

# Public Document Pack



## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 4 October 2016 at 7.30 pm  
Room 6, Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield,  
EN1 3XA

Contact: Stacey Gilmour  
Scrutiny Officer  
Direct: 020-8379-4187  
Tel: 020-8379-1000  
Ext: 4187  
E-mail: [Stacey.gilmour@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Stacey.gilmour@enfield.gov.uk)  
Council website: [www.enfield.gov.uk](http://www.enfield.gov.uk)

Councillors : Derek Levy (Chair), Abdul Abdullahi, Katherine Chibah, Nneka Keazor, Joanne Laban and Edward Smith

Education Statutory Co-optees: 1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative), Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor Representative).

Enfield Youth Parliament Co-optees (2)

Support Officer – Claire Johnson (Interim Governance & Scrutiny Manager)  
Stacey Gilmour (Scrutiny Officer)

## AGENDA

1. **WELCOME & APOLOGIES**
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members of the Council are invited to identify any disclosable pecuniary, other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests relevant to items on the agenda.

3. **CALL-IN: REVENUE MONITORING REPORT 2016/2017** (Pages 1 - 34)

To receive a report from the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services outlining a Call-In received for consideration by Overview & Scrutiny on the following reason: (Report No: 93).

### **Cabinet Decision (6 September 2016): Revenue Monitoring Report 2016/2017**

Decision included on Publication of Decision List No: 25/16-17 Key Decision 4365 (List Ref: 2/25/16-17) issued on 8 September 2016.

It is proposed that consideration of the Call-In be structured as follows:

- Brief outline of reasons for the Call-In by representative(s) of the

Members who have called in the decision.

- Response to the reasons provided for the Call-In by the Cabinet Member responsible for taking the decision.
- Debate by Overview & Scrutiny Committee and agreement on action to be taken.

**4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

**5. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8 SEPTEMBER 2016** (Pages 35 - 44)

To agree the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2016.

**6. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Provisional Call-Ins

Wednesday 26 October 2016

Please note, the next business meetings of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee will be held on

Tuesday 11 October 2016

Thursday 10 November 2016

**7. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS & PUBLIC**

To consider, if necessary, passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 excluding the press and public from the meeting for the item of business listed in Part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that it will involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs of Part 1 Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006), as are listed on the agenda (Please note there is not a Part 2 agenda).

**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 93****MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

**Overview & Scrutiny  
Committee,  
4 October 2016**

**REPORT OF:**

Director of Finance, Resources  
and Customer Services

Contact officers and telephone  
numbers:

Asmat Hussain, Assistant Director Legal and Governance

Tel: 020 8379 6438

Email: [asmat.hussain@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:asmat.hussain@enfield.gov.uk)

Claire Johnson, Scrutiny and Member Services Manager

Tel: 020 8379 4239

E mail: [claire.johnson@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:claire.johnson@enfield.gov.uk)

<b>Agenda – Part: 1</b>	<b>Item: 3</b>
<b>Subject: Revenue Monitoring Report 2016/2017</b>	
<b>Wards: All</b>	
<b>Key Decision No: 4365</b>	
<b>Cabinet Member consulted: N/A</b>	

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 This report details a call-in submitted in relation to the following decision:

**Cabinet Decision (6 September 2016): Revenue Monitoring Report 2016/2017**

1.2 Details of this decision were included on Publication of Decision List No. 25/16-17 (Ref. 2/25/16-17 – issued on 8 September 2016).

1.3 In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider the decision that has been called-in for review.

1.4 The members who have called-in this decision do not believe it falls outside of the Council's Policy Framework.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers the called-in decision and

either:

- (a) Refers the decision back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration setting out in writing the nature of its concerns. The decision making body then has 14 working days in which to reconsider the decision; or
- (b) Refer the matter to full Council; or
- (c) Confirm the original decision.

Once the Committee has considered the called-in decision and makes one of the recommendations listed at (a), (b) or (c) above, the call-in process is completed. A decision cannot be called in more than once.

If a decision is referred back to the decision making person or body; the implementation of that decision shall be suspended until such time as the decision making person or body reconsiders and either amends or confirms the decision, but the outcome on the decision should be reached within 14 working days of the reference back. The Committee will subsequently be informed of the outcome of any such decision.

### **3. BACKGROUND/ INTRODUCTION**

- 3.1 Please refer to Sections 3, 4 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the Cabinet decision report.

### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

None – Under the terms of the call-in procedure within the Council's Constitution, Overview & Scrutiny Committee is required to consider any eligible decision called-in for review. The alternative options available to Overview & Scrutiny Committee under the Council's Constitution, when considering any call-in, have been detailed in section 2 above.

### **5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

To comply with the call-in procedure within the Council's Constitution.

### **6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

#### **6.1 Financial Implications**

The financial implications relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet decision report.

## **6.2 Legal Implications**

S 21, S 21A-21C Local Government Act 2000, s.19 Police and Justice Act 2006 and regulations made under s.21E Local Government Act 2000 define the functions of the Overview and Scrutiny committee. The functions of the committee include the ability to consider, under the call-in process, decisions of Cabinet, Cabinet Sub-Committees, individual Cabinet Members or of officers under delegated authority.

Part 4, Section 18 of the Council's Constitution sets out the procedure for call-in. Overview and Scrutiny Committee, having considered the decision may: refer it back to the decision making person or body for reconsideration; refer to full Council or confirm the original decision.

The Constitution also sets out at section 18.2, decisions that are exceptions to the call-in process.

## **6.3 Property Implications**

There are no corporate property implications arising from the Cabinet decision Report.

## **7. KEY RISKS**

The key risks identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet decision Report.

## **8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

The way in which the called-in decision impacts on the Council priorities relating to fairness for all, growth and sustainability and strong communities have been detailed in the Cabinet decision Report.

## **9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

The equalities impact implications relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet decision Report.

## **10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The performance management implications identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet decision Report.

## **11. HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

The health and safety implications identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet decision Report.

## **12. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

The public health implications identified relating to the called-in decision have been detailed in the Cabinet decision Report.

### **Background Papers**

None

# **APPENDIX 1**

**Call-In: Cabinet Decision: Revenue Monitoring  
Report 2016/2017**

This page is intentionally left blank



**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/17 REPORT NO: 62**

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Cabinet  
6<sup>th</sup> September 2016

**AGENDA PART 1**

**ITEM 7**

**Subject: Revenue Monitoring Report  
2016/17: July 2016**

**Wards: All**

**Report Of:**

Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services

**Contact:**

Isabel Brittain: 0208 379 4744

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report sets out the Council's revenue budget monitoring position based on information to the end of July 2016. The report forecasts an outturn position of a £7.9m overspend for 2016/17. The report also seeks Cabinet approval to apply for the Government's multi-year settlement offer which guarantees a minimum level of funding over a four year period to provide greater certainty in financial planning.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- 2.1 Notes the £7.9m overspend revenue outturn projection.
- 2.2 Agrees that departments reporting pressures should formulate and implement action plans to ensure that all possible actions are undertaken to remain within budget in 2016/17.
- 2.3 Agrees to an application being made to the Government to accept the multi-year settlement offer. Application for the multi-year settlement requires the Council to publish an efficiency plan on its website. Responsibility for preparing and publishing the efficiency plan should be devolved to the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency. Further information on the application process, as well as the information expected in an efficiency plan is provided in Appendix D.

