in terms of enforcing the parking restrictions and will make roads safer for all.</p> |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> |
| <p>This proposal will offer a more robust parking enforcement offer, supporting Businesses and residents.</p> |
| <p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> |
| <p>This growth in enforcement will help the Council meet its statutory obligations in terms of managing the road network. It will support the delivery of P3 and transport strategy objectives.</p> |

| Risks and Mitigation <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| There are difficulties in recruiting Civil Enforcement officers at present. | H | L | We will work with Recruitment to make the offer look attractive and encouraged interest in working with us. We will also start the recruitment process early allowing for any delays in attracting suitable candidates. |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|-------------|
| Ref: PL7 |
|-------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Title of Option: | Litter Enforcement | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Stephen McDonnell |
| Affected Service(s): | Community Safety | Contact / Lead: | Sarah Tullett |

| |
|---|
| <p>Description of Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the proposal in essence? What is its scope? What will change? - What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs) - How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements? - How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined? <p><i>[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]</i></p> <p>We need to have effective enforcement strategies to help keep the borough clean and safe. This proposal is to consider the option for in-house service provision based on the pilot we ran with an external contractor, Kingdom, from November 2016 to September 2017.</p> <p>The proposal is dependent on a £300K growth bid to generate fines (FPNs) which have been estimated at around £400K. This calculation is based on a model which assumes a mixture of FPNs being issued for street litter and fly tipping. Also to act as a deterrent it is proposed that the FPN level increase from £80 to £180.</p> |
|---|

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | | 100 | | | |

| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
|--|
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> <p>Perception of how safe a neighbourhood is can be negatively affected by low level anti-social behaviour such as fly tipping and littering. It also has a negative impact on the economic growth and regeneration of an area.</p> <p>Litter enforcement will assist in the delivery of a cleaner borough that residents would be proud to live in and work in.</p> <p>Some customers will welcome increased enforcement while others may perceive it negatively.</p> |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> <p>A high profile litter enforcement team will play a key role, alongside education, in behaviour change - raising the profile of littering as an anti-social behaviour and increasing the perception of risk to those who drop litter.</p> |

| |
|---|
| Increase in fines and noticeable enforcement presence should have a deterrent effect. |
| How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements? |
| No direct impact however an effective enforcement service is necessary to help us meet our responsibilities under the Environmental Protection Act and other legislation. |

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|--|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| Additional back office costs in relation to legal services and debt management | M | M | To ensure that all associated cost are taken in to consideration as part of a fuller options appraisal |
| High staff turnover | M | H | Working terms and conditions and sufficiently generous remuneration should encourage staff retention |
| A self-funding service would be dependent on targeting specific offences notably dropping cigarette butts. This may seem trivial to some. | M | M | Clear communication about the value we place on clean public places and the harm that can be generated from smoking as well as the greater tendency for litter to proliferate where some litter types are tolerated. |
| A self-funding service is dependent on residents and visitors breaching rules. A successful service may drive behaviour change undermining its ability to fund itself. | L | H | Clear specification of the service, including the prospect that a truly successful service must be measured by outcomes in terms of street cleanliness. |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|-------------|
| Ref: PL8 |
|-------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Title of Option: | Corporate Contracts: Soft FM Efficiency Savings | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Stephen McDonnell |
| Affected Service(s): | Corporate Contracts | Contact / Lead: | Darren Butterfield |

Description of Option:

- What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?
- What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

New Haringey commissioning officer will work with Amey Account manager and required internal and external parties to carry out a review and Re-commission of the soft FM services, and services delivered through Amey contract (e.g. efficiencies in postage, front of house, security, cleaning etc).

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | 25 | 25 | 50 | | |

| |
|--|
| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
|--|

| |
|--|
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> |
| <p>There should be no negative impact on customers, efficiently on savings and processes to be achieved should have a positive impact.</p> |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> |
| <p>The review of the various soft services will be carried out and various partners, stakeholders, staff , unions etc will be involved throughout the process.</p> |
| <p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> |
| <p>No impact on Statutory requirements.</p> |

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|------------|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| No current risk identified at the moment. | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|-------------|
| Ref: PL9 |
|-------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Title of Option: | Review of Leisure Centre Concessions | | |
| Priority: | Place/People | Responsible Officer: | Stephen McDonnell |
| Affected Service(s): | Leisure Centres | Contact / Lead: | Andrea Keeble |

Description of Option:

- *What is the proposal in essence? What is its **scope**? What will **change**?*
- *What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)*
- **How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements?**
- *How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?*

[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]

The Council's contract with Fusion for the management of the three leisure centres includes a council-designed concessionary pricing scheme. The council retain control of the charges that can be levied by Fusion as part of the concessionary scheme. Generally they are only put up by CPI inflation each year.

