



Meeting of the

CABINET

Wednesday, 7 September 2011 at 5.30 p.m.

AGENDA – SECTION ONE

VENUE

Committee Room, 1st Floor, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, London, E14 2BG

Members:

Mayor Lutfur Rahman (Mayor)	– (Mayor)
Councillor Ohid Ahmed (Deputy Mayor)	– (Deputy Mayor)
Councillor Rofique U Ahmed	– (Cabinet Member for Regeneration)
Councillor Shafiqul Haque	– (Cabinet Member for Jobs and Skills)
Councillor Shahed Ali	– (Cabinet Member for Environment)
Councillor Abdul Asad	– (Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing)
Councillor Alibor Choudhury	– (Cabinet Member for Resources)
Councillor Rabina Khan	– (Cabinet Member for Housing)
Councillor Rania Khan	– (Cabinet Member for Culture)
Councillor Oliur Rahman	– (Cabinet Member for Children's Services)

[Note: The quorum for this body is 3 Members].

If you require any further information relating to this meeting, would like to request a large print, Braille or audio version of this document, or would like to discuss access arrangements or any other special requirements, please contact:

Angus Taylor, Democratic Services,

Tel: 020 7364 4333, E-mail: angus.taylor@towerhamlets.gov.uk

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

CABINET

WEDNESDAY, 7 SEPTEMBER 2011

5.30 p.m.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

**PAGE
NUMBER
1 - 2**

**WARD(S)
AFFECTED**

To note any declarations of interest made by Members, including those restricting Members from voting on the questions detailed in Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992. See attached note from the Chief Executive.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

3 - 24

The unrestricted minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Cabinet held on 3rd August 2011 are attached.

4. DEPUTATIONS & PETITIONS

To receive any petitions.

5. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

5.1 Chair's advice of Key Issues or Questions in relation to Unrestricted Business to be considered

To receive any advice of key issues or questions in relation to the unrestricted business to be considered, arising from the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 6th September 2011.

	PAGE NUMBER	WARD(S) AFFECTED
5.2 Any Unrestricted Decisions "Called in" by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee		
(Under provisions of Article 6 Para 6.02 V of the Constitution).		
The following item has been "called in" for further consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting to be held on 6 th September 2011. Should the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, upon consideration, refer the item back to the Cabinet for further consideration Members will receive a copy of the report and the decision/ recommendations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at the Cabinet meeting.		
(i) The Baishakhi Mela in Banglatown, Brick Lane: transfer to community management.		
UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION		
6. A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE		
6.1 Decent Homes Funding Gap Options for 2011-2015 (CAB 031/112)	25 - 42	All Wards
7. A PROSPEROUS COMMUNITY		
Nil items.		
8. A SAFE AND COHESIVE COMMUNITY		
Nil items.		
9. A HEALTHY AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITY		
9.1 Award of contract for Care and Housing Related Support in Extra Care Sheltered Housing (CAB 032/112)	43 - 58	All Wards
10. ONE TOWER HAMLETS		
10.1 Strategic Performance and Corporate Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Quarter 1 2011/12 (Month 3) Report to the end of June 2011 (CAB 033/112)	59 - 124	All Wards
10.2 Recording/ Webcasting Council Meetings (CAB 034/112)	125 - 132	All Wards

**11. ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS
CONSIDERED TO BE URGENT**

To consider any other unrestricted business that the Chair considers to be urgent.

**12. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR
INFORMATION**

Nil items.

13. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

In view of the contents of the remaining items on the agenda, the Committee is recommended to adopt the following motion:

“That, under the provisions of Section 100A of the Local Government Act, 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act, 1985, the Press and Public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting for the consideration of the Section Two business on the grounds that it contains information defined as Exempt in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government, Act 1972”.

EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL SECTION (PINK)

The Exempt / Confidential (Pink) Committee papers in the Agenda will contain information, which is commercially, legally or personally sensitive and should not be divulged to third parties. If you do not wish to retain these papers after the meeting, please hand them to the Committee Officer present.

14. EXEMPT / CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

133 - 136

The exempt / confidential minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Cabinet held on 3rd August 2011 are attached.

15. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**15 .1 Chair's advice of Key Issues or Questions in relation to
Exempt / Confidential Business to be considered.**

Nil items.