**3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The Council's revenue expenditure against budget is monitored by regular monitoring reports to the Corporate Management Board and Cabinet. These reports provide a snapshot of the revenue position for each Department and for the Council as a whole, and provide details of any projected additional budget pressures and risks, or any significant underspends.
- 3.2 The Revenue Monitoring Report is a result of the monthly monitoring process carried out by Departments, which is based on the following principles to ensure accuracy, transparency and consistency:

- Risk assessments, to enable greater emphasis to be placed on high-risk budgets throughout the year.
  - Comparisons between expenditure to date, current budgets and budget profiles.
  - Expenditure is predicted to the year-end, taking account of seasonal fluctuations and other determinants of demand.
  - The 'Key Drivers' that affect, particularly, the high-risk budgets are monitored and reported to Department Management Teams.
  - Action plans to deal with any areas that are predicting or experiencing problems staying within agreed budgets are produced.
- 3.3 This report provides information on the main budget variances and their causes that are affecting the Council across all departments. Although a full budget monitor is carried out each month, the variations in this report are deliberately limited to +/- variances of £50,000 or over in order to provide a greater strategic focus.
- 3.4 A summary overview of financial performance is outlined below in Table 1. The intention of this is to provide the key highlight messages in a "dashboard" style summary. It is designed to capture the key messages across the Council's main financial areas, namely:
1. Income and expenditure;
  2. Balance sheet (liquidity, debtor/creditor management, investments and use of balances); and
  3. Cash flow forecasting and management.

**Table 1: Summary performance overview**

Area of review	Key highlights	Risk Rating		
		June	July	Aug
Income and expenditure position	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Year-end forecast variances of £7.9m overspend have been identified to date in relation to General Fund net controllable expenditure. Budget variances identified to date will need to be managed closely to ensure timely appropriate action can be taken.</li> </ul>	Red	Red	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget profiling across all departmental budgets will continue to be applied in order to better reflect predicted net spending patterns throughout the year. Budget holders now profile individual budgets based on anticipated spend across the year.</li> </ul>	Green	Green	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HRA is projecting a level spend position for year-end outturn against budget.</li> </ul>	Green	Green	
Balance Sheet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current profile of cash investments continues to be in accordance with the Council's approved strategy for prioritising security of funds over rate of return.</li> </ul>	Green	Green	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The year-end outturn projection for the General Fund balances will meet the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy target levels based on the use of uncommitted reserves to meet the one-off overspends in 2016/17.</li> </ul>	Green	Green	
Cash flow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council's cash balances and cashflow forecast for the year (including borrowing) will ensure sufficient funds are available to cover planned capital and revenue commitments when they fall due.</li> </ul>	Green	Green	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interest receipts forecast for the year are on target with budget.</li> </ul>	Green	Green	

#### 4. July 2016 Monitoring – General Fund

4.1 Below is a summary of the projected outturn variances broken down between departments:

**Table 2: Forecast Projected Departmental Outturn Variances**

July 16 Department	Net Controllable Budget				
	Original Budget	Approved Changes	Approved Budget	Projected Outturn	July Variation
	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s	£000s
Chief Executive	4,307	(42)	4,265	4,265	0
Regeneration & Environment	24,956	1,187	26,143	25,720	(423)
Finance, Resources & Customer Services	53,449	(6,432)	47,017	49,198	2,181
Health, Housing and Adult Social Care	78,003	(1,590)	76,413	80,757	4,344
Children's Services	44,935	250	45,185	46,983	1,798
Enfield 2017	(14,650)	7,008	(7,642)	(7,642)	0
<b>Total Department Budgets</b>	<b>191,000</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>191,381</b>	<b>199,281</b>	<b>7,900</b>
Contribution from reserves	0	0	0	0	0
Collection Fund	(1,319)	0	(1,319)	(1,319)	0
Corporate Items	46,791	(381)	46,410	46,410	0
Government Funding	(128,557)	0	(128,557)	(128,557)	0
<b>Council Tax Requirement</b>	<b>107,915</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>107,915</b>	<b>115,815</b>	<b>7,900</b>

4.2 The comparison to the position at this stage last year shows a marked increase overall mainly due to the increase in the FRCS & HHASC departmental variances. The 2015/16 outturn was eventually contained within budget although it should be noted that General Fund Earmarked Reserves reduced by £19.8m.

#### 5. DEPARTMENTAL MONITORING INFORMATION – BUDGET PRESSURES & PROJECTED SAVINGS

##### 5.1 Chief Executive's Department (Appendix A1)

The department is currently projecting an overall level spend position; explanations for variances over £50k are detailed in Appendix A1.

##### 5.2 Regeneration & Environment (Appendix A2)

The department is currently projecting a favourable variance of £0.423m; explanations for variances over £50k are detailed in Appendix A2.

##### 5.3 Finance, Resources & Customer Services (Appendix A3)

Finance Resources and Customer Services are currently projecting an overspend position of £2.1m; explanations for variances over £50k are detailed in Appendix A3.

##### 5.4 Health, Housing & Adult Social Care (Appendix A4)

The department is currently forecasting a projected budget overspend of £4.3m;

explanations for variances over £50k are detailed in Appendix A4.

### **5.5 Children's Services (Appendix A5)**

Children's Services are currently projecting an overspend position of £1.8m; explanations for variances over £50k are detailed in Appendix A5.

### **5.6 Schools Budgets (Appendix A6)**

These variations do not form part of the General Fund position but are reported for information in Appendix A6.

## **6. OTHER GENERAL FUND ITEMS**

### **6.1 Treasury Management and cash flow analysis**

The Bank of England reduced the base rate to 0.25% on 4<sup>th</sup> August 2016. Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) long term and short term rates fell significantly following the announcement. We are advised by Capita, our Treasury Consultants, that yields are now at historic lows and borrowing should be considered if appropriate to the Council's strategy. There is particular value in the 40 to 50 year range at present but other periods will also be considered if more appropriate locally. As the outlook continues to be uncertain we are advised that borrowing should be made in tranches to benefit from the current rates but also to provide some flexibility if rates fall further. A summary of this year's Treasury management activity is set out in Appendix B.

### **6.2 Corporate Items (Including Contingency & Contingent Items) General Fund**

The Council maintains a general contingency of £1.0m. It is expected that £0.8m of this contingency will be utilised for the funding of expenditure in Schools & Children's Services relating to No Recourse to Public Funds costs agreed by Cabinet in 2014-15.

## **7. Housing Revenue Account (HRA) – Projected Nil Variance**

The HRA projection for July shows no major variances. It is too early in the year to predict a variance to the Day to Day Repairs and Maintenance budget, but this continues to be monitored closely.

This year, any identified underspends which are deemed to be ongoing will continue to be removed from managers' budgets in order to assist in addressing the impact of the Government's social rent policy and Housing and Planning Act requirements. There is a target to find £2m of ongoing savings during 2016/17, of which a net £652k has been found to date. This is in addition to the savings of £1.955m identified in 2015/16.

## **8. ACHIEVEMENT OF SAVINGS**

8.1 The 2016/17 Budget Report included new savings and the achievement of increased income totalling £12.9m to be made in 2016/17.

8.2 Information on the progress in achieving the departmental savings is included in Appendix C of this report.

## **9. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

Not applicable to this report.

## **10. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

To ensure that Members are aware of the projected budgetary position, including all major budget pressures and underspends which have contributed to the present monthly position and that are likely to affect the final outturn.

## **11. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **11.1 Financial Implications**

As the Section 151 Officer, the Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services is required to keep under review the financial position of the Authority. The monthly revenue monitoring is a key part of this review process. If required, measures will be put in place to address any risks identified through the monitoring process and to contain expenditure within approved budgets.