The current schemes permits free access to residents over 65 Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm.

In addition those residents who are Under 16, Over 60, Students, those on various DWP Benefits, and Haringey Carers receive the first level of Advantage + discount.

Those residents on Income Support / Universal Credit / Housing Benefit / Council Tax Benefit, Income based Job Seekers or Working Tax Credit receive a higher level of Advantage discount.

The level of discount depends on the activity but a couple of key activities such as a casual swim or a casual gym session the pricing is as follows:-

| Item | Standard Price | Advantage + | Advantage |
|---------------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|
| Indoor Casual Swim | £4.95 | £2.35 | £1.70 |
| Casual Gym | £8.00 | £5.65 | £2.85 |

Since 2008 leisure centre activity pricing has been based on people's ability to pay. Those that are able to pay the full commercial rate are asked to do so, and others that need support in accessing the leisure facilities receive a subsidised rate. The leisure centre subsidy is an average annual sum of £435,000.

Further work needs to be carried out to research, design and quantify the impact of any changes to the concessionary pricing system, but a key outcome will be to simplify a future scheme.

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | | | 50 | 70 | 70 |
| | | | | | |

| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
|--|
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> |
| <p>Reviewing the system of concessionary pricing in the leisure centres would ensure it is still fit for purpose. A reviewed system would ensure that target groups are helped to access the leisure centre where price is a barrier.</p> <p>A reviewed system would ensure that users who can afford to pay are asked to pay.</p> <p>A reviewed system could respond to the increase in the state pension age and recoup fees from a cohort of users who may well be able to pay.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to simplify the system for all users.</p> <p>However, in some instances, a change in pricing could reduce people's use of leisure centres.</p> <p>There are strong links to the People priority of the Borough Plan.</p> |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> |
| <p>The success of this proposal will require a renegotiation of the management contract.</p> |
| <p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> |
| <p>No statutory implications</p> |

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| People dropping out of exercise impacting their long term health. | M | M | Retain a concessionary scheme that targets those most in need of support. Engage with leisure centre users from the outset |
| | | | |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|--------------|
| Ref: PL10 |
|--------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Title of Option: | LCP Revenue | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Barry Phelps |
| Affected Service(s): | LCP | Contact / Lead: | Barry Phelps |

Description of Option:
 The London Construction Programme (LCP) is a virtual organisation managed by the Head of Procurement in Haringey. The LCP provide a suite of pan London construction related frameworks that are accessible by Public Sector organisations.

Towards the end of 2018/19 the LCP will establish a new pan London Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) in partnership with Construction line. The DPS will be for the provision of construction related professional services and minor works.

The DPS will generate revenue through a subscription. There are currently 43 LCP members. It is anticipated at least 50% of the current LCP membership will access the DPS. Subscriptions range between £15k and £25k per member depending upon how many DPS categories they access. Assuming 50% of LCP members subscribe at the mid-point, this will generate £440k of revenue per annum effective 2019/20.

Taking into account additional operational costs associated with the DPS and other resources in Strategic Procurement, it is anticipated there will be an annual surplus of £200k.

| | | | | | |
|---|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Existing Budget | -100 | | | | |
| Proposed net expenditure after savings | -300 | | | | |
| Savings | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New net additional savings (year on year) | 200 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| |
|--|
| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> |
| <p>N/A</p> <p>Customers will not be directly impacted.</p> |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> |
| <p>DPS will increase SME interaction and enhance localism throughout London</p> |
| <p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> |
| <p>Provides a compliant route to market for procurement activity in this sector</p> |