**15 .2 Any Exempt / Confidential Decisions "Called in" by the
Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

(Under provisions of Article 6 Para 6.02 V of the
Constitution).

Nil items.

EXEMPT / CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION

16. A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE

Nil items.

17. A PROSPEROUS COMMUNITY

Nil items.

18. A SAFE AND COHESIVE COMMUNITY

Nil items.

19. A HEALTHY AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITY

Nil items.

20. ONE TOWER HAMLETS

Nil items.

**21. ANY OTHER EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL
BUSINESS CONSIDERED TO BE URGENT**

To consider any other exempt/ confidential business that
the Chair considers to be urgent.

**22. EXEMPT / CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS FOR
INFORMATION**

Nil items.

SCRUTINY PROCESS

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee, at its meeting on **Tuesday 4th October 2011** may scrutinise provisional decisions made in respect of any of the reports attached, if it is “called in” by **five** or more Councillors except where the decision involves a recommendation to full Council.

The deadline for “Call-in” is: Friday 16th September 2011 **(5.00 p.m.)**

Councillors wishing to “call-in” a provisional decision, or members of the public wishing to submit a deputation request, should contact: **John Williams**
Service Head Democratic Services:
020 7364 4205

Agenda Item 2

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS - NOTE FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

This note is guidance only. Members should consult the Council's Code of Conduct for further details. Note: Only Members can decide if they have an interest therefore they must make their own decision. If in doubt as to the nature of an interest it is advisable to seek advice **prior** to attending at a meeting.

Declaration of interests for Members

Where Members have a personal interest in any business of the authority as described in paragraph 4 of the Council's Code of Conduct (contained in part 5 of the Council's Constitution) then s/he must disclose this personal interest as in accordance with paragraph 5 of the Code. Members must disclose the existence and nature of the interest at the start of the meeting and certainly no later than the commencement of the item or where the interest becomes apparent.

You have a **personal interest** in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect:

- (a) An interest that you must **register**
- (b) An interest that is not on the register, but where the well-being or financial position of you, members of your family, or people with whom you have a close association, is likely to be affected by the business of your authority more than it would affect the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision.

Where a personal interest is declared a Member may stay and take part in the debate and decision on that item.

What constitutes a prejudicial interest? - Please refer to paragraph 6 of the adopted Code of Conduct.

Your personal interest will also be a prejudicial interest in a matter if (a), (b) and either (c) or (d) below apply:-

- (a) A member of the public, who knows the relevant facts, would reasonably think that your personal interests are so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgment of the public interests; AND
- (b) The matter does not fall within one of the exempt categories of decision listed in paragraph 6.2 of the Code; AND EITHER
- (c) The matter affects your financial position or the financial interest of a body with which you are associated; or
- (d) The matter relates to the determination of a licensing or regulatory application

The key points to remember if you have a prejudicial interest in a matter being discussed at a meeting:-

- i. You must declare that you have a prejudicial interest, and the nature of that interest, as soon as that interest becomes apparent to you; and
- ii. You must leave the room for the duration of consideration and decision on the item and not seek to influence the debate or decision unless (iv) below applies; and

- iii. You must not seek to improperly influence a decision in which you have a prejudicial interest.
- iv. If Members of the public are allowed to speak or make representations at the meeting, give evidence or answer questions about the matter, by statutory right or otherwise (e.g. planning or licensing committees), you can declare your prejudicial interest but make representations. However, you must immediately leave the room once you have finished your representations and answered questions (if any). You cannot remain in the meeting or in the public gallery during the debate or decision on the matter.

