

Stage 1 Consultation Report Early Years Education in Haringey: Residents' Response

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Purpose | The government is proposing to change the way early years education for all 3 & 4 year old children is funding |
| Summary of responses | <p>Residents responses:</p> <p>Qu.1 Residents were asked to give their views on the proposal of the council removing their involvement in the delivery of school based provision allowing schools to determine their own fee levels. The main responses included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 18% comments agreed with schools being able to set their own fees 2. 38% comments were received expressing their views that they wanted the fees to remain. With 17% comments suggesting that the fees should remain the same for existing parents and increase only for new parents applying. 3. 16% comments indicated that if schools were tasked with setting their own fees then there should be an independent regulator / standardised approach to ensure that the standards & quality of the provision matches the cost. As some residents were concerned that settings would increase their prices but not improve their standards or the services they offer. 4. 21% comments expressed concerns that proposed changes would not provide sufficient time for the settings to implement changes to fees. 5. 2% respondent stated that they would be happy with potential increase to fees if this enabled support for lower waged families. 6. 10% comments highlighted concerns that if settings were able to set their own fees, then the cost of child care provision would be determined by their place of residence, therefore settings in Muswell Hill could see a dramatic increase in fees to match other private providers in the local area. 7. 7% comments expressed that they were happy with the proposal of the council removing their involvement in fee levels. <p>Qu2. Residents were asked to give their views on replacing the single fee structure with a new structure where fees are different from setting to setting. The main responses included;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 33% of comments disagreed with the proposal of fees differing from setting to setting, as they highlighted that this would increase the divide between rich and poor families. Comments also included concerns that settings would not be prepared to implement these changes. With some respondents expressing concerns that this would result in fees increasing and creating an unsustainable environment for settings. 2. 6% of comments seemed to be neutral about changing the fees structure, but suggested that there needs to be clear difference between settings, with an |

improvement to the provision and quality of the settings.

3. 6% comments were in agreement with a new fee structure that was selected by the providers.
4. 23% comments agreed with the proposal of differing fees across settings. Highlighting that for this to work settings would need support from the council and sufficient time to implement, including regulations to ensure that settings meet the correct standards.
5. 2% comment suggested that the fees should remain the same across settings but differ by age group.
6. 2% comment stated **that they don't know.**
7. 8% **comments expressed that they didn't agree with the new structure, but** stated that if subsidy was removed then the new structure would be the only option, but they expressed their concerns that sufficient support was provided to vulnerable families.
8. 2% comment suggested that pay should be according to the age of the child or the number of children per family.

Qu3a. Residents were asked if they thought that the amount of childcare fees they pay school be according to their level of income. The response was;

- 32% Agreed
- 32% Disagreed
- 26% Were not sure
- 10% Didn't give a response

Qu4a Residents were asked if they thought that the amount of childcare fees they pay should differ according to whether they lived in the borough or were a resident outside of the borough. The response;

- 39% Agreed
- 26% Disagreed
- 26% Were not sure
- 9% Didn't give a response

Qu5a. Residents were asked what their thoughts were on having a flat fee. The response was;

- 37% Agree
- 26% Disagree
- 31% Were not sure
- 6% Didn't give a response

Qu6a. Residents were asked what their thoughts were on having a sliding scale fees. The response was;

- 40% Agree
- 34% Disagree
- 19% Were not sure

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7% Didn't give a response <p>Questions 7-9 asked residents about their household income, and their weekly or monthly earnings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 69% of the respondents had an annual household income of £35,000 or more (18% stated their income was between 35 and 50K; 16% between 50k and 66K, 24% between 66 and 99K and 7% over 100K) • 18% of the respondents had an household income of between £16,901 and £35,000 (8% stating their income was in the lower income bracket of £16,901 and £25,000) • Only 3% had an income below £16,900 • 7% left the answer blank. <p>Qu10. Residents were asked to indicate how much, based on their income they could afford to pay per week for full-time childcare.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 43% could pay between £150-£224 - 18% could pay between £250-£299 - 3% could pay between £300-£374 - 2 could pay between £375-£450 - 11% selected other - 22% Didn't provide a response |
| <p>Council's response</p> | <p>Haringey Council Officers have carefully considered the results of the consultation and are working with the maintained sector to ensure measures are in place to support the changes in funding.</p> |

Appendix 1 – Stage 1 Providers Consultation conclusion



| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Who was consulted | Local Haringey Residents, Early Years Education providers (childminders, nursery school), Governors, |
| Methodology | Online survey, internet, websites, emails, engagement sessions |
| Engagement sessions | <p>As part of the consultation we planned and delivered ten face to face engagement sessions covering locations across the borough and including two weekend sessions. The face –to-face engagement started on 24th October and ended on the 10th December 2016.</p> <p>During these sessions we have spoken to a total of 85 residents who were parents of children under the age of 5.</p> |
| Conclusion | <p>The income profile of respondents indicates that the largest majority of responses were from working families using local childcare services. A similar percentage of respondents were families on middle income (34%) and families on higher income (31%). However only 7% were families that earned above 100k. This is in line with the local authority’s current data on average household income of families using maintained childcare and provides an indication on the trend of potential entitlement for 30 hours free childcare.</p> <p>The greatest majority of respondents indicated that they would be able to pay fees between £150 -299 per week for their full time childcare (61.5%) – this is in line with both current maintained sector fees and the average childcare fees in the borough. It has to be noted that 43.5% selected fees at the lower end of the possible brackets (between £150 and £224 per week). Only 4.6% of respondents stated they could afford fees above £300 a week; however 22.5% left this question blank.</p> <p>The responses of residents to the questionnaire and the feedback collected during the engagement sessions clearly highlighted residents’ concerns about potential fee increases which would cause greater financial pressure on families. This is in line with the outcomes of the recent Childcare Sufficiency Assessment (CSA 2015) in terms of parental concerns on the affordability of childcare.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised about the impact the changes could have on accessing good quality provision, particularly in relation to having different fee structures and levels and supporting vulnerable children.</p> <p>Opinions on linking fees to earnings were split with the same percentage of respondents in favour and against this option and 36% unsure or not responding.</p> <p>More respondents agreed than disagreed with the proposal to have different fees for families living out of borough, with a significant percentage being unsure.</p> <p>Respondents had similar views on having a flat or a sliding scale fee structure, however many more (31%) were unsure about having a flat fee structure than those unsure about introducing a sliding scale (19%). This seems to indicate that the respondents in the main favoured a sliding scale fee structure.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| What happens next | Your feedback and the results of both the stage 1 and stage 2 consultations will be submitted to the Cabinet. The Cabinet will make a final decision on how to move forward with the new government changes. We will publish the final decision in March 2017. |
| Dates of consultation: | 20 th Oct - 18 th Dec 2016 |

Appendix 1b Stage 1 Consultation – Funding Early Years Education in Haringey Residents’ online comments

Residents were asked to give their views on the proposal of the council removing their involvement in the delivery of school based provision allowing schools to determine their own fee levels.