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| Demand for service changes unexpectedly | M | L | At present, research has shown that there isn't another organisation that provides access to a professional services DPS platform which covers the categories we are proposing. Quick mobilisation of the team will enable access to the market against only a small number of competitors. |
| Lack of appetite amongst LCP members for professional services DPS platform | H | L | Pre-market engagement has indicated this is a low risk with 80% of LCP members interested. Increase in the marketing strategy through the existing LCP MW 2014 framework agreement. Due to the natural correlation between the MW 2014 framework and the proposed DPS platform it would be more effective to re-energising the client base. |
| Reputational risk if the project is not considered a success within Haringey and amongst the existing LCP client base | H | L | Haringey have learned from several DPS implementations, adequate resource, project governance, realistic project timescales and detailed scoping are key activities to ensure a successful implementation. It is proposed to use the newly established DPS team to project manage the implementation of the DPS alongside the LCP. |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|--------------|
| Ref: PL11 |
|--------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Title of Option: | Flexible Police resources | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Eubert Malcolm |
| Affected Service(s): | Community Safety | Contact / Lead: | Eubert Malcolm |

| |
|---|
| <p>Description of Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the proposal in essence? What is its scope? What will change? - What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs) - How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements? - How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined? <p><i>[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]</i></p> <p>This proposal is to cease funding for the police partnership team.</p> <p>The police partnership team consists of 1 sergeant and 5 PCs.</p> <p>The funding for the team enables the tasking of police officers along with the wider partnership i.e. trading standards, CCTV, ASB enforcement to hotspots in the borough.</p> <p>The current contract runs up to March 2019.</p> |
|---|

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | 200 | | | | |

| |
|---|
| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> |
| <p>The main negative impact will be on Priority 3 - A clean, well maintained and safe borough where people are proud to live and work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced capacity to task officers to tackle ASB and criminality • Reduced capacity to work in partnership to tackle localised issues i.e. targeted joint enforcement activity, unauthorised occupation on council owned land and estates |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> |
| <p>Removing this funding will reduce the ability to have sustainable impact on issues that blight the borough.</p> |
| <p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> |
| <p>This is no statutory duty to have these police officers working with the local authority</p> |

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| Reduced capacity to deal with localised ASB concerns | H | M | Concerns will be passed to local SNT's |
| Reputational damage from the community following increased criminality | H | M | Concerns will be passed to local SNT's |
| Reputational damage with police colleagues from reducing the team | M | M | To discuss with the Borough commander before withdrawal |

Business Planning / MTFs Options 2019/20 – 2023/24

| |
|--------------|
| Ref: PL12 |
|--------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Title of Option: | Waste Services Transformation | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Stephen McDonnell |
| Affected Service(s): | Community Safety | Contact / Lead: | Ian Kershaw |

| |
|--|
| <p>Description of Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What is the proposal in essence? What is its scope? What will change?</i> - <i>What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)</i> - How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements? - <i>How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?</i> <p><i>[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]</i></p> <p>This savings proposal has been developed following independent advice from waste consultants Eunomia. Eunomia reviewed the viability and risks associated with a set of potential waste savings and assessed that on their own, each proposal had risks for deliverability and interdependencies with other services.</p> <p>An alternative approach as proposed by this submission, is to review all the waste and street cleansing services together as a new Transformation Programme. This will form a revised programme of work which will deliver greater savings from 2020/21 onwards.</p> <p>Over the next four months a detailed programme of work will be developed to inform viable models of waste collection and street cleansing that could deliver significant savings from 2020/21. By providing a robust review of our collection systems, the project should also deliver increased recycling, minimise the impact on disposal costs and reduce fly-tipping.</p> <p>A figure of £500,000 in savings from 2020/21 has been put forward as this revised MTFs option. This is derived from assessments made by Eunomia but will be informed by the detailed audit, mapping and modelling and ultimately Member decisions about new delivery models.</p> |
|--|

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | 0 | 500 | | | |

| |
|---|
| Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits |
| <p>What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed? <i>List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)</i></p> |
| <p>Waste collection is a universal service delivered to all homes in the borough, and so any changes are highly susceptible to negative impacts on satisfaction. Furthermore, the design of waste collection is key to recycling which impacts both cost and sustainability.</p> <p>Street cleansing is experienced by all residents and changes can impact satisfaction.</p> <p>To mitigate adverse effects any changes should be supported by small scale trials to make explicit the benefits and allow mitigation of any adverse effects.</p> |
| <p>What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected? <i>List both positive and negative impacts.</i></p> |
| <p>As above. A full EqIA and consultation will be needed before full scale changes are implemented.</p> |
| <p>How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?</p> |
| <p>Waste collection is a statutory function.</p> |