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE CABINET

HELD AT 5.35 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 3 AUGUST 2011

**COMMITTEE ROOM, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Mayor Lutfur Rahman (Mayor)	(Mayor)
Councillor Ohid Ahmed (Deputy Mayor)	(Deputy Mayor)
Councillor Rofique U Ahmed	(Cabinet Member for Regeneration)
Councillor Shahed Ali	(Cabinet Member for Environment)
Councillor Abdul Asad	(Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing)
Councillor Alibor Choudhury	(Cabinet Member for Resources)
Councillor Shafiqul Haque	(Cabinet Member for Jobs and Skills)
Councillor Rabina Khan	(Cabinet Member for Housing)
Councillor Rania Khan	(Cabinet Member for Culture)
Councillor Oliur Rahman	(Cabinet Member for Children's Services)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Kabir Ahmed	(Executive Advisor to the Mayor and Cabinet)
Councillor Khaless Uddin Ahmed	
Councillor Stephanie Eaton	
Councillor David Edgar	
Councillor Judith Gardiner	
Councillor Carlo Gibbs	
Councillor Peter Golds	(Leader of the Conservative Group)
Councillor Ann Jackson	(Chair, Overview & Scrutiny Committee)
Councillor Denise Jones	
Councillor Md. Maium Miah	(Advisor to the Mayor and Cabinet on Third Sector and Community Engagement)
Councillor Joshua Peck	(Leader of the Labour Group)
Councillor Rachael Saunders	

Others Present:

Officers Present:

- Sarah Barr – (Senior Strategy Policy and Performance Officer, Strategy Policy and Performance, Chief Executive's)
- Robin Beattie – (Service Head, Strategy & Resources & Olympic Impact, Communities Localities & Culture)
- Anne-Marie Berni – (Team Leader Development Implementation Team, Planning & Building Control, Development & Renewal)
- Isobel Cattermole – (Acting Corporate Director, Children, Schools & Families)
- Ahzaz Chowdhury – (Political Advisor to Conservative Group, Chief Executive's)
- Deborah Cohen – (Service Head, Commissioning and Strategy, Adults Health and Wellbeing)
- Kevan Collins – (Chief Executive)
- Richard Finch – (Team Leader, Strategic Transport Development, Development & Renewal)
- Isabella Freeman – (Assistant Chief Executive - Legal Services, Chief Executive's)
- Peter Hayday – (Interim Service Head, Financial Services, Risk and Accountability)
- Chris Holme – (Service Head Resources, Development & Renewal)
- Mark Hutton – (Team Leader, Development Design & Conservation, Development & Renewal)
- Joynul Khan – (Intern, Democratic Services, Chief Executive's)
- Ellie Kuper-Thomas – (Interim Policy Adviser to the Mayor, Chief Executive's)
- Axel Landin – (Intern, Democratic Services, Chief Executive's)
- Shazid Miah – (Acting Community Liaison Officer to the Mayor, Chief Executive's)
- Stephen Murray – (Head of Arts, Communities Localities & Culture)
- Chris Naylor – (Corporate Director Resources)
- Jackie Odunoye – (Service Head Strategy, Innovation and Sustainability, Development & Renewal)
- Toks Osibogun – (Head of Valuation & Estates, Asset Management, Development & Renewal)
- Colin Perrins – (Head, Trading Standards and Environmental Health Commercial)
- Takki Sulaiman – (Service Head Communications, Chief Executive's)
- Helen Taylor – (Acting Corporate Director Adults Health & Wellbeing)
- Owen Whalley – (Service Head Planning and Building Control, Development & Renewal)
- David Williams – (Deputy Service Head, Planning and Building Control, Development & Renewal)
- Angus Taylor – (Interim Committee Services Manager (Operational), Democratic Services, Chief

Executive's)

MR L. RAHMAN (MAYOR) IN THE CHAIR

ADJOURNMENT

At this juncture the Mayor informed those present that before he and his Cabinet proceeded to consideration of the substantive business set out in the agenda, there would be an opportunity for the public to put questions to himself, the Deputy Mayor, and other Members comprising the Cabinet who were present. Accordingly the **Mayor agreed** the following:

Decision

That the Cabinet adjourn for a short period at 5.40pm, and that the meeting reconvene thereafter.

The meeting adjourned at 5.40pm

The meeting reconvened at 5.41pm

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of:

- Mr Aman Dalvi, Corporate Director Development and Renewal for whom Ms Jackie Odunoye, Service Head Strategy Regeneration and Sustainability, Development and Renewal, was deputising.
- Mr Halsey, Corporate Director Communities Localities and Culture, for whom Mr Beattie, Service Head Strategy and Resources and Olympic Impact, Communities Localities and Culture, was deputising.

Noted.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made pertaining to the unrestricted business to be considered in Section One of the proceedings.

