

FINANCIAL PLANNING 2008/09 – 2010/11

Cabinet responses to the recommendations made by Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their meetings on 10 & 13 December 2007 and 7 January 2008 to discuss the revenue savings and investment and capital investment options as part of the budget process

| | Recommendation of Overview & Scrutiny | Cabinet response |
|-----------|--|---|
| A. | Revenue | |
| | Government Grant Settlement | |
| 1. | That the Cabinet continue to press the case for a more favourable settlement for Haringey with appropriate Government Ministers and to seek the support of local MP's. | Agreed – the Council will continue its dialogue with the government pressing for an improved settlement. The Leader has written to the Minister in formal response to the draft grant settlement and copied this to local MPs David Lammy and Lynne Featherstone. Particular attention was drawn to the inequitable area cost adjustment in the funding formula and population projections. |
| | Children & Young People | |
| 2. | That the Cabinet propose a corporate review on its transport provision. | Agreed – the report to be brought back to Scrutiny in 2008. |
| 3. | That the Cabinet defer the £125k efficiency saving identified in respect of the integration of services as the Children's networks develop until financial year 2009/10. | Agreed. |
| | Leisure, Culture & Lifelong Learning | |
| 4. | That Haringey staff and non residents should be charged the full premium rate for their Leisure cards | Agreed – the concurrent report on this agenda deals with this issue and others in the pricing policy review. |
| 5. | That the Cabinet do not accept the £35k new revenue saving attached to the capital bid for Parks R&M (Greenflags). | Agreed. This saving was dependent on a high level of capital investment, which is not possible. This revenue saving proposal of £35k has been removed. |
| | Adult, Social Care & Wellbeing | |
| 6. | That the cabinet set a more rigorous target that £400k over 3 years in relation to the move to a more commissioned based approach. | Agreed. The service will be asked to reassess this proposal in consultation with Corporate Procurement as the approach progresses, however, currently the target saving is included as |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | proposed. |
| Housing | | |
| 7. | That the Cabinet set a limit on the number of temporary staff held against permanent posts. | It is not necessarily appropriate to set limits, however, it is something that is monitored in detail on a regular basis and the service is achieving a current downward trend. |
| Environment | | |
| 8. | (1) That the Cabinet set a more challenging savings target resulting from the letting of a new integrated waste management and transport contract and (2) that the cabinet support a 2008/09 bid for additional repairs to the Borough's roads. | (1) Not agreed – the proposed saving is felt to be at a prudent level, given that the procurement option has not yet been selected, however, this will be kept under review. (2) Agreed. A new investment proposal is now included for an additional £200k annual revenue budget for pot-hole repairs across the borough. |
| Community Cohesion & Involvement | | |
| 9. | That the Cabinet delay the efficiencies to Neighbourhood Management until the grant funding position was clear. | Not agreed. This service is only partly funded by grant and it is agreed that all areas of the council should be subject to finding efficiencies. The Area Based Grant allocations are currently being considered, but the overall position is that there is only a small reduction in the total grant. The Theme Board and HSP will make the final decision on funding at project level. |
| 10. | That the Cabinet obtain an estimate from an external advertising agency of the likely advertising income that might be accrued from selling space in Haringey People. | Agreed - but not before approval of the Council to the proposed saving from this initiative. The information will help achieve the agreed saving going forward. |
| Leader of the Council | | |
| 11. | That the Cabinet bring forward the staffing efficiency savings identified for Legal in 2009/10. | Not agreed – the saving is not felt to be achievable before 2009/10. |
| Resources | | |
| 12. | That the investment proposal of £65k in respect of Lymington Avenue be recouped as part of the regeneration of that site. | This is a revenue budget adjustment for lost income as a number of properties are being held vacant to facilitate the development. It is expected that this will be more than recouped by the capital receipt from |