### **11.2 Legal Implications**

The Council has a statutory duty to arrange for the proper administration of its financial affairs and a fiduciary duty to taxpayers with regards to its use of and accounting for public monies. This report assists in the discharge of those duties.

### **11.3 Property Implications**

Not applicable in this report.

## **12. KEY RISKS**

There are a number of general risks to the Council being able to match expenditure with resources this financial year and over the Medium Term Financial Plan:-

- Achievement of challenging savings targets.
- State of the UK economy - which impacts on the Council's ability to raise income from fees and charges and on the provision for bad debt.
- Uncontrollable demand-led Service Pressures e.g. Adult Social Care, Child Protection etc.
- Potential adjustments which may arise from the audit of various Grant Claims.
- Movement in interest rates.

Risks associated with specific Services are mentioned elsewhere in this report.

## **13. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

**13.1 Fairness for All** – The recommendations in the report fully accord with this Council priority.

**13.2 Growth and Sustainability** – The recommendations in the report fully accord with this Council priority.

**13.3 Strong Communities** – The recommendations in the report fully accord with this Council priority.

#### **14. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

The Council is committed to Fairness for All to apply throughout all work and decisions made. The Council serves the whole borough fairly, tackling inequality through the provision of excellent services for all, targeted to meet the needs of each area. The Council will listen to and understand the needs of all its communities.

The Council does not discriminate on grounds of age, colour, disability, ethnic origin, gender, HIV status, immigration status, marital status, social or economic status, nationality or national origins, race, faith, religious beliefs, responsibility for dependants, sexual orientation, gender identity, pregnancy and maternity, trade union membership or unrelated criminal conviction. The Council will promote equality of access and opportunity for those in our community who suffer from unfair treatment on any of these grounds including those disadvantaged through multiple forms of discrimination.

Financial monitoring is important in ensuring resources are used to deliver equitable services to all members of the community.

#### **15. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The report provides clear evidence of sound financial management and efficient use of resources.

## Appendix A1

<b>Chief Executive</b>	<b>Budget Variation July 2016 (£'000)</b>
No variances to report.	
<b>Chief Executive Total</b>	<b>0</b>

## Appendix A2

Regeneration & Environment Department	Forecast Budget Variation July 2016 (£'000)
Regeneration & Environment Department – July 2016 Budget Monitoring projected outturn position is a favourable variance of £423k; explanations for variances over £50k are detailed below:	
<b>Director's Office</b> - Savings identified through on-going service efficiency reviews across the department.	(115)
<b>Community Safety</b> - Salary underspend.	(59)
<b>Regulatory Services</b> - External legal costs £80k (prosecutions) and £32k salary overspend.	112
<b>Planning Applications</b> - Salary underspend and pre-application income.	(236)
<b>Highways Services</b> - Reduced New Roads Street Works Act receipts of £133k and £35k on additional tree works.	168
<b>Street Lighting</b> - Overspend.	70
<b>Traffic &amp; Transportation</b> - Additional Temporary Traffic Order income.	(116)
<b>PRS – AD (Waste Client)</b> - Overspend due to 'invest to save' communications campaign (£220k) targeting reductions in recycling contamination.	162
<b>Waste Client</b> - £347k pressure on dry recycling contract due to contamination issues. £21k underspend in salary costs.	326
<b>Vehicles Leasing and Equipment Replacement</b> - Continued focus on targeting vehicle and equipment replacement programmes.	(100)
<b>Commercial Services</b> - Salary underspend.	(56)
<b>Cemeteries Operations</b> - Cemeteries income overachievement.	(158)
<b>Commercial Waste</b> - Additional income generated from the successful marketing of the commercial waste services.	(142)
<b>Commercial Service (Parks)</b> - Parks events additional income.	(109)
<b>Waste Operations Service</b> - Salaries overspend (bank holiday).	68
<b>Skills For Work Service</b> - The service is currently projected to overspend by £297k. This has been offset by a £200k one-off contribution whilst a restructure has commenced which will prevent future overspends beyond this financial year.	97
<b>Regeneration</b> - Rental income derived from 'meanwhile uses' created on regeneration schemes.	(103)
<b>Other variances under £50k not reported</b>	(232)
<b>Regeneration and Environment Total</b>	<b>(423)</b>



## Appendix A3

<b>Finance, Resources &amp; Customer Services</b>	<b>Budget Variation July 2016 (£'000)</b>
<b>Information &amp; Communications Technology (ICT)</b> - Overspend is due to continued revenue pressure as ICT picks up all revenue costs for new projects with no new revenue budget identified, i.e. Enfield 2017 Platform. A review of the capital programme will be undertaken to see whether any re-profiling could take place to pick up any of the revenue pressures.	850
<b>Unfunded MFD costs</b>	250
<b>Legal &amp; Corporate Governance Services</b> - Overspend within this service area is due to staffing cost overspends in Legal and Corporate Governance (£229k)	229
<b>Property Services</b> Variance due to shortfall in income and loss of income from vacant properties.	852
Other Items	
Use of reserves and other control measures	
<b>Finance, Resources &amp; Customer Services Total</b>	<b>2,181</b>

## Health, Housing &amp; Adult Social Care

## Appendix A4

Health, Housing and Adult Social Care	Forecast Budget Variation July 2016 (£'000)
<b>Adult Social Care</b> Key assumptions within the forecast are based on projected activity and year to year trends. In future years there are increased budget pressures due to demographic pressures, provider cost pressures and a growing demand for social care services.	
<b>Strategy &amp; Resources</b> - There is a minimum of £110k of transport pressures. This is dependent on all the savings being achieved.	110
<b>Mental Health</b> - The service is currently projecting an overspend for the year on care packages.	409
<b>Learning Disabilities</b> - The service continues to project an overspend position as a result of managing demand led services. Not included in the monitor are additional risks of £600k for Ordinary Residence.	2,103
<b>Older People and Physical Disabilities (the Customer Pathway)</b> - The service is projecting care purchasing overspends against a net budget of £30.4m, due to demand led services. This position is consistent with last year's care purchasing overspend.	2,652
<b>Independence &amp; Wellbeing Services</b> - Client income at the two in-house residential homes is less than expected. With the provision of the new home, running costs will be reduced in the longer term.	200
<b>Public Health Grant</b> The Departmental forecast also includes ring fenced Public Health Grant. Public Health grant allocated in 2016/17 is now £17.7m, this reflects a reduction in grant of £409k, with additional reductions of £1.3m planned over the next three years. The Public Health grant is ring fenced and used as per the Department of Health guidance.	0
<b>Other control measures</b> - Use of the Better Care Fund £1.5m and the use of one off monies and further management actions £1.5m.	(3,000)
<b>Adult Social Care &amp; Public Health</b>	<b>2,474</b>
<b>Community Housing</b>	
<b>Housing Related Support.</b> - The savings in 2016/17 were £2.6m in Housing Related Support. The overspend is from Housing Related Support contracts. Savings have already been made in this area in 16/17 and the variance is a result of delayed savings. This service will be closely monitored to ensure the achievement of future year savings.	1,300
<b>Homelessness &amp; Temporary Accommodation</b> - There is a net overspend of £570k over these areas. This is predominantly made up of a £455k overspend resulting from an increase in rents paid in the Private Sector Leased portfolio and Private Leased Annexe portfolio. There is also a projected overspend on Bad Debt of £245k. These are partially offset by a decrease in HRA recharges (£30k) and a projected £100k collection of Amenity charges.	570
<b>Transfer back to reserve to fund initiatives</b> - The reserve opening balance at 1 April 2016 is £566k, £536k will be utilised to fund PSL and PLA incentives and £30k to fund further work by RMG.	0
<b>Community Housing</b>	<b>1,870</b>
<b>Health, Housing and Adult Social Care Total</b>	<b>4,344</b>