| |
|---|
| <p>Unsure, however if there is to be a significant increase in fees it should be frozen for existing parents and used for new children who join after 1 April 2017. My child currently attends one of the settings, previously I used a PVI which was almost 80% more expensive, and spent 70% of my salary on childcare. I ended up resorting to payday lenders due to the high cost of childcare (<i>sic!</i>) for one child aged 3, and I had intended to resign from work. However I received a place which has enabled me to continue working. I am concerned that next year there are several Central (<i>sic!</i>) Government policies which will impact upon costs passed to residents, these are 100% business rates that local authorities will be managing. And the forthcoming Housing and Planning Act which includes a bill to be paid from the sale of council housing stock. All of these policies impact upon one another. It is vital that childcare costs are kept at the current rate to ensure parents are able to work. Living in a middle class area, and being working class it is great for all children to have the opportunity to integrate from all socio-economic and diverse backgrounds.</p> |
| <p>Ridiculous. UK is one of the country with the most expensive childcare (<i>sic!</i>) in the world, and the government (<i>sic!</i>) instead of helping people with that is making families with young children to struggle more and more.</p> |
| <p>I would like a continued supplement funding for my child's provider in Muswell Hill.</p> |
| <p>I feel that the school should take on the responsibility of setting the fees as they are more aware of the community and the affordability of each family. Education should be accessible for all children within the borough</p> |
| <p>I have none</p> |
| <p>My concern is that the removal of local authority funding in April 2017 completely, with no indication of when funding from the government will be received by the Nursery School will put them in a position that they will have a deficit whilst the new suggested formula is processed. The shortfall may result in withdrawal of certain services or childcare.</p> |
| <p>I like the idea of school's being able to set their own fee as this will encourage competitive rates whilst other</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>providers who can offer different hours still have the same base rate.</p> |
| <p>Proposal 1 would only be acceptable if parents/carers were given a say as to what was being taught/delivered to their children. For example, if fees at our centre were to increase there would need to be a much higher standard of instruction and daily activities. At the moment, I do not believe that my son's individual strengths are being addressed and we are supplementing his skills at home. It would be disappointing to pay more for the same level of service. Additionally, other nurseries that his father and I looked at before deciding to send our son close to home, cost more per day however, they provided more activities and day to day documentation of what each child was doing as well as longer hours of service. Not to mention they provide all formula and healthy meals - at times our son's meals are questionable, wedges are not a good choice for tea.</p> |
| <p>If schools can set their own fees, we will start seeing the most popular schools charging more and pricing less well off families out which goes against everything early year education is about: giving an equal chance to all children. There should be a maximum fee, set by the government or the local authority, above which a school cannot go.</p> |
| <p>The timing seems unnecessarily tight for schools and nurseries to implement in a way that is acceptable and affordable and does not increase inequalities in the borough. If the council plan to remove childcare subsidies, then i believe the council should allow schools and nurseries to determine fees that allow lower income families to access childcare.</p> |
| <p>It seems to me that it's incredibly short notice to expect children's centres to make the necessary adjustments by April 2017. This really does not offer the centres, nor the parents, the time to prepare for the funding changes.</p> |
| <p>I believe, if schools have to manage their own fees it will create discrimination amongst families and communities whether only financial circumstances have been taken into consideration, this means only who can afford can access early learning for their child/children.</p> |
| <p>Irrespective, it seems important that the subsidy not be removed from the budgets. While I agree with Giving control to individual schools, it will be counterproductive for relationships if it is immediately followed by an unavoidable increase in charges.</p> |
| <p>Why the local authority will only continue to manage 4 locations, not all within the council? I am concerned about validation of fees - who would validate the fee structure is reasonable?</p> |
| <p>I strongly disagree with this. I think the council should continue to subsidise childcare so that lower income families can afford to attend the nurseries that have until now subsidised their fees. If you remove the subsidies, and allow nurseries to set their own fee levels, those families will no longer be able to afford to attend the nurseries.</p> |
| <p>I am absolutely against any changes to the current organisation and subsidy of the services. I have been very impressed with the way that the Council delivers The Woodlands Park Nursery service. There is a good mixture of people from different backgrounds and I am worried that any changes to the funding and fees would negatively affect the balance of diversity and community.</p> |
| <p>I think that a standardised fee structure is a good way to reduce bureaucracy and administrative costs for settings, however it does not take into account whether or not parents could pay more for services. I would be happy to pay a little more, knowing that a lower fee was being given to a family where the parents were working but on low income.</p> |
| <p>Terrible idea as a working mother I would be unable to afford childcare if fees were increased which would be likely and would mean that I couldn't work and my children wouldn't benefit from the amazing resources at</p> |

| |
|--|
| Woodlands Park. |
| If the childcare subsidy is removed in its entirety, then schools should be able to determine their own fee levels. However, if the subsidy is going to be removed from April 2017, then this wouldn't give schools anywhere near enough time to be able to plan for any fee structure etc that they might put in place. |
| Understand their point of view and many valid points but hope if this will come into effect it won't mean that you will be charged based on location -e.g. paying more in Muswell Hill although quality is not good - etc |
| Childcare in the UK and especially London is already extremely costly. As a result, a large percentage of mothers, in particular, cannot return to employment after they've had children, resulting to millions of pounds of losses to the UK economy. As a parent I felt relief when my child reached the age of three giving us access to slightly more affordable childcare though 15 free hours and excellent but affordable nurseries such as Woodlands Park. The proposal would certainly result to more expensive childcare provision at the same time that the Government is pledging to support working parents more. How is this viable? We, parents in Haringey, are already pushed to breaking point, please do not put further pressure on us through increasing childcare costs! |
| The fee could increase dramatically in the area making it difficult for single parents or parents where only 1 parent works difficult to afford. It will also make it harder for less privileged children to attend. Haringey is going through high gentrification - only the wealthy could afford to go. |
| This is not a fair way to offer childcare in the borough. The same type of place should be offered at the same cost. The same caliber (<i>sic!</i>) of staff should be available at each setting. And the children's centers (<i>sic!</i>) need continued support and funding from the council. Further it is the regulation offered in govt nurseries that makes them appeal - in terms of how they operate. |
| Does this mean schools will effectively be privatised? That doesn't seem like a good idea, and will be unaffordable for a lot of people in my area. |
| I feel this is a very negative development for local families. Quality childcare is already so difficult to find and competitive. By introducing the ability for better nurseries to charge more, the advantages goes to those children from more affluent homes right from the start of their lives, furthering inequality from the outset. The council setting the fees at least keeps a more level playing field. Removing the subsidy (<i>sic!</i>) also means that child care costs, which are already a struggle for so many working families, goes up even further, making it even less viable. |
| The evidence is extremely strong that high quality education for children under 5 has enormous long term benefits, especially for the economically disadvantaged. There is also huge evidence to support the long term benefits to families of having parents in work. The cut you propose will lead to a rise in fees for parents. This will mean some can no longer afford to work, as the costs of childcare will be too high. Inevitably, the losers in this will be economically disadvantaged children. I strongly support the maintenance of existing funding to early years settings. |
| This is absolutely not a good idea. Children centres and nurseries are struggling enough as it is and this will only open the fee structure to abuse and put some nurseries at risk. Parents struggle enough as it is with exorbitant childcare fees. Parents were promised 30 hours of free childcare for 3 year olds by the current government by September this year... I wonder where this promise has gone... |
| I prefer a standardised approach. If a setting has the ability to reduce costs, this can then be passed on to a setting that needs support with costs. Collective responsibility is the way to ensure a fair opportunity for all of our children. |

As far as I am aware, the Council is not actually asking for our views on the removal, or the timing of the removal, of the childcare subsidy. The consultation simply says that it is going to happen. It seems that the council has made this decision without consultation and has given the childcare providers very little time to respond or come up with an alternative plan. There is a dearth of affordable childcare for working parents. It seems that the proposal will make childcare more expensive and difficult for parents. Personally this will have a huge effect, as I was recently made redundant and have found childcare for my now lower paid freelance work difficult to afford. This proposal will affect the fees of a great, affordable childcare provider (Woodlands Park). It will have a detrimental effect on children and their parents wellbeing. Personally it will make it harder for me to work and provide for my family.

I am very concerned about the impact of these changes on the fees for nursery places in Haringey. Reading this consultation I understand that the changes are being driven by central government but it is concerning that the Council is not actually asking for views on the removal, or the timing of the removal, of the childcare subsidy. Haringey council should be working hard with other councils across the country to raise major concerns about this short sighted policy and publicly resist the ideological cuts that are hitting our public services. I am opposed to the removal of the subsidy. At the very least the council should allow a longer time frame (at least September 2018) for the removal of the subsidy and ring fence funding to support lower income families to access nursery places.

Firstly I am shocked at these proposals to remove (*sic!*) the childcare subsidy, which is one of the few ways I feel the council and government offer proper support to those returning to work after having children. Without this funding, many families would find it much more of a struggle financially to make going back to work worthwhile. I am however uncertain as to when the funding for an additional 15 hours of free childcare will come into place. As far as I'm aware, this is not until September of this year which would leave me in difficulty financially from April until September as the increases to my childcare bill would be significant. For those working full time, clearly the 15 hours of free childcare would have less of an impact if the cost of childcare increases significantly from April. However I do think that if the funding is to be removed then it is important that schools are able to determine their own fee levels.