| | | |
|-----------|--|---|
| | | the disposal however this cannot be treated as revenue. |
| 13. | That the Cabinet commission a council-wide energy audit. | Agreed – a number of activities are in place in relation to the green agenda and this will form part of a wider report for consideration on this subject. |
| 14. | That the Cabinet Member for Resources report back to the O&S Committee in February 2008 to identify where the Achieving Excellence specific £5m of savings will be made. | Agreed. A report is due to come to Cabinet on this issue in February 2008 so it could follow soon after. |
| B. | Capital | |
| | Supported Capital Bids | |
| 15. | Street Lighting – bid £9m The committee would, however, question the level of investment proposed and would propose a lesser amount. It would also like to know if there are any revenue or service implications e.g. saving on power, safer streets. | Agreed – the Cabinet will be supporting £1m p.a. (£3m over the planning period), which is higher than the current £0.75m pa. |
| 16. | Thermal Efficiency - £175k The committee would, however, question the level of investment proposed and would propose a lesser amount. It would also like to know if there are any revenue or service implications. | Agreed – but the Cabinet will be supporting the bid in full. |
| 17. | Borough Roads and Footways – bid £10.5m The committee would, however, question the level of investment proposed and would propose a lesser amount. | Agreed - the Cabinet will be supporting £1.7m p.a. (£5.1m over the planning period), which is higher than the current £1.4m pa. |
| 18. | Flood Relief – bid £4.5m The committee question the need for the level of investment proposed and consider it inappropriate to spend at the proposed sum in | Agreed - the Cabinet will be supporting £300k p.a. (£900k over the planning period). Currently there is no allocated budget to this. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | year 2008/09. | |
| 19. | Strategic Renewal of Leisure Centres – bid £2.003m | Agreed. |
| 20. | Belmont Recreation Ground £150k and Stationers Park Fort £190k Agreed in principle but the Committee would like to see if a greater percentage of match funding could be achieved. | Agreed. Cabinet are rejecting the bid but support the view that full alternative sources of funding should be sought. |
| 21. | Bury Road Car Park £450k The committee was strongly of the view that local shops, who would benefit as a result of this investment should be requested to make a contribution. | Cabinet are rejecting the bid but support the view that local shops should contribute to the funding of this project. |
| 22. | Energy Management £150k The committee would however like to see revenue budget savings of the measures to be introduced. | Cabinet are rejecting the bid but support the view that a business case should be put through the sustainable investment fund and should deliver revenue budget savings |
| 23. | Payment Kiosks £120k | Agreed. |
| 24. | Contribution to BSF Programme £2m | Agreed. |
| Bids not supported or not deemed of sufficient priority | | |
| 25. | Major Works Voids (HRA) £400k and Major Works Voids, Conversions and Extensions (Part 2) (HRA) £1.0m The committee was of the opinion that there should be one bid with a rigorous business case provided in support. | Not agreed - the Cabinet believe that there is sufficient need and benefit for these investment bids, however the need for the provision of a rigorous business case is supported. |
| 26. | Commingled Recycling Bring Sites £340k | Not agreed – the Cabinet feel that this meets an important Council priority and should be supported. |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| | The committee was not convinced of the need identified. | |
| 27. | Burial Village at all cemeteries £1.624m The committee thought this item should be self financing and not subsidised by the Council. | Agreed in part – in that the Cabinet feel that additional external funding should be sought but that a Council investment of £800k is appropriate. |
| 28. | Upgrade to Civica £60k and Authority Traffic Upgrade to Civica £150k These should be funded from within the requested resource for the IT Capital Programme | Agreed. |
| 29. | Council Office Recycling £250k The case presented did not convince the Committee. | Not agreed – the Cabinet feel that this meets an important Council priority and should be supported. |
| 30. | Open Space Improvement Programme £1.5m This is in addition to the current spending of £250k per year on improvements. The case presented did not convince the Committee | Agreed in part – in that the Cabinet are prepared to support £250k p.a. (£750k over the planning period). |
| 31. | Private Sector Housing Activity £1.5m The case presented did not convince the Committee | Not agreed – the Cabinet feel there is a significant need for this investment. The proposal is however to be re-profiled over the three year planning period. Grants and loans will be registered as a charge on the property to be recovered when sold. |
| 32. | Single Business Account £300k Need to consider the possibility of joint working opportunities. The case presented did not convince the Committee | Agreed. |
| 33. | IT Capital Programme £9.452 | The Cabinet will be supporting a Corporate IT capital programme of |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>The committee did not have sufficient information to form an opinion. The Committee agreed, however, that the current proposed methodology for approving individual bids by judging each proposal on its own merits as appropriate. Additionally, the Committee felt that individual IT proposals should have a 5 year payback period.</p> | <p>£4.8m over the planning period and a clear business case for individual projects will be a requisite. A more detailed list of the bids as considered by Cabinet in September are attached at appendix H2.</p> |
|--|---|--|