Noted.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The **Mayor agreed** the following:

Decision

That the unrestricted minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Cabinet held on 6th July 2011 be approved and signed by the Mayor, as a correct record of the proceedings.

4. PETITIONS

The clerk advised that the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) had received no requests for petitions in respect of the business contained in the agenda.

5. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

5.1 Chair's advice of Key Issues or Questions in relation to Unrestricted Business to be considered

The Chair informed members of the Cabinet that Councillor Jackson, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, had **Tabled** a sheet of questions/ comments arising from the deliberations of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, held on 2nd August 2011, in respect of the unrestricted business contained in the agenda for consideration, a copy of which would be interleaved with the minutes.

Councillor Jackson, Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC), addressed members of the Cabinet:

- Reporting prioritisation of options for the OSC work programme during the coming Council year and anticipated agreement of this by the OSC in September 2011.
- Advising of key elements of OSC consideration of the report "Budget 2012/13 – 2014/15 – Resource Allocation and Budget Review" to inform Cabinet consideration of the same report.
- Informing the Mayor/ Cabinet that she had nothing to add to the questions/ comments raised by the OSC, as set out in the tabled paper.

The **Mayor** thanked Councillor Jackson for presenting the contribution of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; and then **agreed** the following:

Decision

That the questions and comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted, and that these be given consideration during the Cabinet deliberation of the items of business to which the questions/ comments related.

5.2 Any Unrestricted Decisions "Called in" by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee

The Clerk advised that no requests had been received by the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) to "call in" for further consideration, by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, any provisional decisions taken by the Mayor/ Cabinet, at its meeting held on 6th July 2011.

6. A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE

6.1 Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (CAB 017/112)

Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

The **Mayor agreed** the recommendations as set out in the report.

Decision

1. That Option 3, finalisation of the Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan SPD, contained within section four of the report (CAB 017/112), be approved;
2. That the draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan SPD, attached at Appendix C to the report (CAB 017/112), be approved for a six week period of statutory public consultation, with a view to Cabinet subsequently approving the final Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan as an SPD, following the public consultation; and
3. That the Corporate Director Development and Renewal, after consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, be authorised to make any appropriate and necessary minor amendments to the draft Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan SPD, prior to statutory consultation anticipated in September 2011.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.6 of the report (CAB 017/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.9 of the report (CAB 017/112)

6.2 Limehouse Cut Conservation Area (CAB 018/112)

Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

The **Mayor agreed** the recommendations as set out in the report.

Decision

1. That the decision of the Judicial Review in the High Court, which whilst quashing the original designation accepted that designation of the area as a Conservation Area might be appropriate, be noted;
2. That the responses to the public consultation considering the proposed designation and the supporting Limehouse Cut Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines, be noted;
3. That the Designation Statement attached at Appendix C to the report (CAB 018/112), which sets out the special character of the area, be agreed;
4. That the designation of the Limehouse Cut Conservation Area, with boundaries as indicated in the map attached at Appendix A to the report, (CAB 018/112), including the transfer of land to include Violet Road Bridge and a section of canal and landscaping to the front of Caspian Wharf from the Langdon Park Conservation Area to the new Limehouse Cut Conservation Area, be agreed. That it also be noted that this land already has conservation area status, thus the status of this land remains unchanged, and the alterations are a prudent rationalisation of boundaries because the canal and this small area of land are more logically located within the Limehouse Cut Conservation Area;
5. That the amended boundaries to the Langdon Park Conservation Area, to reflect the rationalisation in decision 4 above, be agreed. Also noting that the revised boundaries of the Langdon Park Conservation Area are shown in Appendix B to the report (CAB 018/112);
6. That the addition of the following buildings, identified during the public consultation, to the List of Locally Listed Buildings within the Limehouse Cut Conservation Area, be agreed: - Dowgate Wharf (22-23) Gillender Street, 24 Gillender Street, Towpath House on Dod Street; Printers Gate on Dod Street; The Sail Loft on Dod Street; and The Spice Store on Dod Street; and
7. That the attached draft Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan, attached at Appendix D to the report (CAB 018/112), which supports the proposed designation, setting out the character of the Limehouse Cut, identifying those buildings which are to be Locally Listed and putting forward proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area; be adopted.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.3 of the report (CAB 018/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.2 of the report (CAB 018/112)

6.3 Introduction of a Permit Transfer Scheme (CAB 019/112)

Councillor Rabina Khan, Cabinet Member for Housing, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein. Councillor Khan emphasised in particular the ecological aspirations of the Mayor/ Administration, and consequent support for the positive step of car free status for many new homes in the borough; but also emphasised the imperative to balance these aspirations with accommodating the needs of large families living in overcrowded accommodation, who required the use of a car, and could not accept offers of larger social rented housing with car free status.