| Risks and Mitigation | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---|
| <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| Impact on recycling rate | M | M | Full service review will aim to minimise impact on recycling rate and some options may be available to increase it. This will be assessed as part of all the options developed for members. |
| Impact on waste disposal costs | M | M | Full service review will aim to minimise impact on waste disposal costs, and this will be assessed as part of all the options developed for members. |
| Impact on street cleanliness | M | M | Full service review will aim to minimise impact on street cleanliness, and align resources better to achieve the same outcomes across the borough. |
| Impact on resident satisfaction with the above services, and more widely, of the Council | M | M | All service changes will be subject to resident consultation and will need to be supported by an effective communications campaign. |

**Business Planning / MTFs Options
2019/20 – 2023/24**

Ref:
PL13

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Title of Option: | Parking Transformation Programme | | |
| Priority: | Place | Responsible Officer: | Stephen McDonnell |
| Affected Service(s): | Parking | Contact / Lead: | David Murray / Ann Cunningham |

| |
|--|
| <p>Description of Option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What is the proposal in essence? What is its scope? What will change?</i> - <i>What will be the impact on the Council's objectives and outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes, and Borough Plan Evidence Packs)</i> - How does this option ensure the Council is still able to meet statutory requirements? - <i>How will the proposal deliver the benefits outlined?</i> <p><i>[Proposals will be mapped to the new Borough Plan Priorities/Objectives/Outcomes as they emerge – please take account of any likely changes when framing proposals]</i></p> <p>The Parking Transformation Programme will deliver significant improvements to this service over the coming three years. A number of work streams are being developed, including the financial appraisals.</p> <p>Proposed Savings</p> |
|--|

| Activity | Revenue Expenditure | Income | Net Savings | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 | Total |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| CPZ Review and Expansion Phase 3 | £500,000 | (£1,000,000) | (£500,000) | (£500,000) | | (£500,000) |
| Pricing and Permits - Diesel Surcharge | £0 | (£500,000) | (£500,000) | | (£500,000) | (£500,000) |
| Total | £500,000 | (£1,500,000) | (£1,000,000) | (£500,000) | (£500,000) | (£1,000,000) |

CPZ Review and Expansion – phase 3

This will continue the CPZ rollout programme taking the borough to 100% coverage. Demand for CPZs is high and those controls support the delivery of transport and air quality strategies, as the delivery of new Borough Plan priorities.

Pricing and Permits - Diesel Surcharge

The Council adopted a parking permit charging policy based on CO2 emissions a number of years ago, encouraging the use of more fuel efficient vehicles. Many boroughs are now extended their charging models to tackle emissions from Diesel vehicles. It is proposed that Haringey also does so, which will complement a range of other measures to improve air quality across the borough.

Any additional income will need to be ring fenced to fund transport related services, for instance contributing to concessionary travel costs.

| 1. Financial benefits summary | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 2018/19 Service Budget (£000s) | | | | | |
| Savings | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
| <i>All savings shown on an incremental basis</i> | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s | £000s |
| New net additional savings | 0 | 500 | 500 | | |

Impact / non-financial benefits and disbenefits

What is the likely impact on customers and how will negative impacts be mitigated or managed?

List both positive and negative impacts. Where possible link these to outcomes (please refer to relevant Corporate Plan 2015-18 objectives and outcomes)

CPZs improve road conditions making them safe, improve air quality by reducing congestion and as such there no negative impacts.

What is the impact on businesses, members, staff, partners and other stakeholders and how will this be mitigated or managed? How has this been discussed / agreed with other parties affected?

List both positive and negative impacts.

Parking provisions will be made for Businesses.

How does this option ensure the Council is able to meet statutory requirements?

The Council has a statutory duty to manage the road network.

| Risks and Mitigation <i>What are the main risks associated with this option and how could they be mitigated?</i> | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Risk | Impact H/M/L | Probability H/M/L | Mitigation |
| The CPZ programme is subject to consultation and the community may reject proposals. | H | L | Consultation will be undertaken |
| The introduction of a Diesel surcharge is subject to consultation and the community may not support its introduction | H | M | Consultation will be undertaken |

