

Appendix 11 - Budget Scrutiny Recommendations

Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Recommendation	Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No)	Director Response
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	This savings proposal is linked to a proposed capital budget for Northumberland Park, to be targeted at investments in the station and the area around the estate, as an overarching approach to estate improvements is developed. The new capital budget will now provide for some costs previously charged to revenue. It is not proposed that there are any reductions in the number of staff, including engagement officers, in the North Tottenham team as part of this proposal.
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>	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.	Yes	<p>Outdoor Media comprises a variety of types.</p> <p>Street screens are part of an exclusive contract with Clear Channel which has seen in 2019 the replacement of paper backlit screens (which have been located along the Wood Green High Road for the last 20+ years) by digital screens. Fewer digital screens are installed as media can be changed frequently so offering access to more advertisers.</p> <p>The content of the advertisements is controlled by a policy that is incorporated</p>

					<p>into the contract to enable the Council to utilise the technology for its own messages and to control the type of advertisement to prevent unacceptable advertisements as well as preventing the promotion of unhealthy foods and beverages.</p> <p>It is intended that larger billboard and other property-based opportunities' advertising is subject to a concessions contract tender to be placed in the near future. As such no sites are identified except for a single paper billboard site that already exists near the Leaside Industrial Estate. The successful tenderer(s) would need to identify potential sites and obtain town planning consent. The content of advertisements would be controlled by the policy that is already in use for street screens, although it may be updated to reflect the larger sizes and impact of the installations.</p> <p>The relevant policy has been sent to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.</p>
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	Yes	<p>The Council will always be cautious, and the types/locations used for this purpose.</p> <p>The commercial portfolio includes a small number of roof top aerial and mast locations on rooftops across the Borough to provide 4G communications, which</p>

			<p>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.</p>		<p>have been in place for several decades with 2 and 3G in earlier years.</p> <p>Small cell relays are also installed on lamp posts under a contract with Arqiva that is now in its fifth year of ten.</p> <p>It is proposed that a tender will be issued in the near future to enable the future 5G technology to be available across Haringey as part of the Borough Plan for economic growth and connected communities. LSH has been appointed to review existing licences for access to rooftops for aerials and masts to enable 4G communications. In addition, they have been asked to advise the Council on a digital policy which will address historic health fears and establish a methodology to secure better communications across the Borough.</p> <p>This technology will be across some of the Council's buildings but predominantly across the street assets as 5G requires closer spacing of relays due to the shorter distance capability of the 5G signal.</p>
Various	HRA		<p>Concerns were expressed about additional charges being added to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) which is under pressure and</p>	Yes	<p>The proposed new recharges to the Housing Revenue Account fall into two separate categories. The first relates to the work of the Carbon Management team, where it is proposed that the HRA</p>

			<p>that movements of cost from the General Fund to the HRA risks delaying repairs and improvements to the communal areas of housing estates.</p> <p>The Committee requested clarity on what is being proposed in relation to the additional charges added to the Housing Revenue Account</p>		<p>be recharged for the work on the renewing the district heating network at Broadwater Farm, and to support the best possible energy performance in the emerging Council housing development programme. The second relates to the work of the Regeneration team, where it is proposed that the HRA be recharged for work on improvements to existing Council housing estates, and to support the Council housing development programme by bringing forward large and complex sites. The emerging HRA business plan absorbs these costs without putting any pressure on current or future plans to maintain and improve Council housing stock</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Environment and Community Safety Panel – Place Priority					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Director Response
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.	Yes	<p>PL01:</p> <p>The proposed Selective Licence scheme will bring in a significant investment in resources to regulate and support the Private Rented Sector.</p> <p>The proposal is for a Selective Licensing fee of £600 and assumes 60% of the Borough will be licenced. Whilst there is further work to be done given previous work and the proliferation of PRS in the borough it would be likely that 60% threshold could be reached. The proposal is subject to consultation, Cabinet approval and Secretary of States approval.</p> <p>Saving relate to existing costs of established positions, the savings will be met from a reduction of core staffing funding gross budget in 2021/22.</p> <p>Initially the scheme will see an additional member of staff to ensure compliance and administration in the first year of the scheme.</p>