Firstly I think it needs to be stated that it is deeply concerning that parents and residents have not even been consulted on whether early years funding should actually be cut. Any cuts in the early years sector have profoundly damning short and long term ramifications for our children, families and the community as a whole. Early years education and care needs to be available to all sections of society as every child deserves the opportunity to be happy, healthy and get the best possible start in life, the future starts here. The suggested cuts are HUGE. By removing any sum - let alone such a huge figure as suggested - will destroy these opportunities and harm our children and future generations. Early learning and early intervention are key to our children's development and the foundation of the community. Woodlands and our other children's centres are the backbone for so many people and has created and helped an amazingly mixed and diverse community flourish. It offers so many pivotal services and the suggested cuts would severely damage the community. The other point I'd like to make here is the timing suggested for the cuts. There is no time for the centre to actually plan and try and make the most of what little funding they may receive. The cuts and the timescale presented is completely alarming. There is no time for the centre to plan, for parents to be informed of fee increases. At least a year is needed to re-organise and re-structure such a huge change in funding. To summarize the cuts are too great and the time in which it has been proposed they be implemented much much too short. If indeed the childcare subsidy is to be removed then it seems that the children's centres would need the ability to set

| |
|--|
| <p>their own fee levels although this would inevitably result in less families being able to access services and an unfair advantage to better off families, thereby damaging our community.</p> |
| <p>I strongly oppose this proposal. This will effect children who benefit greatly from these nurseries at the current level of funding. This is something we should not remove power or funding from as we are just lumping the problems of the present onto the generation of the future and this is wrong. A shameful proposal by a 'so-called' Labour stronghold council.</p> |
| <p>I am not sure what this means if there is a gap between the fees asked by the nursery and the fess covered by the council. who will be asked to pay for it? If it is the parents that will mean that parents and especially the most vulnerable ones such as lone parent and low income working families will be excluded from early years services and surely it will be a case against the care and education of children and social justice.</p> |
| <p>Sound ok</p> |
| <p>It s clear to me the timing of this proposal leaves the 8 nurseries effected very little time to plan for the implementation of a new fee structure. This also leaves families facing sudden and unknown increases to fees at short notice. All of which destabilises the offer of early years' provision in the borough. I would suggest the council delay the removal of the current subsidy until at least September 2017, if not 2018. I would also suggest, under the proposed means-tested fee system, a process for retaining some subsidy for the lowest-earning childcare users is considered.</p> |
| <p>I think this is a good idea.</p> |
| <p>My child is in Woodlands Park Nursery. There are children attending that nursery whose parents would not be able to afford an increase in fees. There are mothers who use the nursery service to enable them to work and have a full life who would not be able to continue to do so should the funding be removed. Families have not been given enough notice to make changes to their financial planning should fees need to rise as early as April 2017. If the subsidy is removed then it seems likely that Woodlands Park would need to have the ability to set their own fees in order to continue to function.</p> |
| <p>I do not think that the child care subsidy should be cut. In the event that it is, it should certainly not be withdrawn so quickly without the childcare providers having time to plan for the new circumstances. The removal of the subsidy should be delayed until September 2018.</p> |
| <p>We believe that the council should focus on the childcare centres that it directly manages, such as Triangle, to maintain a socially responsible, publicly accountable childcare option for Haringey residents.</p> |
| <p>In theory it is a good idea to allow schools to set their own fees, as only each school will know their operating costs. However, I do worry that this will allow schools to become more restrictive and selective: higher fees will reduce the likelihood that poor or average families (unable to receive assistance) can enroll (<i>sic!</i>) their children in quality education.</p> |
| <p>As a resident, parent, and contributor to this borough, both in personal efforts and paid taxes, I very strongly object to the removal of the childcare subsidy for early years provision in the borough. It is essential that children of all backgrounds, disadvantaged and otherwise, are supported in their early development. Withdrawing the subsidy will penalise children. The timing/scheduling of this proposal seems wilfully terrible. No organisation can effect change well in an impossibly short time frame without bad decisions being made and unnecessary damage being done. EXTEND THE TIMEFRAME!! Please!</p> |
| <p>I do feel like it's a good idea to let school governing bodies make their own fees. However I also think it's better to have an independent regulator to make sure fees are not too high or very low. I also think that there will be a great deal of compitition (<i>sic!</i>) between schools for better service and fees. My question though will there be</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>uniformity in the services provided by the schools as the fees varies?</p> |
| <p>There does not seem to be a question about the proposal as a whole to remove the childcare subsidy. It seems a strange decision to take given the outcome of the Government's recent consultation on early years provision and the renewed emphasis on local Government support for early years particularly in deprived areas. From my understanding of this proposal, it was put forward by Haringey before the outcome of the national public consultation. Given that the outcome of that consultation was more positive than had been expected by the Council, I would recommend that Haringey revisits its own proposal. Removing the subsidy will have a huge impact on the types of people able to use these services, making it akin to another private nursery, and without the benefit and opportunity for integration that the council nursery schools provide. Further, the timing to implement the proposal is unfair to parents. Parents with children in these schools signed a contract for the academic year and budgeted on that basis. I have two children at one of the nursery schools and work part time. If the proposal goes ahead, I will have to find a way of paying the additional funds for both children or give up work to stay home with them. As a civil servant, that seems wrong but also it means that there will be many in more difficult financial circumstances than I am in - although not to the extent they would receive completely free childcare - who will be forced to withdraw their children in April. If you are going to bring in this proposal in, it must be phased in gradually, starting at the very earliest in September 2017 and then phased in over the next couple of years. My understanding from the results of the national consultation is that central government is doing something similar, phasing in new proposals for funding from 2019.</p> |
| <p>Woodlands park is the only nursery in the local area with high quality amenities and facilities for children that does not charge extortionate fees. If the council didn't set the fee rate the nursery would likely compete with others in the area and increase prices significantly. This would likely mean that many families could no longer afford to send their children to nursery and many mothers would subsequently have to give up their jobs to take care of the children. This in turn could lead to a rise in applications for social benefit payments.</p> |
| <p>Suddenly removing the childcare subsidy in its entirety will be extremely damaging to nursery schools like Woodlands Park and the families that use them. People have made decisions on their jobs and rents and mortgages based on the current childcare fees. Once you have a place you assume that is it for your child's time there, and that price rises will be small. To hike up prices steeply, without notice, or a timed stepping up period, will be an incredible strain on many families and just make their current situation suddenly completely affordable. It would be an utter scandal. You need to have given families and nursery settings more notice - years not weeks and months. Settings would need more say in their fee structure if subsidies removed or cut back, of course, but this is a difficult conversation for them to have with their families.</p> |
| <p>Is the "nursery" a "school". What does this mean in practice for Woodlands Nursery? That fees will increase? If yes, I'm opposed.</p> |
| <p>The childcare subsidy should not be removed. It is essential for keeping nurseries affordable and with a mixed demographic that doesn't discriminate against people who aren't able to pay. My understanding is that if the childcare subsidy is removed then schools will need the ability to set their own fees in order to survive. But I do not agree with the removal of subsidies.</p> |
| <p>To date I think the councils' involvement in our nursery has been extremely beneficial. We recognise that removal of the subsidy and allowing (<i>sic!</i>) the nursery to set it out their own fee levels will mean fees ago up and that this will be extremely difficult for us. The removal of the childcare subsidy will have a major impact on our household finances and with so little time to plan will be very difficult to manage.</p> |

It concerns me that this may widen the range of quality of childcare available - a defined fee will be levelling the field to an extent. On the other hand the principle makes sense. I would like to know there is a limit on how wide ranging the fees could become though, so that its not possible for example for school A to charge £A and school B to charge 4 x £A.

As I understand, this consultation is not about the whether the childcare subsidy is cut or even when, rather it is a question of how. As a parent of two children, one of whom is still under 5 I would like to have had a say on whether the subsidy should be cut at all, which I believe it should not. Childcare is expensive, especially for people such as ourselves, who although in work do not have a large income. If the cost of childcare were to dramatically increase for our son, we would have to seriously rethink the number of days he could be in nursery (meaning one of us cuts our work hours) or we would have to increase the number of hours we are working. Both of us are working long hours already. From what I understand under the council's proposals my son's nursery would have to have the ability to set their own fees for the childcare services to survive, and this would mean an increase in costs, which would be difficult for us to meet.

I think that fees should probably be charged on a sliding scale basis. However subsidising low income families should not be altered as everyone should be entitled to nursery care not just those who can pay for it. Subsidised places support families to go to work. Subsidised places help children to learn, socialise and achieve. Nursery places help communities to build, friendships to be made, support networks to grow. An utter disgrace that government would propose cuts to the most vulnerable of our society. A poorly thought out, shocking attack on the poor.