## HHASC Overall Summary Position

## Appendix A4

<p>The HHASC Department is currently forecasting a projected budget overspend of £4.34m, which is made up of £2.36m in Adult Social Care, £0.11m in Strategy &amp; Resources, £1.3m in Housing related support and £0.57m in Temporary Accommodation. The table below shows the ASC pressures and savings.</p> <p>The July monitor contains a level of uncertainty on risks and pressures which will be crystallised in future months. The main forecast pressures are in Learning Disabilities £2.1m, Older People and Physical Disabilities £2.65m, Mental Health £409k and Independence &amp; Wellbeing Services £200k. £3.0m of planned control measures reduce the overspend position being reported on Adult Social Care. These figures include the allocation of 2016/17 Better Care Fund monies and the Adult Social Services Precept. The Department delivered savings of £6.7m last year and contained in year pressures using £3m of one-off resources. Further budget control actions are being taken, along with exploring opportunities to maximise BCF allocations which should reduce the projection in the August Monitor.</p>	
<b>ASC Pressures and Savings</b>	<b>£m</b>
Savings for 16/17 (Excludes Housing Related Support savings of £2.6m)	7.70
Demographic Pressures	2.60
DoLS-Pressure	0.80
National Living Wage	1.30
Contract Inflation	0.76
Pressures contained in 15/16 for which one off reserve was used	3.00
<b>Total Pressures into 16/17</b>	<b>16.16</b>
ASC -Precept	-2.10
<b>Total Pressures 16/17</b>	<b>14.06</b>

## Appendix A5

<b>Children's Services</b>	<b>Budget Variation July 2016 (£'000)</b>
<b>Catering</b> The over achievement of income has increased. This is mainly due to the primary and secondary schools projecting a higher update of school meals coupled with a food rebate from suppliers.	(198)
<b>SEN Transport</b> is currently anticipating the same level of expenditure as last year. This will mean that the service will be overspent by £2.02m this year.	2,028
<b>Integrated Commissioning</b> is reporting an overspend of £63k. £84k relates to unachieved savings across the service. There is a £26k YEP budget to be returned to this service and £5k relates to salary overspend.	63
<b>External Residential Child Care Placements</b> The external residential placements budgets are showing a net underspend of £76k, based on current and planned placements. There was an overspend of £593k within this budget in 2015-16 however a growth in the 2016-17 budget of £185k was approved to support the on-going pressures in this area. This is largely due to a higher than expected number of adolescent children coming into care who cannot be accommodated by our in house fostering service due to their complex needs. The July monitoring projection includes planned placements but possible additional placements totalling £580k are not reported.	(76)
<b>Adoption Allowances</b> This service area has seen a budget growth in 2016-17 of £350k, however the service is still projecting an overspend. Allowances are projecting to overspend by £120k which are offset by savings within other operating costs reducing the pressure to £72k. At present, 25 additional allowances are expected. There is a risk that this overspend however could increase, where for example an additional 40 allowance payments would lead to an estimated pressure of £450k based on a 50:50 split of Special Guardianship & Adoption allowances. The July projection has increased since last month by £25k due to 2 new SGO's.	72

## Appendix A5

<b>Children's Services</b>	<b>Budget Variation July 2016 (£'000)</b>
<p><b>Leaving Care - Client Costs</b> The Leaving Care client costs budget is projecting to overspend by £60k. There has been a budget increase of £870k in 2016-17 which in part explains the reduced overspend compared to last year. There is however a significant risk that this overspend will increase when new clients come into care and existing package costs increasing with delays in clients moving on to independence. Based on behaviour of activity last year it has been estimated that this could be in the region of £450k. The LAC service are continuing to review the most expensive support packages and exploring alternative or new options for service provision for these clients where possible. There is also a shortage of semi-independent accommodation which means clients are unable to be moved from their expensive residential placements. The July projection has increased since last month by £50k due to 3 new clients.</p>	110
<p><b>Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children</b> Savings are currently projected due a budget increase (£187k) within the UASC budget but also an increase (effective from July 2016) in the rates paid in the Home Office grant received. There has been a rapid increase in placements historically over the years, however in light of the UK leaving the EU it is difficult to predict the behaviour of these numbers at this stage. Between April and June 2016 there have been 9 new clients. The net spend on this budget was £203k higher in 2015-16 than the July projection and there is a risk that additional support hours may be required which may deplete savings currently projected. A national transfer protocol of UASC's has been created to enable the safe transfer of unaccompanied children from one local authority to another. Enfield is one London Borough that has more than its share of UASCs within its overall LAC population. Therefore costs may stabilise due to a London rota scheme in place to accommodate new arrivals. A review of client costs in July has identified a £27k reduction in the saving previously reported.</p>	(154)
<p><b>Youth Strategy &amp; Support Service</b> An overspend of £59k is projected due to unbudgeted early retirement pension costs of 2 senior management posts which have been deleted.</p>	59
<p>Other Minor Variations</p>	(106)
<p><b>Children's Services Total</b></p>	<b>1,798</b>

<b>Schools Budget</b>	<b>Budget Variation July 2016 (£'000)</b>
<b>Education Services</b>	
<b>Early Years.</b> This service is reporting an underspend due to placements for 2 year olds and 3&4 year olds being less than anticipated. This is partly as result of a cut in promoting the 2 year old placements.	(1,869)
Reduction in DSG Early Years Block. Actual 16/17 allocation reflecting numbers as at Jan 2016 census lower than estimated. Offset by lower placement costs reported above	1,911
<b>Special Education Needs</b>	
<b>Mainstream Tuition.</b> At this early stage of the cycle, demand has been based on last year's figures. This is forecast to underspend by £252k	(252)
<b>Independent Day</b> It is anticipated that there will be an increase in the number of children over and above the budgeted amount. This will result in an overspend of £566k	283
<b>Independent Residential.</b> It is anticipated that there will be an increase in the number of children requiring this service in excess of the budget. This is expected to show an overspend of £593k	593
<b>School Revenue Budget</b> The summer term SEN count has shown an increase in the number of Education, Health & Care Plans (EHCP). Consequently, this has resulted in an increase in the spend on the Primary & Secondary revenue budgets to meet this demand.	300
<b>High Needs Contingency</b> Contingency for high needs pressures not yet utilised but is expected to be fully used during the financial year (see School Budget Risks below)	(850)
<b>Budgets with no/ minor variances</b>	(87)
<b>Total Variation – Schools Budget</b>	<b>29</b>

**Schools Budget Risks** There are additional pressure areas in the Schools Budget, particularly in relation to SEN which are expected to result in additional costs later in the financial year. These include the expansion of Waverley School to create additional early years provision which is estimated to cost £300k in 16/17 and the ongoing increase in the cost of funding additional Education, Health and Care Plans for pupils in mainstream schools. The high needs contingency funding available had already been utilised so any additional pressure will result in a DSG overspend.

