

## Appendix A

### Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

<b>Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No)</b>
EC02	Reduction of North Tottenham revenue budgets		The Panel was concerned that levels of engagement with the local community could fall as a consequence of the budget reductions. The Panel recommends that the Cabinet give consideration to what measures would be necessary to mitigate this.	Yes
EC08	Income from Outdoor Media – Strand 2 (Rental payments from outdoor media companies)	<p>Details of the number and type of buildings to be used for the outdoor advertisements that are proposed.</p> <p>Details of Haringey Council's advertising policy.</p>	<p>The Panel had concerns about the potential for over-commercialisation of Council-owned buildings and public spaces through their use as hosts for advertisements from outdoor media companies. However, the Panel was not provided with sufficient information about the nature of the sites that would be used for this and the size of the advertisements.</p> <p>The Panel also sought reassurance on the type of companies that the Council would host advertisements for and that a high ethical standard would be imposed.</p> <p>The Panel recommended that further</p>	Yes

			information on the sites/buildings to be used and the Council's advertising policy be considered alongside the Panel's concerns about potential over-commercialisation and about ethical standards and that the OSC should consider whether or not recommendations on any restrictions to the advertising under this proposal would be appropriate on this basis.	
EC10	Strategic Property Unit – New Income 5G		The Panel noted that mobile phone masts can potentially cause damage to buildings when attached to them and that some residents in the immediate vicinity may be concerned about potential health risks caused by mobile phone signals. The Panel recommended that caution be exercised about the type and location of Council-owned buildings used for this purpose.	Yes
Various	HRA		Concerns were expressed about additional charges being added to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) which is under pressure and that movements of cost from the General Fund to the HRA risks delaying repairs and improvements to the communal areas of housing estates.	No

<b>Environment and Community Safety Panel – Place Priority</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested if appropriate)</b>	<b>Comments/Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)</b>
PL01 & PL03	Selective Licensing/CCTV enforcement of weight limits and emissions through ANPR/DVLA check	The Panel requested that Cabinet provide further evidence of the feasibility of achieving these two net savings targets. The Panel also sought further assurance from Cabinet around the enforcement activities that would be in place to ensure compliance and, ultimately, ensure that the stated income levels were achieved. As a specific example, the Panel commented that there were two cameras already in place at either end of Wightman Road to enforce against weight limits for vehicular traffic. However, HGVs continued to use this road regularly with over 1400 incidents in 2018 and approximately 2,000 incidents so far in 2019. How would Cabinet ensure that robust enforcement would be carried out in relation to PL03, if existing enforcement activities on weight limits on Wightman Road were only partially successful?	The Panel welcomed the savings proposals. It noted the significant level of savings set out in both schemes (£239K & £642k respectively) but questioned the extent to which these net savings were achievable.	

PL6	Contract Centre Efficiencies		The Panel raised concerns with saving proposal PL06 in relation to the loss of two staff members from the Veolia Contact Centre. The Panel were clear that waste, recycling and cleansing services were a key area of concern for residents and questioned the necessity and impact of making this saving. The Panel noted the mitigation that management sought to channel shift customers online but were concerned about the equalities impact of this as well as a lower level of responsiveness overall. The Panel requested that Cabinet reconsider this saving proposal in light of the potential impact on the level of service to our residents and the relatively small net saving achieved as a result.	Yes
PL8	FM Transformation	The Panel suggested that some of the staff affected had been treated poorly by the Council and the Panel would like assurance that the organisation would ensure that adequate training and support for staff was in place for those being transferred. The Panel would also like assurances that staff coming back into the organisation would be recycled into other roles, where that service was subject to staffing reductions and that in general, redeployment of staff was done in an imaginative, compassionate and constructive manner.	In light of the proposal for FM Transformation (PL08) and the commercial exit from the incumbent FM contract and the TUPE transfer of staff back to the Council, the Panel requested that Cabinet give consideration as to what lessons could be learnt for the future.	Yes

PL13	EV Charging	<p>The Panel requested that Cabinet provide assurances of how the additional roll out of EV charging points would be communicated across the borough, including the impact on specific locations i.e. loss of individual parking spaces.</p> <p>The Panel also requested that Cabinet provide further information on the roll-out and equitable distribution of charging points across the borough. The Panel would to know how will this would be done, what locations were proposed and the timescales involved. Furthermore, how would all of this be communicated to residents and local businesses?</p>	<p>The Panel broadly welcomed proposals to increase the number of Electric Vehicle charging points across the Borough (PL13). In the context of recent concerns relayed to the Panel around consultation and engagement, the Panel set out the importance of clear and effective communication with residents and local businesses.</p>	
------	-------------	--	---	--