Residents were asked to give their views on replacing the single fee structure with a new structure where fees are different from setting to setting:

No increase to remain as is. As will result in 'us' and 'them' settings for eg. (*sic!*) Tottenham vs Crouch End and will widen the disparity between rich and poor. Also having used a PVI , council nurseries would have to up there game to justify the increase. PVI have higher staff ratio, brand new premises, language and dance lessons included, fantastic menus etc, and literally give a 1:1 level of care and service that you expect for the exorbitant fees. Its Harrods style vs Aldi, for eg. now when dropping off or collecting my child I am rarely acknowledged. The council cannot compete and if fees are increased the attitude of staff would have to change. A PVI aim is profit hence there (*sic!*) objective is to deliver high standards. In addition the impact of Brexit has affected the economy. Workers in both the private and public sector, especially public have either had 0% or 1% pay increases. Not advisable to increase, as most families cost childcare as ongoing until a child is 4 years old. Where would families find the additional money? For the current fees to retain, and a 'reserve' fund used to cover additional costs. All settings should have predicted costs for 2017/18, and this will indicate whether there is to be a shortfall. Rather than immediately increasing fees.

To pay according the age of your child or the number of children per family is logical, to pay according your

| |
|--|
| level of incomes is absolutly (<i>sic!</i>) unfair. |
| I would like a continued supplement funding for my child's provider in Muswell Hill. |
| I don't think this is fair. It doesn't take into account the varying levels of income and social economic background of the families and children receiving child care and other services. Let the schools/childcare centres set their own fees |
| Ok |
| The single fee structure seems a fairer system, but if the local authority withdraw their lump sum fees this quickly and it's not yet confirmed if and when the new single fee will be given. My concern is that the nursery school will be in a state of flux with uncertainty of how to proceed with the services they provide. |
| Agree |
| Proposal 2 makes sense if the centre is providing specialised care for many children with SEN or other additional needs. But surely, Haringey council would supplement this as part of a child's local offer? It is unclear to me what additional provisions are being provided at different centres that would warrant different fee structure. That should be clearly communicated with parents before asking if they would be comfortable paying more/less per centre. Also, wouldn't this create inequalities among the centres? Parents would want to send their child to a centre that was providing more services or services even basic for the best price – if they were concerned about fees, which many parents are. I am not opposed to paying more if it is very clear why. |
| It makes sense that the cost should be different per age group, as more staff is required for younger children based on Ofsted rules. However the costs should remain the same across all providers. |
| If the childcare subsidy is removed (which i think is an appalling action for the council to take), I believe this is a good idea to allow a new structure where fees are different from setting to setting. To remove childcare subsidies (<i>sic!</i>) in Haringey will be to the disadvantage of many lower income families who will no longer be able to afford the increased cost of early years education. There is a wealth of evidence that early years education is one of the best equalisers and one of the only interventions that give children from lower income families a chance at escaping the cycle of poverty they often find themselves in. Without it, they already start school behind their peers from richer families and are never able to catch up. Not only that but early years settings provide a platform for ensuring the health and wellbeing of young children, enabling key workers to identify problems or safeguarding issues early. Given Haringey's history with Baby P, I am appalled that the council is considering cutting childcare subsidies and, effectively, removing the benefits of early years education for hundreds of children. |
| The proposal has suggested a change in how fees will be charged, however how those will effect (<i>sic!</i>) the quality of the service and how in practice the fees will change from the current ones have not been mentioned. Will it increase or decrease from the current rate? As a parent of a child under 5, I would like my |

| |
|--|
| child to access early learning without creating a financial distress. |
| This would seem essential to allow for differences between the different sites. |
| If single fee structure is not feasible, why not have several different fee structures that the nurseries should be using - such as by staff level, size of school, etc? |
| I don't think the subsidy should be removed, and if it isn't it wouldn't be necessary to change the fee structure. |
| I am happy with the existing structure and I do not want this to change. I feel that a single fee structure is fair for the area and that the Council should continue to subsidise this vital service. |
| As mentioned I think that a standardised fee across settings is not necessary fair. It does not account that some settings may be dealing with a different more needy demographic than others. However i think settings would not also have the capacity to to put new systems in place to charge whatever they want and process these different payments. |
| Again this would mean an increase in fees and I would not be able to afford it. It would create a divide between nurseries and those who could afford and those that couldn't. |
| If the subsidy is removed, then it seems inevitable that fee structures would have to be different from setting to setting. |
| Fair enough but don't really understand why is this so different from proposal 1 |
| This proposal is unfair and just sets one more 'postcode lottery' type of practice. We want equal access to childcare for all, and this proposal is aiming to achieve the exact opposite -that is, inequality and lack of parity regarding access to childcare for people in the Borough. |
| I think it would be best if the single fee structure is replaced with a new structure where fees are different from setting to setting (this seems fairer). |
| As per question one. This will kit be fair. Although I can understand if a different level of service is offred then perhaps pricing should be different - ie more flexible/longer hours |
| Don't know |
| I feel it is wrong for costs to become a variable so children can only access the best services if their parents can afford it. One of the best things about the local nurseries (and our neighbourhood as a whole) is the diversity. It would be such a shame to see this eroded. But without a subsidy, it also seems unfair that nurseries would have to cross subsidies each other and not see the benefits (<i>sic!</i>) / needs for operating efficiently. |

| |
|--|
| <p>Unless this will make fees cheaper (which I doubt) I am completely against. I have no doubt that this will mean the fees will increase considerably simply making childcare unaffordable. As a freelance worker, I am already struggling enough as it is with childcare. Most of the money I earn (whether or not I work during that month) is spent on childcare so I really can't see how I will be able to have childcare with the new proposal. This is an absolute disgrace that those cuts and fee structures are happening. Parents and children will suffer considerably.</p> |
| <p>I think this is problematic and I do not want to see this option go ahead. This will create competition between settings & does not offer a fair & equal opportunity to all our children.</p> |
| <p>While I oppose the cuts I believe that any new fee structure should prioritise those families with the greatest need. That should not be a simple case of all the subsidised places being provided in specific nurseries. It should recognise the importance of mixed communities and that all nurseries in Haringey should be accessible to low income families.</p> |
| <p>I do believe that it would be better that the single fee structure would be replaced with a new structure where the fees could be flexible from setting to setting to ensure each school/nursery has ownership over its own fees so that a well-run and financially well-managed establishment does not end up subsidising a less-well run setting.</p> |
| <p>If childcare subsidies are cut then it is likely that a new structure will be needed to replace the single fee structure. We will need to ensure the best possible outcome for each community each setting nurtures, as these obviously differ. We don't want one less off community having to subsidise a wealthier one through a steeper hike in fees thereby putting the less well off community at an even greater disadvantage. Time will be needed to re-structure to best serve the individual setting and community as far as possible in the event of such hideous cuts.</p> |
| <p>If the childcare subsidy is removed - and only then - would i be in favour of this proposal.</p> |
| <p>sustainability is created by steady support of council and governmental resources in children's' education and not by increasing the fees. I am not sure as I said before by increasing the fees how the parents can pay and how this can provide sustainability for the delivery of early education services.</p> |
| <p>This won't take into consideration some important factors as number of children under school age, divorce parents with more than one household, etc</p> |
| <p>I would ask what training and support will be in place for the settings affected during the transition. I see no issue with differing fees across different settings in principle, but I would want to know what checks and support are in place to ensure fees remain affordable for the majority of current and local childcare users</p> |
| <p>I think this is a good idea, and would match the market in private nurseries.</p> |
| <p>Given that the removal of the subsidy would affect eight settings, it does seem fair that fees should be able to differ from setting to setting.</p> |

| |
|---|
| I think all settings should charge the same amount. All parts of the borough should have equal access to child care. |
| Social services such as childcare should be provided equitably to all council residents, and fees should be consistent across the borough. To charge differently by area will simply further increase economic ghettoization and reinforce inequality. |
| While the single fee setting is best for parents, I can understand that nurseries have different costs. I do worry that it will affect parents' abilities to enroll (<i>sic!</i>) their children in quality childcare setting because they will be unable to afford the cost of attending. |
| If the fee structure changes, it would make sense that fees relate to the different settings/schools. |
| I don't feel changing single fee structure is the solution. I think working alone parents will struggle to put their children to nursery the more fees are tampered with. |
| If this proposal is going to brought in, it would be better for fees to be different from setting to setting. |
| I think each setting may benefit from having fees set according to what they offer and the families they serve. Woodlands for example, is an incredibly special place, with long established staff, an amazing Head teacher and special needs service, but most of all I think everyone recognises its diversity - the huge range of children that go there, many with special needs, and how completely every child is celebrated and made to feel safe, happy, important and steered towards success. The nursery knows much more than I do about what they need to charge and they need to be listened to. |
| It doesn't seem unreasonable |
| My understanding is that a new structure where fees are different from setting to setting is needed to enable schools to survive. I would support this. However, I do not support removal of the childcare subsidy. |
| If the subsidy is removed then it will be best if the existing structure is replaced with a new structure where fees can be different from setting to setting. We are concerned that our fees will be used to subsidise other settings |
| This seems fair. If the government and council are removing funding, it has to come from somewhere. |
| If the fee structure is to change then I would agree it would have to vary from setting to setting. I would not want the fees that I am paying to the nursery school to be diverted to subsidise other settings, which we as a family are not using. |
| And how would you propose deciding which setting is which? Ridiculous idea. Treat all centres the same. |