				<p>In line with policy, we will maximise the use of additional fee income recharges against ancillary services, overheads, training costs during service delivery.</p> <p>The five-year scheme will have an additional Enforcement Officer over the 5 years which is an investment in Enforcement staff.</p> <p>The team will use its experience from the additional Licencing scheme and intelligence models to identify and properties which require a licence to ensure that income levels are brought in over the 5-year period.</p> <p>All surplus income generated from the scheme needs to be ring fenced for housing improvement objectives.</p> <p>PL03</p> <p>This enforcement while important to residents is relatively new and has been secondary to parking and other traffic violation i.e. bus lanes and yellow box junctions. We are now focusing on the enforcement of weight restrictions and the estimated income levels may be exceeded</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>or may require additional capital investment as the programme roll outs.</p> <p>We are also working with neighbouring boroughs whom have rolled out similar projects to identify best practise.</p>
PL6	Contract Centre Efficiencies		<p>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.</p>	Yes	<p>The Veolia Contact Centre consistently provides high standards of call handling and customer response. 93% of calls are answered within 30 seconds. The average call time is two and a half minutes. Less than 1% of calls are dropped.</p> <p>Customers increasingly want to access services via electronic media such as web and app delivery. The Our Haringey app is the most common source of reporting for street cleansing issues and enquiries. 75% of street cleansing reports are made via the app with email and telephone contact accounting for 13% and 8% respectively. The remaining contacts are via twitter, web form or other media. Telephone is a more popular route for reporting missed collections. There is scope to make this simpler to report on line. We have invested in web enabled subscriptions including direct debits for charged services such as garden waste. This trend is expected to continue rather than diminish and more of</p>

					<p>our services will be designed for electronic delivery. We will always retain telephone contact for those customers that require it but increasingly this is becoming a smaller part of our business. As we increase use of electronic media and e-forms our back office processing and data entry requirements diminish.</p> <p>Given the significant lead in to the proposed savings we would expect to manage the savings through natural staff turnover rather than redundancy.</p>
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	Noted
PL13	EV Charging	The Panel requested that Cabinet provide assurances of how the additional roll out of EV charging points would be communicated	The Panel broadly welcomed proposals to increase the number of Electric Vehicle charging points across the Borough	No	Noted

		<p>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>(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>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

Children and Young People's Panel – Children's Services					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Director Response
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	Noted
120	Children's Services Estate - Capital Maintenance		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	No	Noted

			<p>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 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, 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</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>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>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Adults & Health Scrutiny Panel					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Recommendation	Cabinet Response Required (Yes/No)	Director Response
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	<p>The concerns of the scrutiny committee are noted. Implementation of savings is from 2021 onwards and we will work to ensure any negative impacts on outcomes are mitigated.</p> <p>Scrutiny can receive reports on performance and public health targets such as smoking prevalence as requested.</p>
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"> - Why has the Capital cost of the Osborne Grove proposals had quadrupled to around £30m since the original proposals? - What projections have been made about the expected demand in the market given the financial risks associated by unused places in future years? 	<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	<p>Cabinet welcomes the interest of Adults and Health Scrutiny Panel in the exciting redevelopment of Osborne Grove Nursing Home which will enable in-borough provision of nursing care in future years.</p> <p>The Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group have been working together on demand for nursing care for Haringey. In addition, the Council is working closely</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How does the projected build cost per bed compare with other similar new care homes? - What is the current number of clients and estimated cost of care for the current financial year for out of borough placements due to the unavailability of space at Osborne Grove? 			<p>with the four other boroughs in North Central London (NCL) to ensure stronger working on capacity, demand and quality improvement across nursing care. Across both strands, there remains a strong case for in-borough nursing care and for safeguarding nursing care provision within the NCL area.</p> <p>Cabinet would welcome OSC reviewing how the new Osborne Grove facility is operating once open.</p>
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"> a) As further information becomes available for each of the capital programmes 	Yes	<p>Cabinet supports the continued focus on developing the Council's capital assets and on ensuring alignment of the capital and revenue investment and spend across Adults and Health.</p> <p>The capital programme is a financial framework.</p> <p>Information on individual business cases will go through the normal governance processes and those which relate to key</p>

			<p>this is provided to the Panel for further scrutiny via the Panel's budget monitoring reports throughout the year.</p> <p>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'.</p>		<p>decisions will normally go through Cabinet, therefore OSC will have the opportunity to receive and understand these as and when the schemes reach this stage.</p>
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 & Health budget in 2020/21 (and subsequent years) as compared to the previous year. Information that would be required for this purpose includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - changes to the budget caused by 'policy growth', e.g. changes resulting from the London Living Wage. - changes to the budget caused by 'demographic growth' - additional funds originating from internal Council sources such as 	Yes	<p>Cabinet recognises that scrutiny of the budget proposals is an important part of the annual Budget development process. Cabinet welcomes the constructive feedback provided.</p> <p>The draft Cabinet report produced in December provides the detailed information regarding proposed changes to Service budgets and this will be provided to Panels / Committee in the future along with the detail of savings and capital expenditure agreed in prior years' processes.</p>

			<p>reserves being used to mitigate any budget gap.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - additional funds originating from external Council sources such as government grants. - additional funds originating from the Adult Social Care precept. <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"> 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. b) In addition to the details of new savings proposals, all Scrutiny Panels should be provided with their relevant section of the MTFs Savings Tracker to enable them to monitor ongoing savings proposals that were 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>submitted to that Scrutiny Panel in previous years but that take effect during any relevant years that the Panel is scrutinising.¹</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 & 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	The 2020/21 Budget and 2020-2025 MTFS report clearly acknowledges the risk to the MTFS of grant changes beyond 2020/21. Close attention will continue to be paid to this over the coming months and any resultant impact on the MTFS for 2021/22 and beyond will be addressed in future Budget updates.