<b>Children and Young People's Panel – Children's Services</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Comments/Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)</b>
PE09	0-19 year old public health commissioned services - a new integrated commissioned service delivery model		<p>Panel Members queried the presentation of a budget reduction in the Public Health Service as having a positive impact. It noted that health visiting had previously been targeted, with parents only receiving a small number of visits. However, the service had now been transformed and increased its reach against the five health visiting mandated areas. The proposed savings were to be achieved through merging the health visiting and school nursing services. This would lead to natural efficiencies through less duplication and back office savings. Public health grant funding was ring fenced and the savings achieved would need to be deployed elsewhere within Public Health.</p> <p>The Panel noted that the provider for health visiting was Whittington Health. 92% of parents were currently receiving a new birth visit between 10 and 14 days of the birth. 78% of parents were receiving a 6 to 8 week visit. Although this represented an improvement, further progress still needed to be made.</p>	No

120	Children's Services Estate - Capital Maintenance		<p>The Panel noted that the main capital investment that was planned was in respect of schools estate maintenance. A swathe of surveys of the schools estate had taken place during the last 18 months and these had revealed its condition. An additional amount of £10 million per year for five years had been put into the capital budget to fund the work that was required. It was noted that the government only provided a grant of £3 million per year. However, the amounts that had been allocated were still not enough to cover all of the work that was required. The Council was currently developing an asset management plan which would assist in the setting of priorities. It was agreed that a report be submitted to a future meeting of the Panel on the challenges that schools estates were facing.</p> <p>The Panel noted that the additional funding would cover all of the Children's Services estate and not just schools. It was accepted that the amount that had been allocated was indicative but the need for investment needed to be balanced against the pressure on the Council's revenue budget, which was under pressure and would be affected by additional borrowing costs. The Asset Management Plan and the Capital Strategy would contain additional detail on the proposals including scheduling and priorities. In respect of deliverability,</p>	No
-----	--	--	---	----

			<p>current performance showed an improvement so that was an increased level of confidence.</p> <p>The Director of Children's Services commented that a lot of preparatory work had been undertaken in the past year on the schools estate due to its maintenance being given a higher priority. Specific criteria was being used to prioritise work that was based on the degree of urgency. In addition, consideration was also given to the priorities of individual schools. Further detail could be provided in a report to a future meeting.</p> <p>The Cabinet Member stated that there was a massive need for repairs in schools and as much as possible had been allocated for this work. However, there were longer term issues that needed to be considered, such as the future school population. The Panel noted that there would be a regular cycle of reports to inform and guide the work that was undertaken, including the pupil place planning reports. The environmental impact of work would be considered as part of the process.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

<b>Adults &amp; Health Scrutiny Panel</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No)</b>
PE01	Public Health Lifestyles		<p>The Panel noted this savings proposal but was concerned about the potential negative impact on public health outcomes.</p> <p>The Panel requested that progress on public health targets/performance indicators continue to be reported to the Scrutiny Panel for future monitoring.</p>	Yes
PE02 and Capital Scheme 220	Osborne Grove Redevelopment	<p>The Panel requested further information on a number of points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Why has the Capital cost of the Osborne Grove proposals had quadrupled to around £30m since the original proposals?</li> <li>- What projections have been made about the expected demand in the market given the financial risks associated by unused places in future years?</li> <li>- How does the projected build cost per bed compare with other similar new care homes?</li> <li>- What is the current number of clients and estimated cost of care for the current financial year for out of borough</li> </ul>	<p>Although the Panel could see that this initial years' saving would be made, in light of the questions raised the Panel wished to record its concerns that there could be a financial risk to the Council in future years if the new nursing home did not run at full capacity.</p>	Yes

		placements due to the unavailability of space at Osborne Grove?		
Capital programme (217 to 220)	Various		<p>The Panel welcomed the information provided about the capital programme but did not feel that it was in a position to make detailed recommendations on the specific proposals as it did not yet have access to the relevant business plans and detailed financial information.</p> <p>However, the Panel wishes to continue to monitor the proposals and therefore recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) As further information becomes available for each of the capital programmes this is provided to the Panel for further scrutiny via the Panel's budget monitoring reports throughout the year.</li> <li>b) Details of these capital proposals and all future ongoing capital projects should be brought to the annual budget scrutiny meeting of the Panel and not just the 'new proposals'.</li> </ul>	Yes
General	Budget information provided to Scrutiny Panels		<p>The Panel took the view that the information provided with the agenda papers was not sufficient to understand the overall changes of the proposed Adults &amp; Health budget in 2020/21 (and subsequent years) as compared to the previous year. Information that would be required for this purpose includes:</p>	Yes