Residents were asked if they thought that the amount of childcare fees they pay school be according to their level of income

Please provide the reason for your answer:

| |
|---|
| <p>Whilst I agree in principal that those on a higher level income should perhaps pay more. Circumstances can change so rapidly that with the new formula the adjustment to the individual could be harder to keep track of and amend.</p> |
| <p>Taxes are paid so that all receive education equally. Children have no income and would be penalised on something out of their control.</p> |
| <p>Parents that have worked hard and earn more should not be penalised for this by having to pay higher childcare costs. The cost should be the same for everyone.</p> |
| <p>It feels a bit unfair that our family should have to pay more for the same level of service as a family making less. Would the higher fee paying families have access to additional services like longer nursery hours to allow them to collect children later? But then this is not equitable for the families on less. So again this proposal is a bit confusing. You're asking some families to pay more for the same service. We pay our council tax and nursery fees like other parents and we work really hard to provide for our family. Living in London is expensive and hard for many people and using income level as a deciding factor seems unfair – especially because this does not take into account each family's personal situation i.e. are they paying for a child in university or a mortgage that is high in proportion to a family making less. Everyone has their story.</p> |
| <p>If one chooses to use a private childcare provider, fees will be the same for all families. Why should it be different here? To be honest, people who can send their children to provisions that are only open term times are either not working or have an extensive network support who can cover 16 weeks without childcare so I am not sure changing how much they pay is right.</p> |
| <p>All children have a right to education and i believe this should include early years and as such, children should not be denied this right because their parents earn very little. There is a wealth of evidence that early years education is one of the best equalisers and one of the only interventions that give children from lower income families a chance at escaping the cycle of poverty they often find themselves in. Without it, they already start school behind their peers from richer families and are never able to catch up. Not only that but early years settings provide a platform for ensuring the health and wellbeing of young children, enabling key workers to identify problems or safeguarding issues early.</p> |
| <p>It's possible that without any form of subsidy for those on a low income, the fees for those on higher incomes would have to be prohibitively expensive. So yes, in an ideal world, a sliding scale seems fair, but in practice, it's likely to be far more complicated.</p> |
| <p>The service provided will be the same across all children, however it is unfair to charge more to whom has an</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>high income and low to has a low level of income. Expectations will be high from who pays more which will create pressure to staff. I would like not to have stressed staff looking after my child while at work..</p> |
| <p>To move away from a regressive system it seems only appropriate that, wherever possible, charges essential services such as childcare should be means-tested</p> |
| <p>Because the level of the service would be the same.</p> |
| <p>I agree that families who can afford to pay more should pay more, BUT only if the fees of lower income families are being subsidised and all rates stay relatively low. Otherwise, everyone will end up paying significantly more than they do now - and even the better off families will not be able to afford the nursery.</p> |
| <p>I think that the Council should continue to subsidise the services for all, but with extra help for those on lower income.</p> |
| <p>I do think that the amount of childcare fee you pay should be based on income, however i think those on maternity leave and therefore not earning should be taken into consideration. also if you are not working at all then it should not necessarily mean you are given lots of free hours, but possibly an incentive to work some hours part time.</p> |
| <p>As someone who is on relatively high income, I have no issue with paying higher fees to subsidise families on lower incomes. I think the Council would have to administer any sliding scale though, as it would be quite an ask for individual schools and nurseries to do this and would introduce an unpleasant dynamic into interactions with staff.</p> |
| <p>Me and my partner both work full time. I am a teacher and in a management position so i am earning quite well therefore we are not qualified for any help, tax credit etc. We would not be qualified the 20 hours free chils care when my little one turn 2 years old and already have to pay £1400 a month for childcare. Which is as much as our rent a month. How fair would that be the charge more just because i work and we both work and not on benefits ???</p> |
| <p>I don't think that childcare subsidised by the Council should be means-tested, because this means so little in London. I am a parent on the 40% income tax threshold, which makes me a high earner. However I am unfortunate enough to have no inheritance, get late not he property ladder, pay a massive mortgage and to have no support network that can offer me a relief on costs. If childcare costs increase they will become like London properties: middle class professional couples will not be able to afford to have children in London - certainly not more than one, which is already increasingly the case.</p> |
| <p>I think there is a lot of pressure on young families who work and pay high tax as it is. My wife works part-time just to cover the nursery cost as we feel its important for our son to interact with children across the community.</p> |
| <p>Everyone's circumstances are different. Some have less income but other advantages (i.e. Benefits or a parent</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>that doesn't have to work). Fees should not be means tested. They should be the same for everyone based on what service you are getting. Otherwise what is the incentive for people to go for promotions at work if they just end up subsidising low income earners with Childcare costs. Higher income earners already do that via higher tax rates.</p> |
| <p>That could potentially work, and sounds like it would be less problematic for some people on much lower incomes, but hopefully wouldn't affect the quality of care that gets provided.</p> |
| <p>It depends on whether the levels are fair. It creates a bit of a conflict of interest if these are set by the nursery. , I would hate for children from lower income families to miss out on childcare because of costs. On the other hand, with so many of the previously universal benefits (child benefit, childcare vouchers etc) being taken away, I wonder where it will end</p> |
| <p>You should pay for the service you receive therefore if you receive the same service you should pay the same price</p> |
| <p>As a family of freelance worker, our income is very irregular. We struggle enough as it (we have to pay the monthly fee even though we are not working) but this would make it impossible for us to budget for childcare.</p> |
| <p>The question is too simple for me to answer truthfully with agree or disagree. But I am sure what I think. Yes, I think people who need financial support should pay reduced childcare costs in order that their children have the same opportunities. No I don't think people should pay different amounts for the same service, so I don't support a tiered system.</p> |
| <p>I think that there should be a subsidy in place as there currently is so that all parents can afford childcare. Woodlands Park is a friendly, inclusive place where lots of different families mix and where every child can receive a good education despite their family background.</p> |
| <p>I am opposed to these cuts. While the priority must be to protect the families with the greatest need it is far from clear from this question how means testing would be carried out or policed. In many cases means testing has been shown to be more bureaucratic and expensive to administer, while creating stigma and division. If means testing were to take place it would need to be administered by the local authority rather than individual nurseries as they will not have the capacity. The whole premise is tragic though as we need more, cheaper or better still free nursery places to support families in Haringey. Again I would strongly urge Haringey council to publicise the impact of these changes and campaign to change central government's decision.</p> |
| <p>I don't believe that it is right that one person should have to pay more than another for the same service. I believe that the government should be supporting and protecting those more vulnerable/lower income families and their right to return to work rather than those who earn more money but who are still being hit by cuts from many other areas. However, I do believe that it would be a great loss to the diversity of our local nurseries if these lower income families were unable to continue to afford childcare as a result of these cuts and so would absolutely want to protect this diversity. As for a sliding scale I believe that it would be essential</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>for some level of council funding to continue to ensure that fees for those higher earners did not become prohibitively expensive. Yet I do not believe a sliding scale can work. To implement this would be hugely complicated and no doubt costly. I also believe that this would be a like opening up a can of worms. How would people's income be monitored and how would people's incomes be policed? In fact who would do the policing? On reflection, it sounds to me like it has the potential to be a Kafka-esque (<i>sic!</i>) recipe for disaster.</p> |
| <p>So that all children have the most fair access to childcare and education yes I do think those who can afford to pay more should. HOWEVER a sliding scale of fees will not be possible without at least some level of funding. The upper level of fees would be far too high to cover the lower level of fees without decent funding. Also the re-structure will have to be planned, the implementation needs to be administered and policed. This all takes time and money. Also if the children centre itself would have to administer and police this system this will cause problems with families and relationships will be strained and lost, breaking down the community. As long as the individual children's centres did not have to administer and police this, it could be a viable option.</p> |
| <p>self evident. If it is above the means of the family then the children will not be able to attend the service therefore be excluded from it.</p> |
| <p>That doesn't take into account expenditure</p> |
| <p>Myself and my partner are self employed. Any income tested fees would have to be based on previous years' earnings, which depending on our circumstances could end up being out of proportion to actual current earnings. I would also suggest, if fees for higher earners rise significantly higher than other private childcare settings in the area, higher earners may move their children to private, single-fee settings (i.e. other nurseries unaffected by these changes, child minders etc), leaving the structure of using higher fees to subsidise the fees of lower earners unworkable.</p> |
| <p>I agree in part, I think there should be a threshold above which you pay full fees, which should be based on the average wages in the area, and below this you pay reduced fees. I don't think that you should have to pay over the full fees if you are a particularly high earner to subsidise other people.</p> |
| <p>I want my daughter to be educated in a diverse environment. There are children in Woodlands Park Nursery whose families would not be able to afford a rise in fees and I don't think that only the children of the middle class families in the area should have access to this facility.</p> |
| <p>A sliding scale is more fair than increasing the cost for everyone however that means that some sort of subsidy needs to remain. Without a sliding scale the childcare provision will only be accessible to wealthier people and the people served would be less diverse.</p> |
| <p>Taxes or vouchers, not childcare fees, are the proper way to balance out economic inequality. Means testing fees will place an undue administrative burden on already overburdened childcare providers.</p> |
| <p>I wonder how this will affect my family, as we must budget to send our child to nursery school and we are unable to receive early years funding. This could negatively impact our ability to send our child to school. It</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>does make sense to have a sliding scale, but I can see how it may negatively impact middle income families.</p> |
| <p>Schools/nursery admin teams do not have the structure or resources to administer a sliding scale system. LBH should take this on if desired. Diversity of children should be supported - whichever method is used to pay for services.</p> |
| <p>fees should not at all be dependent on parents I come. They should be uniform and affordable (<i>sic!</i>) for every working parent.</p> |
| <p>I can understand that parents with higher income should pay more than those who otherwise wouldn't be able to afford to go at all but this has to be within reason. If those who can pay more have to subsidise the vast majority of the fees of those who can't it will 1) cause resentment and division between the parents who pay different fees and 2) may lead those who pay the higher fees to look to private nurseries elsewhere, making the upkeep of the council nursery schools unsustainable in the long term. If you are going to do this, you need to retain some of the childcare subsidy to be able to pay for those children who cannot pay the higher fee.</p> |
| <p>Many women would simply not return to work if it meant that they were paying higher fees for their childcare. We should not be penalised for pursuing a career.</p> |
| <p>I think a sliding scale is fair, but with fairly small differences. We used to use Bowlers Community Nursery in Islington - their sliding scale always seemed fair and we respected it. But the nursery shouldn't be expected to police and administer checking peoples incomes levels, as this would undermine their relationships with their families, some of whom are vulnerable.</p> |
| <p>I think flat rate where lower income families apply for a subsidy would probably be my preferred solution</p> |
| <p>It may be necessary to ensure the diversity of families attending a childcare setting. However, it should not be policed / administered by the nursery but by the local authority. It is also not achievable unless some level of childcare subsidy is continued in order to subsidise the sliding scale.</p> |
| <p>I do think the current diversity in the nursery is very important, for my own child's development and for supporting children less fortunate than us. However if the fees increase significantly for us because of a means testing then we will not be able to afford to keep our child in the nursery. We have already moved him once and we feel very strongly that we do not want to move him again now that he is so settled. I am also conscious however that there are childminders available in the area who are at an equivalent fee level to that of the nursery currently, so I am not concerned that some people would not be able to afford childcare at all. Ultimately the most important thing is that the nursery remains open, not the diversity that currently exists.</p> |
| <p>This is fair. I agree with the general principle of means testing for public services.</p> |
| <p>All parents should have access to childcare that they can afford. If fees must be increased it is only fair that people on lower incomes should not have to pay more. However if the fees increase too much, even higher</p> |