The **Mayor agreed** the recommendation as set out in the report.

Decision

That the forthcoming introduction of the proposed targeted Permit Transfer Scheme (PTS), by the Mayor of Tower Hamlets Council, using the scheme criteria outlined in Section 5.4 of the report (CAB 019/112) to help reduce levels of overcrowding in the social rented housing stock in the borough, be noted. That it also be noted that the PTS will be a change in the operation of the Council's existing on-street Residents' Parking Permit Scheme.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.5 of the report (CAB 019/112)

Alternative Options Considered

Not detailed.

6.4 St George's Pools Refurbishment (CAB 020/112)

Councillor Rania Khan, Cabinet Member for Culture, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

The **Mayor agreed** the recommendations as set out in the report.

Decision

1. That a partnership project with Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL) to invest in the fabric of the St Georges Pools to secure a minimum of five years life be supported;

2. That it be noted that every effort is being made to programme the work to maintain pool access during the proposed works and keep periods of closure to an absolute minimum to reduce the impact on users;
3. That it be noted that a communications programme for users (including schools) and the local community will be prepared in partnership with GLL;
4. That it be noted that these works will be funded via partnership arrangements with the leisure management contractor (GLL); and
5. That it be noted that the Corporate Director Communities Localities and Culture will undertake further work to determine the best long-term option for co-locating wet and dry leisure facilities on the existing site in line with the recommendations of the Leisure Facilities Strategy.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report (CAB 020/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.3 of the report (CAB 020/112)

6.5 The Baishakhi Mela in Banglatown, Brick Lane: transfer to community management (CAB 021/112)

Councillor Rania Khan, Cabinet Member for Culture, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein. Councillor Khan emphasised in particular that community management of the Baishakhi Mela would enable officer resources to be devoted to other priorities such as the Olympics, Royal Diamond Jubilee and the City Bid, which would increase the number of community events for resident enjoyment.

An option was proposed that the Mayor/ Cabinet agree two additional recommendations to those contained in the report as follows:-

- That the two independent panels referred to in the report at paragraphs 2.1, 2.2 and 6.2 of the report should both involve proportional cross party representation of Members.
- That the management licence [for the Baishakhi Mela] should be set at three years subject to renewal dependent on an external audit of the organisation and a full report for Cabinet consideration.

The **Mayor considered and rejected** the option proposing the additional recommendations and **agreed** the recommendations as set out in the report.

Decision

1. That it be agreed that the Baishakhi Mela in Banglatown, Brick Lane be returned to community management for 2012 and that the right to manage the Mela be granted for a period of nine years, subject to reviews at year one, three, and six by an independent panel;
2. That the approach to select a successor organisation as set out in the report (CAB 021/112), including the proposal to delegate the recommendation of the successor organisation to an independent panel which will be supported by staff, be agreed;
3. That the outline specification, as set out in paragraph 6.3 of the report (CAB 021/112), be agreed;
4. That the level of financial and other support for the successor organisation as set out in paragraph 6.4 of the report (CAB 021/112), be agreed; and
5. That the timetable for granting the right to manage the Mela, as set out in paragraph 6.6 of the report (CAB 021/112), be agreed.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report (CAB 021/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.2 of the report (CAB 021/112)

7. A PROSPEROUS COMMUNITY

7.1 Establishment of sixth form consortium to meet increasing demand in sixth form places from 2012 (CAB 022/112)

Councillor Oliur Rahman, Cabinet Member for Children's Services, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

The **Mayor** welcomed the initiative and **agreed** the recommendations as set out in the report.