## Treasury Management Cashflow Investments &amp; Borrowing as at 31 July 2016

The Treasury Management position as at 31 July 2016 is set out below:

	Jun-15	Sep-15	Dec-15	Feb-16	May-16	Jun-16	Jul-16
	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
Long term borrowing	272,532	314,986	324,986	354,837	352,641	362,241	362,241
Short-term borrowing	17,000	19,000	39,000	58,000	63,000	64,000	81,000
<b>Total borrowing</b>	<b>289,532</b>	<b>333,986</b>	<b>363,986</b>	<b>412,837</b>	<b>415,641</b>	<b>426,241</b>	<b>443,241</b>
Total investments	19,315	46,195	30,560	41,220	16,695	28,150	7,325
<b>Net debt</b>	<b>270,217</b>	<b>287,791</b>	<b>333,426</b>	<b>371,617</b>	<b>398,946</b>	<b>398,091</b>	<b>435,916</b>
Increase in Net debt since 1 June 15		17,574	63,209	101,400	128,729	127,874	165,699

## Movement in debt

	01-Apr-16	Debt repaid	New debt	31-Jul-16
	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
PWLB	287,478	(250)	10000	297,228
Commercial loan	30,000	0	0	30,000
Local Authority Borrowing	18,000	0	0	18,000
Salix	1,462	0	0	1,462
Temporary borrowing	86,000	(55,000)	50,000	81,000
LT Borrowing from LEEF	5,850	(151)	0	5,699
EIB LT Borrowing	9,851	0	0	9,851
<b>Total borrowing</b>	<b>438,641</b>	<b>(55,401)</b>	<b>60,000</b>	<b>443,240</b>

## London Borough of Enfield Investments at 31 July 16

Financial Institution	Principal	Start Date	Effective Maturity	Rate	Days to Maturity	Days to Maturity	Lowest Credit Rating
<b>Call Accounts</b>							
HSBC TREASURY CENTRE CALL ACCOUNT	4,325,000	n/a	On demand	0.47%			
SVENSKA HANDELSBANKEN CALL ACCOUNT	3,000,000	n/a	On demand	0.50%			
<b>Notice Accounts</b>							
Santander 31 Day Notice Account	0	-	On demand	-			
<b>Money Market Funds</b>							
HSBC Sterling	0	-	On demand	0.44%			AAAm*
GOLDMAN SACHS STERLING LIQUID RESERVE FUND		n/a	On demand	0.45%			
IGNIS LIQUIDITY FUND		n/a	On demand	0.53%			
<b>Long Term Deposits</b>							
Lloyds Bank PLC	0		-	-			A
<b>Total - Investments</b>	<b>7,325,000</b>		<b>Average</b>	<b>0.48%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
Number of Investments	2						

## London Borough of Enfield Short Term loans at 31 July 2016

Financial Institution	Principal	Start Date	Effective Maturity	Rate	Days to Maturity
Workingham BC	£2,000,000	08/09/2015	18/08/2016	0.50%	18
South Ayrshire Council	£5,000,000	27/10/2015	25/10/2016	0.55%	86
Milton Keynes	£10,000,000	01/12/2015	30/11/2016	0.60%	122
West Somerset DC	£2,000,000	15/01/2016	13/01/2017	0.56%	166
L.B. of Islington	£5,000,000	28/01/2016	26/01/2017	0.60%	179
West Midlands Police Commissioner	£5,000,000	29/01/2016	27/01/2017	0.60%	180
Chichester DC	£2,000,000	29/01/2016	28/01/2017	0.60%	181
Tameside MBC	£10,000,000	01/04/2016	03/10/2016	0.57%	64
West Yorkshire Combined Authority	£10,000,000	15/04/2016	13/04/2017	0.55%	256
SEDGEMOOR DISTRICT COUNCIL	£5,000,000	02/06/2016	03/04/2017	0.60%	246
POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSION FOR WEST YORKSHIRE	£5,000,000	07/06/2016	07/04/2017	0.58%	250
WEST YORKSHIRE COMBINED AUTHORITY	£5,000,000	15/07/2016	18/04/2017	0.47%	261
LONDON BOROUGH OF EALING COUNCIL	£5,000,000	11/07/2016	11/04/2017	0.49%	254
CHELMSFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL	£5,000,000	15/07/2016	14/07/2017	0.42%	348
LONDON BOROUGH OF EALING COUNCIL	£5,000,000	19/07/2016	18/07/2017	0.39%	352
<b>Total</b>	<b>£81,000,000</b>		<b>Average</b>	<b>0.54%</b>	<b>198</b>

## Appendix C – Savings Monitoring

July 2016

Department	Red		Amber		Green		Blue		Total
	£000's	%	£000's	%	£000's	%	£000's	%	£000's
Regeneration & Environment	0	0%	(60)	3%	(2,120)	97%	0	0%	<b>(2,180)</b>
Finance, Resources & Customer Services	(122)	37%	(209)	63%	0	0%	0	0%	<b>(331)</b>
Housing, Health & Adult Social Care	(1,170)	17%	(3,787)	55%	(1,912)	28%	0	0%	<b>(6,869)</b>
Schools & Children's Services	(352)	11%	(2,829)	89%	0	0%	0	0%	<b>(3,181)</b>
Chief Executive	0	0%	0	0%	(300)	100%	0	0%	<b>(300)</b>
<b>Total New Savings for 2016/17</b>	<b>(1,644)</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>(6,885)</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>(4,332)</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>(12,861)</b>
									<b>(12,861)</b>



## Appendix D

### **Multi-year settlement agreement**

Cabinet approval is sought for applying for the Government's four year funding agreement. In order to apply, an efficiency plan must be published on the Council's website and an application must be made to the Government by the deadline of 14<sup>th</sup> October 2016. There is growing uncertainty regarding public finances following the BREXIT decision and the Chancellor has indicated that he may reset some public finances in this year's Autumn Statement. Given this background, achieving some security in the level of funding Enfield will receive over the medium term would be desirable.

### **Background**

Local authorities have taken the biggest hit in terms of central government cuts since 2010. The scale of the reduction, along with a degree of volatility around the phasing / timing of these cuts to different authority types, has made it very difficult for authorities to plan their spending priorities strategically. The need for effective medium term planning has never been stronger.

The government's response has been an offer of a guaranteed minimum grant envelope, paid to councils for a 4-year period from April 2016 covering Revenue Support Grant, transitional funding and Rural Services Delivery Grant. This should increase local authority certainty and confidence and would be a key step towards supporting councils to strengthen financial management and work collaboratively with local partners when considering the way local services are provided in future.

### **What is an efficiency plan?**

Every council in the country is different. Each will have its own vision, policies, opportunities and challenges and each will be at a different stage in its journey to financial sustainability.

So no two efficiency plans are likely to focus on the same things, have common aims or include the same reports. Each council should therefore be judged on its own merits when the government are reviewing their plans. Key considerations may include: How clear are the targets? What role is partnership working expected to take? What are the aspirations around transformation programmes? How are councils planning to achieve their efficiencies? Is there clear ownership and accountability? And is there robustness around the management, monitoring and measurement of outcomes?

The way a council chooses to put this story together in their efficiency plan remains for them to decide, as is the supporting documents that they would choose to include.

## **Content of an efficiency plan**

- The cornerstone of the efficiency plan is the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for the four years of the offer. Not just the numbers in a table, but a short narrative that sets out what a council intends to do to address the challenge of financial sustainability and where it hopes to be at the end of the period. An efficiency plan needs to be about more than just money.
- Most practitioners favour a short 2–4 page narrative, with typical documents to support this narrative to include the latest budget, corporate plan, transformation plan, asset-management plan and baseline organisational structure.
- It follows that an efficiency plan needs to have clear links to the Council's corporate plan and where the authority is involved in key partnerships, such as shared management arrangements or progress towards a combined authority. It should acknowledge any links with partner organisations and plans that this entails.
- It also needs to reference ongoing and planned transformation projects and programmes where these are significant in ensuring the council reduces its costs or generates additional income locally.
- However, an efficiency plan need not be any more than an 'abridged version' of key / existing public documents already put together by the council. The Council should not find itself doing a major piece of extra work to deliver an efficiency plan.
- Councils could consider presenting the efficiency plan by theme, for example, what it is doing to grow its local economy, to bear down on costs, to manage current and future demand or to re-forge its 'contract' with local residents.