earners will either not be able to afford or not want to pay them. It is therefore imperative that some form of subsidy is maintained. The nursery school my son goes to is Woodlands Park. They have informed me that they would not have the capability to implement a sliding scale, therefore it would need to be administered (and policed) by the local authority. Which implies that the local authority will be hit with costs it would not otherwise have if the subsidy remains in place, thereby negating any benefit of cutting the subsidy. Policing any forms of means testing of family would be problematic, both administratively and diplomatically with families the nursery has a relationship with.

The government should be providing financial support for childcare where it is in the interests of the community to do so. There are clear value for money reasons to subsidise childcare for young children from disadvantaged backgrounds, since there is clear evidence that early interventions of this sort can be extremely beneficial in avoid later problems which can, in turn, be extremely expensive to local and national governments. This is not to say that other parents should subsidise this cost, but that the government should recognise the clear financial benefits in the short and medium term to low cost early years intervention.

My family benefitted from subsidised childcare purely because we lived near a children's centre. If we had not we would have payed (*sic!*) for private nursery where standards are poorer and fees much higher. We would have been happy to pay on a sliding scale and paid more if required. I would like to think ability to pay would not be a barrier to all children receiving this care.

I think that the use of council funds and property for these nurseries has been extremely unfair. There is a subsidy from central council funds and there is presumably a further subsidy because these nurseries don't pay commercial rent on the space they use.

I support subsidy for families who have low income or for children who because of their family circumstances need high quality nursery care.

However, it is unfair that some local families who don't have these particular needs have been able to access and use subsidised childcare when others have not. Reasons that families might not have been able to use this care include the hours available, or the location, or the shortage of spaces. People who have to use commercial providers pay a much higher price for nursery provision because there is no council funding, and private providers have to pay commercial levels of rent for the premises. These families that pay the higher fees then also contribute, via their taxes, to a subsidy to other families.

I have been unable to use council subsidised childcare because getting three children from my home to our nearest nursery in Crouch End every morning and then getting to my work in London at 8.30 would have been impossible - even if there were places available for them.

Residents were asked if they thought that the amount of childcare fees they pay should differ according to whether they lived in the borough or were a resident outside of the borough
Please provide the reason for your answer:

| |
|---|
| Yes. Outside residents to pay more. |
| there is not always a correlation between where you live and your incomes. |
| It should not matter where you live, but what you earn. |
| with an exemption for haringey (<i>sic!</i>) employees |
| I believe it should be based purely on income and affordability not where a child lives |
| I think the childcare fee should take into consideration the family situation (not just financially) to ascertain what fee could and should be paid |
| If not living in borough, tax not paid so no absolute right to subsidised services. |
| If other boroughs have lower rates then it could encourage new families. It all depends on the reputation of the borough causing competition which in turn can offer choices for parents. |
| If you do not live in the borough then you should not receive the in-borough discount. We were looking at nurseries in Hackney as we were unsure if we would get a place in Haringey and the fees were higher for out of borough. The discount/lower fees should go to parents that pay into the borough through council tax – which is a lot as it is. |
| I don't think that my taxes should pay for childcare provision for people from another borough. There is a shortage of places in Haringey so local children should have priority for places and funding. |
| Fair enough that local residents should benefit most. |
| I believe the service and the fees should be equal across all the boroughs. It should not be different. |
| In general I don't feel that postcode should determine how much you have to pay for your child. |
| Because the residents pay council taxes which should be reflected to the services available within the borough we live |
| I think it should be less expensive to go to a nursery within your borough. |