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the full extent of budget savings that are taking effect in 2020/21 (and subsequent years), including those that were submitted to scrutiny panels in previous years and not just 'new' savings proposals.</li> <li>- changes to the budget caused by 'policy growth', e.g. changes resulting from the London Living Wage.</li> <li>- changes to the budget caused by 'demographic growth'</li> <li>- additional funds originating from internal Council sources such as reserves being used to mitigate any budget gap.</li> <li>- additional funds originating from external Council sources such as government grants.</li> <li>- additional funds originating from the Adult Social Care precept.</li> </ul> <p>The Panel therefore recommends that future agenda papers for budget scrutiny meetings for all four Scrutiny Panels should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A breakdown of all the important factors affecting the overall budget (for the Panel's relevant budget area) for all relevant years that the Panel is scrutinising, including all savings proposals, policy growth, demographic growth, other pressures, any additional funding from internal or external sources and any other relevant factors.</li> <li>b) In addition to the details of new savings proposals, all Scrutiny Panels should be</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>provided with their relevant section of the MTFS Savings Tracker to enable them to monitor ongoing savings proposals that were submitted to that Scrutiny Panel in previous years but that take effect during any relevant years that the Panel is scrutinising.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>c) That the relevant sections of the MTFS Savings Tracker provided to the Scrutiny Panels should include a column that provides details of the date of the meeting at which each savings proposal was originally considered by that Scrutiny Panel.</p>	
General	Risks associated with Government grants	Information about any contingency plans to mitigate against circumstances where Government grants are not available to cover budget gaps in future years.	<p>The Panel noted that pressures on the overall Adults &amp; Health budget had been balanced by a new grant from the Government of £4.9m. The Panel was concerned about the risks associated with this given that Government grants of this nature cannot necessarily be relied upon in future years.</p> <p>The Panel requested further information on what contingency plans exist to mitigate against this should such grants not be available in future years.</p>	Yes

<sup>1</sup> A recent version of the MTFS Savings Tracker was provided in the Cabinet agenda papers for its meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> Dec 2019 and can be viewed from page 59 at <https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/g9155/Public%20reports%20pack%2010th-Dec-2019%2018.30%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

Ongoing Savings <sup>2</sup>	Haringey Learning Disability Partnership	An explanation of the reasons for a shortfall in the expected savings and of what action is being taken.	The Panel expressed concern about the shortfall in the expected savings on this proposal and requested further information to explain why this had occurred, what action is being taken to rectify this.	Yes
------------------------------	--	--	--	-----

---

<sup>2</sup> This relates to a previous savings proposal considered by the Panel in Dec 2017 – see B2.8 in the MTFS Savings Tracker for further details.

<b>Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Your Council</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>MTFS Proposal</b>	<b>Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)</b>	<b>Comments/Recommendation</b>	<b>Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)</b>
YC02	Income from joining the London Counter-Fraud Hub.		<p>The Committee noted that this proposal was contingent on at least 26 other local authorities signing up to the scheme and that discussions were ongoing. The saving therefore was not certain to go ahead.</p> <p>OSC felt that this saving was somewhat theoretical and would like assurance of how the £50K would be generated if the Counter-Fraud Hub did not proceed. The Committee would also like assurance that Cabinet would monitor this scheme to ensure that income generated through fraud prevention was maximised and, where possible, opportunities were explored to generate further income above the stated £50k.</p>	Yes
YC05	Alexandra Park and Palace Charitable Trust (APPCT).	The Committee requested further information about how APPCT would mitigate the budget gap that would arise from a reduction in the revenue grant received from the Council.	<p>The Committee commented that there was a lack of detail around the potential impact on APPCT as a result of the proposed reduction in grant funding.</p> <p>The Committee were particularly concerned that the reduction would impact some of the Trust's outreach work as well its ability to provide free access to community events and inclusive exhibitions. The Committee were also concerned about any reduction in events and exhibitions that were disability friendly.</p>	Yes

			The Committee requested that Cabinet provide assurance that conversations were taking place with the Palace to mitigate the concerns outlined above.	
YC06	Re-imagining Libraries	<p>The Committee would like further information about where the savings would come from, given the commitment that the number of libraries and existing opening times would be maintained</p> <p>The Committee would also like clarification about what the term co-ordinated opening hours meant and whether libraries would be unstaffed, for example.</p>	<p>The Committee raised some concerns about the viability and deliverability of some of the schemes set out in this proposal and would like assurance that the proposed activities were sustainable and there was a demand for them. The Committee feels strongly that the Council needs to retain libraries and to protect their core function as a library.</p> <p>Where it is proposed to generate additional revenue by creating and letting workspaces, local start-ups and community and voluntary groups should be given priority with concessionary rates where possible.</p> <p>The Committee would like Cabinet commitment and engagement for further scrutiny work to take place around this proposal and the future service offer in libraries.</p>	Yes
YC07	Extending FOBO approach across Council Services		OSC have followed the journey of FOBO/Community First closely and emphasise that we would not like to see an improved service offer for some residents coming at the expense of other groups. Particularly in terms of those that do not use information technology or have complex or urgent needs.	Yes

YC12	Capitalisation of IT infrastructure staff.	The Committee requested further information on the figures presented in relation to this proposal. In particular, the Committee sought clarification on the discrepancy between the estimated £416k staff cost savings from capitalisation and the £345k figure outlined in the financial benefits summary section of this saving.		No
------	--	--	--	----