## **Key Principles of the Medium Term Financial Plan**

Enfield's Medium Term Financial Plan is based on a number of key principles and assumptions. These are:

- That savings identified will be implemented to allow benefit realisation as soon as practicable.
- The Medium Term Financial Plan assumes a 1.99% (1.98% in 2016/17) increase in Council Tax and a Social Care precept of 2.0% for each year over the period of the Plan.
- That the demographic pressures the Borough faces are regularly reviewed and updated throughout the lifetime of the plan.
- That all risks related to both the delivery of the proposals in the plan and any future uncertainties are reviewed on a regular basis.

- Minimum balances of around £14m are maintained in accordance with the latest Finance Resilience Review carried out by external auditors.

### **Financial Planning & Budget Setting Process**

Enfield Council has a consistent financial planning and budget setting process, which is being used again this year. During the course of this budget round, decisions will continue to be made in accordance with the following principles:

- Continuously review the Council's existing and planned Capital Programme, to minimise the capital investment that is reliant upon increased borrowing funded by the council tax.
- Utilise business and commercial practices where possible to increase investment without recourse to public funding.
- To invest where affordable so as to:
  - Grow the borough by developing Meridian Water to increase council tax revenues and boost local business and economy.
  - Invest to Save.
- Review service savings proposed by Directors and Cabinet members, in order to find savings to balance the 2017/18 budget and MTFP.
- Complete the Enfield 2017 Transformation Programme for the Council that will deliver a much more automated, digitally supported experience for both internal and external customers of the Council, and devise the next phase of the Council's transformation.
- Continue the commercial development of the Council, so that income can be generated wherever possible, and/or longer term asset wealth is created. This covers a wide range of issues, including fees and charges (primarily in Environment, but also across the Council more generally), developing existing commercial relationships (with, for example Fusion Leisure), trading of council services (e.g. cleaning, HR and payroll) with other councils, sharing services, the development of the council's housing companies, and, potentially, longer term opportunities such as LVHN.
- Develop the MTFP using risk based assessment so that budgets are provided based on the probability of pressures materialising whilst risks are covered by reserves and balances.

This page is intentionally left blank

# **APPENDIX 2**

**Call-in request form submitted by 8 Members of  
the Council**

This page is intentionally left blank

## CALL-IN OF DECISION

(please ensure you complete all sections fully)

Please return the completed original signed copy to:  
 Claire Johnson, Scrutiny Team, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Civic Centre

TITLE OF DECISION: REVENUE MONITORING REPORT 2016/2017  
JULY 2016

DECISION OF: CABINET 6th SEPTEMBER 2016

DATE OF DECISION LIST PUBLICATION: 8th SEPTEMBER 2016 ✓

LIST NO: KD4365 List N° 25.

(\* N.B. Remember you must call-in a decision and notify Scrutiny Team within **5 working days** of its publication).

A decision can be called in if it is a corporate or portfolio decision made by either Cabinet or one of its sub-committees, or a key decision made by an officer with delegated authority from the Executive.

**(a) COUNCILLORS CALLING-IN (The Council's constitution requires seven signatures or more from Councillors to call a decision in).**

- |                                   |                                       |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| (1) Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> | Print Name: <u>MILIE RICE</u>         |
| (2) Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> | Print Name: <u>ERTAN HUZAR</u>        |
| (3) Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> | Print Name: <u>DOEAN SELMAN</u>       |
| (4) Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> | Print Name: <u>ANDY MILNE</u>         |
| (5) Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> | Print Name: <u>TIM STEVEN</u>         |
| (6) Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> | Print Name: <u>Alessandro Gersian</u> |
| (7) Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> | Print Name: <u>JATON CHARTRAMBOS</u>  |
| (8) Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> | Print Name: <u>ANNE MARIE PEARCE</u>  |

**(b) SCRUTINY PANEL RESOLUTION (copy of minute detailing formal resolution to request call-in to be attached).**

NAME OF PANEL: Overview & Scrutiny Cttee

DATE OF PANEL: 4th October 2016.

This page is intentionally left blank



# **APPENDIX 3**

**Reasons for Call-in by Councillor calling in the  
decision**

**&**

**Briefing Note in response to called in decision  
*(Please note this will be a 'to follow' item)***

This page is intentionally left blank

(1) Reason why decision is being called in:

See Attached.

(2) Outline of proposed alternative action:

Report is referred back to CABINET  
for greater detail and explanations  
given to how the overspend will be covered and

(3) Do you believe the decision is outside the policy framework? greater

ANALYSIS OF  
LOW INCREASE

No

(4) If Yes, give reasons: n/a

**FOR DST USE ONLY:**

Checked by Proper Officer for validation –



Name of Proper Officer:

Date:

Asmat Hussain

20/09/2016

**Reason why the decision is being called in:**

**1. £7.9m overspend**

The recommendations to the Cabinet in the report simply ask that Cabinet note the £7.9m overspend and that it agrees that departments reporting pressures should formulate and implement action plans.

£7.9m is the about equivalent of an 8% increase in band C Council Tax and therefore a significant sum.

The report lacks any detail as to the types of efficiencies and savings to be achieved or the exact time frame within which the savings are to be achieved. The report only provides details as to the reasons for the over spend, which includes:

Finance, Resources & Customer Services (Appendix A3)	£2,181,000
Health, Housing and Adult Social Care (Appendix A4)	£4,344,000
Children's Services (Appendix A5)	£1,798,000

Given that there may be additional overspends and financial pressures in the foreseeable future and the programmes set out in page 35 again lack any detail or substance and may not be achieved it is essential that more detailed information, planning and a time scale given as to the immediate efficiencies and savings to be undertaken to eliminate the overspend before additional spending pressures arise.

**2. Borrowing**

Appendix B on page 31 discloses that the Local Authorities combined net short-term and long-term borrowing increased from £270,217,000 in June 2015 to £435,916,000 in July 2016; an increase of £165,699,000.

This is the largest sum ever owed by this Local Authority.

Other than being noted in the appendices there is no reference in the main body of the report for the reasons for the increase in debt or the longer term direction in which the level of debt is heading.

## OVERVIEW &amp; SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.9.2016

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON THURSDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER 2016**

**COUNCILLORS:** Derek Levy (Chair), Abdul Abdullahi, Katherine Chibah  
**PRESENT** (Vice-Chair), Nneka Keazor, Edward Smith and Dogan Delman.

**STATUTORY** Mr Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative)  
**CO-OPTES** *Mr Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative), 1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative, Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor representative, Kayah Taylor (EYP Representative), Asiya Warsame (EYP Representative) ) – Italics Denotes absence*

**OFFICERS:** Ian Davis (Director Regeneration & Environment), Bob Griffiths (AD Planning, Highways & Transportation), David B Taylor (Head of Traffic & Transportation), Paul Rogers (Programme Manager, Cycling), Richard Eason (Cycle Enfield Consultation Manager), Jon Judah (Cycle Enfield Project Director), Julian Edwards (Interim AD Children's Social Services), Maria Anastasi (Service Manager Safeguarding & Quality), Anne Stoker (Head of Safeguarding), Andy Ellis and Elaine Huckell (Scrutiny)

**Also Attending:** Councillor Terence Neville OBE JP, Leader of the Opposition & the Conservative Group, Councillor Daniel Anderson, Cabinet Member, Environment and approximately 70 members of the public.