| |
|---|
| <p>It should be less expensive to go to a Nursery in your borough, this would also prevent unnecessary (<i>sic!</i>) journeys and negative environmental effect.</p> |
| <p>Boroughs in London are a virtual boundary. they should not interfere with provision for early years or school education.</p> |
| <p>If the childcare subsidy is removed then I don't see that it makes any difference if you are resident in the borough or not. The childcare fee you pay would be based on the sliding scale</p> |
| <p>This depends on whether childcare is subsidised across Boroughs.</p> |
| <p>I think if you live outside the Borough it just makes it more practical to select base on those who live in the borough. you have to set a boundary somewhere and by which borough you live seems the most simple and practical.</p> |
| <p>I think local residents should be first in line. But there are always extenuating circumstances. Perhaps the offer of a place should go to residents first but fees remain the same to all.</p> |
| <p>I don't know enough about childcare and who has access to what to give a helpful answer about this! I'm sure there will be some parents who don't feel childcare near their home is good enough quality / affordable / might not be available, so I wouldn't want to exclude them by making it more money for them.</p> |
| <p>Agree if this applies to a subsidy. Not really if there is no subsidy. The main issue is that places are allocated in favour of resident children and that local children are not priced out of the local nurseries</p> |
| <p>Sometimes you live on the edge of a borough and it's easier to get to a childcare facility that happens to be in another borough, you shouldn't be penalised for that.</p> |
| <p>I support the idea that a childcare setting should be a local community resource, so I think this makes sense.</p> |
| <p>I understand the idea that families should not receive the benefit of any childcare subsidy from the local authority if they do not live in the borough but it is not clear why they should pay more if there is no longer any childcare subsidy as proposed? This change is also likely to create bureaucracy and individual nurseries should not be expected to administer or police it.</p> |
| <p>If there is no subsidy from the council then why should they pay more? It sounds like yet another costly and difficult thing to manage and police at a time when councils are trying to cut back on wasteful and lengthy admin.</p> |
| <p>I think the amount of childcare fee you pay should differ for residents as long as there is actually childcare subsidy provided. If cuts are made then it seems strange that non-residents would have to pay more. This again would be problematic for the children's centres to implement themselves and would need to be administered and policed outside of the setting.</p> |

| |
|---|
| everybody has the right for accessing services based on human rights act of children. |
| If the council are proposing to remove local authority subsidy for childcare, I fail to see how residence within the borough makes a difference. |
| Not sure of the logic here. I thought all the access to Council nurseries depending on proximity anyway. |
| The children and families of Haringey should benefit from these facilities. |
| The provision should be for local people. But if the local subsidy is removed it probably doesn't make much difference if non-local people access it. |
| Council tax should be used to redress the budget shortfalls, and so out-of-borough places should pay more |
| What if a parent works outside the borough and it is most convenient to send their child to nursery nearest their work? It is also difficult to find a nursery place in many boroughs so that would be unfairly penalizing those who have to go elsewhere for education. |
| Non-borough residents shouldn't receive borough subsidy; but if accepted for a place, should pay the same. |
| I do not think the childcare subsidy should be used to pay for children living outside the borough. I would also worry that if the fees are set high and the provision is good, it will attract wealthier parents from outside the borough, leaving even less childcare provision for those in Haringey. |
| There are limited childcare places and priority should be given to local residents. |
| seems arbitrary. I see no reason why a Hackney or Islington resident should pay more |
| Doesn't seem to make sense for people outside the borough to pay more if there is no childcare subsidy anyway. Again the nursery setting shouldn't (<i>sic!</i>) have to administer/police this. |
| Any council support or subsidy should be only available to those within the borough, otherwise it might draw others from other areas and might distort the subsidy system. Likewise fees should be aligned to the average income of the local area, I believe they are more likely to be if they charges are different for those outside of borough. Ideally childcare is delivered near to the child's home as well for the sake of the child. |
| If council are part funding childcare providers and are doing so by differing amounts in different boroughs, it would seem fair to offset this by charging different fees to parents from outside the borough, in order to compensate for any discrepancies. I see this as secondary to means testing parents directly though. |

| |
|--|
| <p>There is a clear argument that families living outside the borough should pay more for childcare subsidised by the local authority. However once this subsidy is removed there is no clear reason to continue this policy. But once again, it should not be left to the childcare setting to administer and police this change - see point 3b.</p> |
| <p>Each borough should have the ability to support those in need who reside in the borough. It is for other boroughs to support their own residents.</p> |
| <p>I think places are provided on locality anyway, and should remain so. I would not want a local child to not get a place because an out of borough child had the place. The community building aspects of a local nursery cannot be belittled and I would definitely think a child coming from out of borough would not receive subsidy and would pay full fees.</p> |

Residents were asked what their thoughts were on having a flat fee
Please provide the reason for your answer:

| |
|---|
| <p>As is likely to be higher than current cost. And living in the posh part of Haringey, but am working class. We do not all have high incomes.</p> |
| <p>different costs different fees.</p> |
| <p>It will create in-equality as not every household earns a flat income.</p> |
| <p>should be set at levels in regards to affordability</p> |
| <p>this can only if there is a subsidy</p> |
| <p>I believe this is fair as childcare service level will be maintained and more children able to attend pre school education</p> |
| <p>My understanding is this helps the nursery school make its financial plans easier, but it is not necessarily fair on those families with lower incomes. However, the flat fee allows the nursery school to be confident that they can provide the childcare and facilities needed.</p> |
| <p>Is this not what we are currently doing?</p> |
| <p>All children have a right to education and i believe this should include early years. Having a flat fee will exclude certain children because their parents cannot afford the care. children should not be denied their</p> |

| |
|---|
| right to education because their parents earn very little. |
| As per my previous answer - a sliding scale is fair but only likely to be practical if a subsidy is in place for lower income families. (<i>sic!</i>) |
| This could work if the flat fee is an affordable and realistic one. |
| While easier to administer, the more appropriate option would be to means test on a case by case basis, although I understand that this would be more complex to achieve. |
| Again, the service level would not be different depending on payment |
| If the fees are going to go up for everyone, which it sounds like they will if you plan to remove subsidies, then I think less well off families should pay less, so that they can continue to attend the nursery. |
| It should be a fixed amount with a council subsidy (<i>sic!</i>) as it is now |
| Because if you earn lots you should pay a little more to subsidise those that are struggling. However as said this should not mean lots of free hours for those that do not work at all. |
| Families on lower incomes should have the same ability to access the high quality childcare supplied in the borough. |
| Equality |
| I think a flat fee that is affordable (which is currently the case) offers equal access to childcare to all. However I think that parents on state benefits and families with disability entitlement should be offered some hours of free or reduced cost childcare. |
| If its related to the amount of staff and resource it makes sense to charge by age group. e.g. more staff for 2 - 3 year olds than 4 - 5 year olds then higher the costs. |
| As stated in earlier question. Means testing is not the answer. Higher earners already pay higher taxes. |
| It keeps things simple. It just depends if that flat fee is affordable! |
| A flat fee would be good if it was truly affordable for all income groups. If not, then I would not want to see lower income families no longer able to afford childcare, which problem mean their income falls even lower... particularly if these changes are being brought in quickly without much time for nurseries or parents to adjust |
| Variable fees will lead to variable provision and will lead to social disintegration. Some settings will charge more, provide a better service and be swamped by advantaged children. Those from economically |

| |
|---|
| disadvantaged backgrounds will gravitate towards the cheaper providers, who will only be able to offer a reduced service. |
| It would make it impossible for families with irregular incomes to budget for childcare. |
| I agree that paid places should be a flat rate, that is affordable to 70% of the local community. I believe that there should still be free places in each age group for children to have a fair opportunity. |
| This depends very much on the level of the fee. The fees should not be unaffordable for any families not least those with the lowest means. We need publicly funded universal and free child care for all who need it - it would be great if the council would add its voice to support organisations (including even the British Chamber of Commerce) that are calling for that. |
| Fairer and without long-winded admin at an already difficult and time-poor period in their lives as they struggle with having young children and returning to work. However ultimately I believe that there should be subsidies in place to support those most in need. |
| Not everyone can afford it |
| As Haringey is made up of such a diverse community we need to maintain this and enable access to EYC for all. Flat fees would not be fair for poorer families and would damage and limit the diversity we currently have and maintain. |
| At the same time needs to be affordable for different incomes |
| As above! |
| I don't have a problem with reducing fees for low income families |
| If fees are to rise then there are families who would not be able to afford a flat fee increase. |
| This would not be fair and would make the service less accessible to lower income families. The provision would be less diverse as a result and outcomes for children in the borough would be worse. |
| A flat fee provides clarity to families in their financial planning and simplicity for the providers. Vouchers or progressive council tax rates are a more appropriate way to improve access to services. |
| Agree if families with lower income would receive funding. |
| A flat fee only above a certain income threshold. Unless the flat fee is affordable by all, including disadvantaged. |