Decision

1. That the contents of the report (CAB 022/112), including the published statutory proposals for St Paul's Way Trust School, Bow School, Langdon Park School and Stepney Green Maths, Computing and Science College at Appendix A, be noted;

2. That the statutory requirements for the school organisation decision-making process and the considerations to be taken into account in making any decision, as set out at paragraphs 6.1 – 6.4 of the report (CAB 022/112), be noted; and
3. That the proposals, attached as Appendix A to the report (CAB 022/112), for the addition of sixth form places at St Paul's Way Trust School from September 2012, Langdon Park School and Stepney Green Maths, Computing and Science College from September 2013 and Bow School from September 2014, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report (CAB 022/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraph 4.1 of the report (CAB 022/112)

7.2 Update on Building Schools for the Future Programme including authorisation to issue LGCA Certificates, in connection with the Deed of Variation, to the PFI contract (CAB 031/112).

Special Circumstances and Reasons for Urgency

The Mayor informed members of the Cabinet that the special circumstances and reasons for urgency associated with the proposals were detailed on the front page of the report. The **Mayor** subsequently **agreed** the special circumstances and reasons for urgency, as set out on the front page of the report, and also set out below:

“The Authority intends to enter into the Deed of Variation to allow the LEP to refurbish and build new facilities for four schools that are part of the existing PFI contract. Through their due diligence, Lenders have made clear that they require the Authority to provide them with fresh LGCA certificates to authenticate the contracts. The issuance of such certificates requires Cabinet approval.

The Authority intends to sign the Deed of Variation in the first week of August in order to maintain the programme for the delivery of the BSF schools. If Cabinet does not approve the assurance of LGCA certificates, then Lenders will refuse to consent to the variation.”

Ms Cattermole, Acting Corporate Director Children, Schools and Families, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

Ms Freeman, Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services), advised that cross references, to paragraphs in the body of the report, contained in

recommendations 2.1 and 2.3 were currently incorrect, and should the recommendations be agreed the decision would need to reflect their correction.

The **Mayor**, taking account of the advice of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services), **agreed** the following:

Decision

1. That the contents of the report (CAB 031/112), to reaffirm the decisions duly authorised at the January Cabinet (the latter set out at paragraph 6.1), be noted;
2. That the issuance of LGCA certificates to authenticate the Deed of Variation to the PFI contract and the Funders Direct Agreement in the forms provided at Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 to the report (CAB 031/112) be authorised and the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make any final amends to these certificates; and
3. That subject to exceptions set out in the report (CAB 031/112), the Section 151 Officer (Corporate Director of Resources) be indemnified against any claims made whatsoever against him (including costs incurred by and awarded against him) and will not itself make claims against him for any loss or damage occasioned by act, error or omission committed by such officer in the course of any work undertaken preceding as well as for the purpose of the act of certification (whether or not necessarily undertaken in order to certify the contract) and generally in connection with the signing of such certificates or documents as are referred to in decision 2. above. The indemnity will not extend to loss or damage directly or indirectly caused by or arising from the following, fraud, dishonesty or a criminal offence committed by the indemnified person.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report (CAB 031/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraph 4.1 of the report (CAB 031/112)

8. A SAFE AND COHESIVE COMMUNITY

8.1 Sex Establishments - Adoption of Legislation - Approval of Consultation Process (CAB 023/112)

Councillor Ohid Ahmed, Deputy Mayor, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

Councillor Ahmed emphasised the high level of community concern that sex establishments such as lap dancing and strip clubs caused within the community and the Mayor/ Administration shared this concern considering these businesses to be a blight on the community.

An option was proposed for the consideration of the Mayor that, since some existing sex establishments in the borough marketed services of a similar nature to those provided in the sex establishments which were mobile (for example stretched limousine tour to central London with champagne and performer), if it were legally possible this aspect of the services provided by sex establishments should be included within the draft policy to be an activity that would not be permitted within the borough and should be included in the consultation.