**129**

**WELCOME & APOLOGIES**

The Chair welcomed all attendees to the meeting. Apologies for absence were received from Mr Simon Goulden.

It was noted that Councillor Dogan Delman was substituting for Councillor Joanne Laban.

**130**

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interests were put forward.

**131**

## OVERVIEW &amp; SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.9.2016

**CALL-IN OF REPORT: APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR THE A105**

The Chair invited Councillor Neville to present the Reasons for Call-In. Councillor Neville began his submission by referring to the need for Members to act impartially, as this meeting should proceed without the 'party whip'. Councillor Levy confirmed that all matters at Overview and Scrutiny are considered in this manner.

Councillor Neville stated that the Call-in was about the consultation undertaken in respect of the Cycle Enfield proposals for the A105, including consideration of the consultation findings and the adequacy of this.

He summarised the reasons for Call- In as follows:

- The leading law case which gives the criteria for a fair local authority consultation refers to two legal principles that are relevant here i.e. that 'adequate time must be given for consideration and response' and 'the product of consultation must be conscientiously taken into account' He did not think adequate time had been given for consideration as the consultation ended on 29 July 2016 with 1600 objections received, and the decision by the Cabinet Member to approve the scheme was signed by him on 17 August 2016.
- An objection had originally been given by Arriva Bus Company to the proposals, in particular the withdrawal of the bus lane going south from the Triangle, Palmers Green towards the North Circular Road and the impact/ delays of this on bus journeys. Although the report refers to there being extensive discussion with TfL re a commitment to identify measures elsewhere on the route (mainly in Haringey) to mitigate this impact, we do not know what has been agreed with them. He understands that even following recent meetings with officers, the Commercial Planning Manager of Arriva London (Bob Pennyfather) still has concerns about this scheme.
- Reference was made to the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) England and Wales Regulations 1996, that if an objection is made by a bus company to something that would restrict the movement of buses along the route, then the local authority is required to hold a Public Local Inquiry. The objection from the bus company is not included in the schedule of objections received and the report does not state that the objections from Arriva have been withdrawn. As such a Local Inquiry is still required. Under the same regulations there is a requirement to hold a public enquiry if an order is made prohibiting the loading or unloading of vehicles.
- The air quality report acknowledged that there was likely to be some increase in NO<sup>2</sup> concentrations at junctions where there were some increases in queue length and delay time although with potential improvements if there was a modal shift from private car to cycling. However the report acknowledges that the shift from cars to cycles is not guaranteed and it is possible that the resulting air quality improvements may not be achieved.

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.9.2016**

- The London Ambulance Service (LAS) has set out serious reservations they have about the proposals. It appears that all three emergency services would be affected detrimentally by the scheme.
- The numerous objections received cannot possibly have been considered in the time taken before the report was signed off by the Cabinet Member. Between the 29 July 2016 to the 17 August 2016 there were only 13 working days to look at all issues raised.
- The original objections put forward by Councillor Neville and Arriva (Bus company) to the proposals were not listed in the schedule.
- This is a very costly scheme and in all his years in the Council, Councillor Neville said he had never seen a scheme which had attracted so many objections.

The Chair invited Councillor Anderson to respond, which is summarised as follows:

- The decision had not been 'rushed', consideration of all issues had been undertaken over an 18 month period.
- Of the 1600 objections received, 1000 of these were similar objections in principle which were classified under the following 'groupings' -
  - Objections about the principle of the proposals
  - Objections about a common feature of the proposals
  - Objections about a specific location
  - Objections based on a technical or procedural matter
- Consideration of objections had been dealt with as they were being received. Councillor Anderson had held daily conversations with officers to discuss issues as they were raised. All representations and objections have been considered in detail.
- Arriva London have stated that they have withdrawn their formal objection to the scheme, their initial comments and officers responses are set out in paragraphs 5.17 to 5.21 of the report. A public inquiry is not required.
- There appears to be an assumption that vehicles cannot legally access the loading facilities but this is incorrect and the 'response to reason for call-in' para 3.15 to 3.21 sets out the proposed loading arrangements.
- The London Ambulance Service had not objected to the proposals. He referred to para 5.16 of the report regarding the use of traffic separators to segregate cyclists from other traffic to help minimise the impact on emergency service response times, allowing broken down vehicles etc to pull into the cycle lane if necessary. The Police Service have said that the scheme would improve the safety for cyclists. The Fire Brigade have no objections and he noted that their vehicles are larger than ambulances.

Councillor Levy pointed out that the decision to hold a public inquiry is not within the remit of this Committee. In addition, Councillor Levy advised the meeting that as there was an appeal pending in the High Court, caution should be observed in relation to comments and questions.

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.9.2016**

The Chair then invited the Committee to put forward any questions/ comments which were as follows:

- Councillor Smith said it would appear that Councillor Neville is requesting that this matter be referred back to the Cabinet Member for Environment, for him to reconsider whether this should be the subject of a public inquiry as a result of changes to 'waiting and loading' restrictions and the restriction for public service vehicles. He asked if any pressure had been put on Arriva London to withdraw the original objection they had to the scheme? David Taylor answered that a meeting had been held with Bob Pennyfather, the Commercial Planning Manager of Arriva London to examine their concerns. They discussed mitigation measures. Following on from this, Arriva then withdrew their formal objection to the scheme.
- Councillor Smith referred to the waiting and loading restrictions, which are to be introduced on an experimental basis by the use of a temporary order. He said at some point when they become permanent how will you avoid having a public inquiry? David Taylor stated the waiting and loading restrictions would be introduced on an experimental basis to enable them to be modified in the light of feedback and operational experience. As this is an experimental order there would be no requirement to hold a public inquiry.
- It was questioned whether the time taken to consider objections could be considered as adequate. Councillor Neville said the statutory consultation period ended on the 29 July and the first report by officers was completed on 11 August and the draft given to Councillor Anderson. Councillor Neville did not think there could have been sufficient time for adequate consideration of objections. Councillor Anderson said officers had worked hard for 3 weeks on considering issues raised, the categorisation of objections made it possible to consider all representations and objections in a very efficient manner.
- With reference to there no longer being any formal objections from public services, Councillor Neville said the main issue was how well or not objections had been considered. He said his objections and those from Arriva London had not been included in the schedule.
- Councillor Delman asked if information was available of when objections were received during the consultation process i.e. were the majority received during the last part of the consultation? It was answered that the majority were received via the on-line system and are date stamped. A steady flow of representations had been received which officers were able to review as they 'went along' there was a fairly even spread of comments received.
- It was asked why Councillor Neville and Arriva London's objections had not been included on the schedule, it was answered that the substantive issues raised were included in the main report.
- Councillor Anderson and officers were asked if they were satisfied that the withdrawal of Arriva London's formal objection meant that a public inquiry would not be needed. David Taylor confirmed that to be the case.



**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.9.2016**

- Reference was made to objections about the principles of the proposals as listed in Table 1 in Appendix B of the report – Councillor Anderson commented that this was an efficient way of looking at generic objections.
- Councillor Neville thought a public inquiry should be held – he said at the time the report on the scheme was presented to Councillor Anderson, the objection from Arriva London ‘still stood’. It was only later that this objection was withdrawn. He reiterated his comments regarding the timetable of communications between officers and Arriva London and stated that he thought there appeared to be an element of ‘chicanery’ about this business. This comment drew applause from the audience at which point Councillor Smith also showed his approval and applauded. The Chair reminded Councillor Smith to be mindful of his earlier comments regarding declarations of prejudicial interests, reiterating those also requested by Councillor Neville about the need for committee members to act impartially. Councillor Smith said he agreed with this, but had been persuaded by the points made by Councillor Neville.