¹ A recent version of the MTFS Savings Tracker was provided in the Cabinet agenda papers for its meeting on 10th 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 ²	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	n.b. this Recommendation appears to be in relation to in year budget monitoring rather than scrutiny of the 2020/21 Budget / MTFS proposals. This will be addressed as part of the regular Budget updates to Cabinet

² 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.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Your Council					
Ref	MTFS Proposal	Further info requested by the Panel (if appropriate)	Comments/Recommendation	Cabinet Response Req'd (Yes/No)	Director Response
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	<p>In the absence of the London Counter Fraud Hub (LCFH) going ahead, the Audit team will use the National Fraud Initiative (NFI) to deliver the £50k income identified in the savings proposal. The Audit team have already carried out detailed work using the NFI, and although the NFI is not as precise as the LCFH, the NFI will deliver the additional income.</p> <p>Discussions around the model and design of the Fraud Hub are continuing and are likely to evolve. Once these are finalised, the Audit team will seek to maximise the benefits of the technology of the Hub and seek to identify and generate additional income over and above the £50k identified where possible. Delivery of savings will be reported to the Corporate Committee and Cabinet.</p>
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	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.	Yes	The APPCT were first informally notified of the possibility of a reduction in their revenue grant funding more than 12 months ago.

		revenue grant received from the Council.	<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> <p>The Committee requested that Cabinet provide assurance that conversations were taking place with the Palace to mitigate the concerns outlined above.</p>		<p>It is recognised that the Chief Executive of APPCT has written to advise "<i>Whilst we fully understand the pressures that the Local Authority is under we feel that the Trust's finances are too fragile and uncertain to absorb and sustain a cut of this size at this time. The Trustee Board therefore would recommend that, if the cut to the Trust's funding cannot be avoided, that it is delayed by at least 12 months</i>". Their response is being provided in full as part of the report to Cabinet and the Council on the outcome of the public consultation on the Council's Budget and MTFs. While noting that the proposed level of funding reduction would consequently increase the level of financial pressure upon the APPCT, they themselves recognise that the revenue grant from the Council has been stable for some years. Given that the Council's level of resources has dropped substantially over that period, which has necessitated cuts in Council services, it is considered that the proposed approach to the APPCT 2020/21 grant is reasonable and that the size of their business should afford them adequate opportunities to mitigate the impact of the grant reduction.</p>
YC06	Re-imagining Libraries	The Committee would like further information about where the savings would come from, given the commitment that the number of libraries and existing	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	Yes	The Cabinet would welcome further OSC scrutiny/engagement on our future service offer from libraries. Cabinet is fully committed to ensuring that library buildings are used to their full capacity.

		<p>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>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>		<p>The figures quoted refer to income generation and are based on circa 60 workspaces calculated on a monthly fee of approx. £100pm for each workspace. Research indicates that other existing providers fees range from £100pm to £350pm depending on location. There have been initial conversations with WimbleTech https://wimbletech.com/ a not for profit organisation delivering workspace provision in libraries in other Boroughs. They are keen to get involved and feel that there is potential. The Highgate Friends group also feel it would be well received there. The proposal utilises spaces, predominantly on the first floor that are not used for the core library function. Therefore, the core library function will not be affected. There is an expectation that improving spaces and with a more proactive approach to marketing will result in an increase in room hire income. There are no plans to change opening hours, or for any of the current open hours to be unstaffed. The term 'coordinated hours' referred to the extended community use/workspace offer.</p>
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	Yes	The Customer First programme will build on the changes the Council has made over the last two years, which have enabled those people who want to connect through online channels to do so and freed up time in traditional channels

			in terms of those that do not use information technology or have complex or urgent needs.		of face-to-face and telephone to ensure those with urgent and complex needs to receive the targeted support they need. This approach has, for example, seen significant reductions in Housing Benefit processing times, which has enabled people with complex cases to receive more thorough support. The approaches developed in the last year will be applied to a broader range of Council services with the explicit aim of freeing up time for more complex and urgent interactions.
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	Noted