| |
|--|
| |
| <p>If you are getting rid of the childcare subsidy, this means that no parents of low to middle income will be able to afford to come to these schools anymore unless you retain sufficient subsidy to allow the school to remain affordable for all.</p> |
| <p>I'm not sure what you mean by the responses to this question - agree or disagree - if you are asking for views. Do I support a flat fee? I think a sliding fee would be better, see previous answer. But there is obviously a limit to what families will pay. You can't remove subsidies entirely and then expect better off families to make up the massive shortfall. They won't. They can't. Everyone finds childcare a huge outgoing and they have to go where it's affordable. If Woodlands lost all these families who can pay a bit more but not a lot more, then it would collapse. What's lovely about Woodlands is its diversity. Children from very different backgrounds play and learn and develop alongside one another and everyone is equal and cherished there. It would be so sad to lose this. No one (<i>sic!</i>) will pay more than (<i>sic!</i>) going rate. For example, I have friends who attend Little Jewels nursery on Cavendish Road and Little Eagles and Green Lanes. They are both happy with these settings and we couldn't justify paying more than their rates. However amazing Woodlands is - and it really is - we have so many outgoings, we have to go with what's affordable.</p> |
| <p>Don't favour the idea of having fees based on income. Some people will not declare income. Would it be voluntary or would individuals have to show end of year tax. Could be difficult to administer. Prefer to see means based assistance for low income users</p> |
| <p>want to maintain diversity of families at nursery settings</p> |
| <p>see question 3.b</p> |
| <p>As I understand it this is the current situation. To me it seems it would result in some parents who couldn't afford the fee missing out on the opportunity of the childcare, and I don't think this is fair.</p> |
| <p>As discussed before I am against the removal of the subsidy and any change in fee structure should not have to be administered by the childcare setting. I would therefore argue that it is expedient to continue with the current flat fee, however if there is a change then it would have to be affordable to lower income families.</p> |
| <p>Flat fees do not target those in need, and are, therefore, poor value for money solutions to anything at all.</p> |
| <p>Flat fee only if remain the same as now and free places for those that need.</p> |

Residents were asked what their thoughts were on having a sliding scale fees.
Please provide the reason for your answer:

| |
|---|
| As above. Unless fees will be lower. As choosing a nursery is based on cost. I earn over £25,000 but below £30,000 and do not receive additional benefits. However government agencies seem to think this is wealthy! It is not. |
| People with high incomes goes to private nurseries so the differences of income between those who goes to subsidized nurseries is very low. |
| We are on a low income, but live in Muswell Hill and still need more help with childcare costs. |
| believe this would make it fairer |
| what will it cost to means test and who will do this |
| As above, it's a fairer system allowing those families to access childcare, but if the nursery school have a deficit on running the childcare because it's uncertain how the new single fee will be attained, then it's cancels itself out. |
| Penalised the child for circumstances out of their control |
| Not fair to parents who have earned income. |
| This sounds like a question asked previously. Again, I do not think income based fees are fair, unless some additional service is provided. What will you do about parents (like myself) that work freelance and have varying levels of income each month? |
| This is discriminatory and not supporting working families. |
| Children have a right to education and i believe this should include early years. Having a flat fee will exclude certain children because their parents cannot afford the care. children should not be denied their right to education because their parents earn very little. HOWEVER, having a sliding scale that still works for the poorest families requires some level of childcare subsidy and the council should continue to provide this. Equally, some schools and nurseries will not be set up to administer sliding scales and so support to do this needs to be provided by the council. |
| Depends on who administers this - would be a great administrative burden on each children's centre to take this on. |
| It becomes a luxury service, which it is completely unfair. I strongly disagree on this, |

| |
|--|
| See above comment in 6a |
| Same as 5b |
| If the local authority were to administer this then I think it would be fairer that families who can pay more do, in order to keep the costs down for low income families. However, I would rather that the subsidies remain and all families benefit from them. |
| It should be a fixed amount with a council subsidy as it is now. But those on lower income should receive more help on a case by case basis. |
| I would be perfectly happy to submit to mean testing to ensure that more disadvantaged families and children can access the childcare provision |
| Absolutely disagree. This would again punish honest hard working people who does not have lots of savings but trying to live from month to month and only judging based on income??? |
| I explained in a previous question why I disagree with this. Level of income does not, in London, match level of outgoings. Many of my friends have lower income levels than we do as a family but have inherited property in London or been able to purchase property earlier and as a result have lower outgoings too. |
| If it slides relevant to cost then yes. |
| As above. |
| I find it hard to make up my mind on this! It's not a clear cut argument. |
| It would put the nursery in a very difficult position if they would have to check and police this |
| If earnings change considerably from one year to another, it's going to be freelancers or zero hour contract workers that suffer the most. This is unfair. |
| I think this is expensive to administer & to monitor. I would like to see a graph showing the impact on fee costs per setting when including & excluding the salary & training costs of the person who would be responsible for fees. |
| Means testing is difficult and very hard to administer. It would (<i>sic!</i>) be simpler and probably save money not to bring means testing in. However, there would need to be a subsidy from the council for this to happen, to some families might not be able to afford the fees. |
| While I agree that those in most need should be supported to access the service it is difficult to make a |

| |
|--|
| <p>judgement without understanding the costs of administering any means testing and policing of such a system. We need publicly funded universal and free child care for all who need it - it would be great if the council would add its voice to support organisations (including even the British Chamber of Commerce) that are calling for that.</p> |
| <p>If this was to be implemented, I believe that council money should be used to subsidise this sliding scale. It should not be those with higher incomes doing the subsidising.</p> |
| <p>Helps those parents who cannot afford it</p> |
| <p>As long as a sliding scale system is properly funded and given the time to be properly planned, and NOT administered or policed by the school or centre then it seems the better option. This will ensure the best possible opportunity for all.</p> |
| <p>I understand from the affected childcare settings that: a) a sliding scale would still not be cost effective unless some level of subsidy was retained for the lowest-earning families. b) There is not the capacity for each setting to implement a sliding scale using their own administrative structures. Therefore the Local Authority would need to administrate this process centrally. Providing proof of income and possibly residence is a potentially invasive process, which you are requiring the nurseries affected to implement on a very short timescale. In order for this to be done in partnership with families, and retain the existing diversity of childcare settings in the borough, it is clear to me the nurseries affected need more time and support.</p> |
| <p>As long as it's not infinite, and there is a cap.</p> |
| <p>I do think a sliding scale is fairer but I worry how that would be policed. Who would take responsibility for checking salaries, benefits etc.? I do not think that should be in the remit of nursery schools involved here.</p> |
| <p>See above.</p> |
| <p>Means testing is difficult to maintain for the centers (<i>sic!</i>) and opaque to parents. Childcare should be accessible to all at the same rate.</p> |
| <p>Agree but worry that this will negatively impact middle income families who cannot receive funding but are struggling to "get by" - especially with the rising cost of housing!</p> |
| <p>OK if administered by LBH. But the administration can't be added to the nurseries without more resources</p> |
| <p>Why should a parent with a lot of earning pay more? It's not like the child is given an extra attention cause of the parent's income!</p> |
| <p>I would worry that this would be divisive. Any sliding scale of fees must not be administered by the Centres themselves but must be done centrally by Haringey Council. Have you costed (<i>sic!</i>) the administration charges of doing this? What would be the savings in the end compared to the subsidy. It might be easier to</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>reduce the subsidy in part but not bother about the administration of calculating sliding scale of fees.</p> |
| <p>See previous answers above. But think the local authority should administer and police this.</p> |
| <p>A sliding scale would be an invasion into people's income details. It would not take into account "wealth" and the ability of some earners to not declare all income.</p> |
| <p>BUT it should not be administered/ policed by the nursery as this would be problematic for relationships with families. This is really important.</p> |
| <p>See question 3.b. If a sliding scale is implemented then I am conscious that those on the lowest income should be in work or need the childcare for other reasons to qualify. I am concerned about the potential increase in our fees if a sliding scale is implemented. Ultimately the most important things to me are that this fantastic nursery remains open and that we can still afford to use it.</p> |
| <p>I think this is fairer. However, I think that something would need to be in place to prevent the childcare providers selecting children solely from affluent households so that they get more money. Each provider should be required to give places to an even spread of the different household incomes.</p> |
| <p>As already discussed the complete removal of the subsidy would mean that to maintain affordable fees for low income families, higher income families would be hit with prohibitively expensive fees. Some subsidy would be required to maintain this balance. Also as previously discussed any change in policy would need to be administered and policed by the local authority, which would cost the authority money, therefore negating the benefit of cutting the subsidy.</p> |
| <p>I agree strongly with a sliding scale where cheaper childcare is subsidised by the government in recognition of the fact that it is government who financially benefits where early years interventions are made. I do not agree with the government renouncing its responsibility to those families in need and asking other parents to subsidise those costs, whilst reaping the benefits of improvements to society and increase tax revenues from parents returning to work.</p> |
| <p>Makes sense.</p> |