The Chair then invited three questions to be put from members of the audience, which were as follows:

- Has Councillor Neville spoken to Arriva London? Councillor Neville confirmed that he had spoken to them and understands that they still have concerns
- I know that two long reports received from David Burrowes and others would have been received by the department in the last 2 days of the consultation, could they have been adequately considered in the time given? It was confirmed that these reports were detailed and they had received careful consideration. Conversations had been held and there had been direct responses given.
- The email I sent raised two safety issues that were not included in the report and I have not had an answer? Richard Eason confirmed that he had received the objections mentioned and the issues raised have been covered in the report. It was stated that a written response would be sent to Mr Mandel. *(Post meeting note - An email was sent to Mr Mandel on 15.9.16, from Paul Rogers giving details of where the objections he had raised were covered in the portfolio report).*

The Chair asked Councillor Anderson to summarise his position which was as follows:

- The essence of the objections raised appears to be about whether sufficient time had been spent in examining consultation replies and the objections put forward. This is a matter of opinion, and I have explained the process which enabled us to examine all issues raised.
- The time taken to look at these issues was in fact three weeks and not the 11 days previously mentioned.
- The objection originally raised by Arriva London has been addressed – they no longer have a formal objection.
- The issue around ‘waiting and loading’ is addressed in the report.

## OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.9.2016

- There have been no formal objections from the London Ambulance Service or from the Fire Brigade.

Councillor Neville summarised his position as follows:

- Councillor Anderson had spoken of whether adequate consideration had been given to objections raised as a matter of opinion – Councillor Neville did not agree that this was a matter of opinion.
- He said both his objections and those raised by David Burrowes had not been included in the schedule. He questioned whether there were other objections that had not been included. He therefore did not think all objections had been considered. Arriva London had not been included on the schedule as having objections.
- There is an explicit requirement for a public enquiry regarding waiting and loading restriction changes and also in respect of objections from public service vehicles.

The Committee then voted on the decision

Councillors Abdullahi, Chibah and Keazor voted in favour of confirming the decision.

Councillors Smith and Delman voted in favour of referral back to the Cabinet member for reconsideration.

The Chair therefore **CONFIRMED** the decision.

## 132

### CHILDREN'S & YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Julian Edwards, the Interim AD Children's Social Care introduced this report to update the Overview and Scrutiny Committee about workload/ activity levels and trends for the service. It gave information about levels of activity locally for children defined as being 'in need'. This includes children for who the local authority has had to initiate child protection processes and children who are in the care of the Council.

He highlighted the following:

- There has been a significant change in the size and nature of Enfield's population over the last few years with an increase in child population and an increase in the number of children who are living in poverty. Data shows Enfield is the 5<sup>th</sup> most deprived borough in London and Enfield has the largest number of children living in poverty of all London boroughs.
- There has been an increase in referrals to Enfield's Children's social care services with a 50% increase over the last 3 years.
- The main factors that have led to an increase in referrals are believed to be - demographic, child sexual exploitation, FGM (female genital mutilation) and greater awareness of domestic violence.

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.9.2016**

- The numbers of children subject to Child Protection Plans has varied during the last year with approximately 200 currently in effect.
- The number of children adopted during 2015/16 is slightly less than in previous years
- The percentage of Enfield's LAC children with a diagnosed disability is approximately the same as previous years.
- There have been 7 unaccompanied adolescent asylum seekers in Enfield of whom 4 were dispersed to other boroughs and 3 have stayed with us.

The following points/ questions were raised:

- It was confirmed that none of the 7 unaccompanied adolescent asylum seekers had come from Syria.
- When asked how adolescent asylum seekers come to Enfield it was confirmed that there is no particular reason why this happens. Some boroughs have larger numbers than others such as the higher numbers in Kent, Croydon, and Hounslow. A large number of adolescents are Albanians they also come from countries such as Afghanistan and Eritrea. When children arrive in Enfield we have a duty to look after them.
- It was pointed out that only a small minority of Enfield's LAC (Looked after Children) are in residential care, there would always be a few in residential care as a result of the Court system. The aim would always be for children to move out of residential care as children benefit from being in a family situation.
- When asked about the impact of costs on the service Julian Edwards said foster care is much cheaper than paying for residential care, which can be very expensive i.e up to £5k a week. This is because specialist/ environment care may be necessary.
- It was confirmed that when unaccompanied children arrive in the borough, the government provides a contribution towards the cost. For over 18's there is no government contribution, although it may be necessary for some form of care to be provided. Local Authorities are lobbying the Government about providing further funding.
- The Chair asked Julian Edwards if there were any areas of particular concern he may wish to make members aware? He answered that data shows our service performs positively with comparable boroughs. This is done by working closely with families and in a decisive way, to 'steadily move situations along'. His main concern relates to the growing level of need in Enfield at a time when resources are being reduced. This is especially in relation to preventative services. He said we need to ensure that any cuts being made do not have a detrimental effect on statutory services.
- It was asked whether we try to locate the parents of children who arrive in the borough as unaccompanied asylum seekers? An answer was given that we would aim to do this, however this may not be possible. He said it had been possible for one youngster to be able to be reunited with his family and repatriated back to Albania with the assistance of his embassy.

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.9.2016**

- It was confirmed that looked after children from other local authorities are sometimes placed in Enfield. Some boroughs such as Croydon and Kent have high numbers of looked after children and have asked other authorities not to place children in their boroughs.
- It was thought the reason why a high number of adolescent asylum seekers came from Albania was due to factors such as - better educational opportunities, superior health care and generally better prospects. This differs from adolescents coming from Eritrea who are escaping a war torn country.

Maria Anastasi, Service Manager, Safeguarding and Quality Service and the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) and Ann Stoker, Head of Safeguarding, Quality & Principal Social Worker, Schools & Children's Services presented reports on –

The Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) Annual Report 2015/16 and

The Safeguarding & Quality Assurance Service Independent Review Officer (IRO) Annual Report 2015/16

The above reports were received and the following points / issues raised:

- There are 7.5 full time equivalent staff who are responsible for Child Protection Plans.
- One of the responsibilities of the service is to review cases of LAC (Looked after children) to consider if they can be rehabilitated.
- The numbers of children subject to Child Protection Plans has varied from 350 last year to the 200 currently existing. We aim for children not to be the subject of Child Protection Plans for long i.e 'they must be robust'
- A statutory role of LADO includes responsibility for management and oversight of allegations against individuals who work with children. This would include both paid and unpaid people e.g governors, scouts, teachers.
- A breakdown of allegations given in the LADO Annual report refers to substantiated, unsubstantiated and unfounded allegations– It was requested that a definition be given of these classifications.
- Councillor Smith referred to a situation relating to a teacher, known to him, who had concerns regarding a safeguarding issue. Councillor Smith would email details to Julian Edwards and Ann Stoker who would look into this case.
- It was asked what would happen if a case was unsubstantiated? i.e would the situation be dismissed? It was answered that discussions would be held and professional help may be given e.g for training. Behaviour would be monitored.

The Chair thanked officers for their reports

**OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.9.2016**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 30 JUNE & 14 JULY 2016**

The Minutes of the meetings held on 30 June 2016 and 14 July 2016 were **AGREED**

**134  
AGENDA PLANNING**

An OSC Call-In meeting will be held on the 15 September 2016 on:

Education Services: A New Model of Service Delivery

**135  
DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The dates of future meetings were **NOTED**

**136  
EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS & PUBLIC**

This page is intentionally left blank