The **Mayor** agreed the proposed amendment to the options being considered, and considered it would be appropriate to adjust the decision accordingly; and consequently **agreed** the following:

Decision

- 1) That it be resolved that Schedule 3 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982 as amended by section 27 of the Policing and Crime Act 2009 is to apply to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets area; and that Schedule 3 shall come into force in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets area;
- 2) That it be agreed that the date that Schedule 3 shall come into force shall be the same day as the policy for Sex Establishments comes into force; and
- 3) That, subject to (a) below, the draft policy for Sex Establishments [attached at Appendix 1 to the report (CAB 023/112)], be approved for consultation: -
 - (a) Inclusion within the draft policy of mobile services of a similar nature to those provided in the sex establishments and marketed by such establishments from within the borough.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.2 of the report (CAB 023/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraph 4.1 of the report (CAB 023/112)

9. A HEALTHY AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITY

9.1 Commissioning Strategy for Accommodation of Working Age Adults with a Mental Health Problem (CAB 024/112)

Councillor Abdul Asad, Cabinet Member for Health and Wellbeing, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

Ms Taylor, Acting Corporate Director Adults Health and Wellbeing addressed the matters raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, held on 2nd August 2011, in relation to the report; as set out in the tabled sheet of questions and comments presented by the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee earlier in the proceedings:

The **Mayor agreed** the following:

Decision

1. That the Strategy for developing and improving accommodation with support for people of working age with a mental health problem, as set out in the report (CAB 024/112), be agreed; and
2. That it be agreed that detailed engagement and consultation with service users affected should now proceed.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.2 of the report (CAB 024/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraph 4.1 of the report (CAB 024/112)

9.2 Development of Tower Hamlets Statutory Health and Wellbeing Board (CAB 025/112)

Ms Taylor, Acting Corporate Director Adults Health and Wellbeing at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

The **Mayor agreed** the recommendations as set out in the report.

Decision

1. That it be agreed that the Mayor [of Tower Hamlets] chairs the Tower Hamlets Health and Wellbeing Board;
2. That the proposed membership of the Tower Hamlets Health and Wellbeing Board, as set out at paragraph 6.8 of the report (CAB 025/112) be agreed;

3. That it be agreed that the first meeting of the THHWB should be in September 2011 and quarterly thereafter;
4. That it be agreed that the work of the Healthy Communities Community Plan Delivery Group (CPDG) should be fulfilled through the THHWB and its associated Groups, therefore disbanding the CPDG; and
5. That it be agreed that the proposal that the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Panel attends the THHWB to report on Health Scrutiny activities and to comment on agenda items of THHWB, be approved;

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.2 of the report (CAB 025/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.2 of the report (CAB 025/112)

10. ONE TOWER HAMLETS

10.1 Contracts Forward Plan (CAB 026/112)

Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report:

- Summarised the key points contained therein.
- Commented that recommendation 2.1 contained in the report requested that the Mayor/ Cabinet specifically identify contracts where it was felt appropriate that a further report required consideration prior to contract award by Chief Officers under delegated authority.
- Proposed accordingly that the Mayor agree recommendation 2.1 set out in the report subject to the following amendment:

“Submission of a comprehensive report (including an options appraisal) relating to contracting strategy/ contract award in respect of the following contracts:

- *D&R Contract:* “Corporate Contract for Provision of Technical Advisers for Construction (including architects, quantity surveyors, engineers, clerks of works, health & safety advisers)”
- *AHWB Contract:* “Learning disability day options (multiple contracts)”.

listed in Appendix 1 to the report, for the consideration of the Mayor/ Cabinet Member for Resources/ appropriate Cabinet Member with portfolio for the service area, and also their subsequent consultation and agreement to the proposed contract award.”

Ms Taylor, Acting Corporate Director Adults Health and Wellbeing addressed the matters raised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, held on 2nd August 2011, in relation to the report; as set out in the tabled sheet of questions and comments presented by the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee earlier in the proceedings:

The **Mayor** concurred with the rationale prompting the proposed amendment to the options being considered, and considered it would be appropriate to adjust the decision accordingly; and consequently **agreed** the following:

Decision

1. That the contract summary at Appendix 1 to the report (CAB 026/112) be noted;
2. That, subject to (a) below, the relevant Corporate Director who holds the budget for the service area be authorised to award the contracts listed in Appendix 1 to the report (CAB 026/112):
 - (a) Submission of a comprehensive report (including an options appraisal) relating to contracting strategy/ contract award in respect of the contracts:
 - *D&R Contract*: “Corporate Contract for Provision of Technical Advisers for Construction (including architects, quantity surveyors, engineers, clerks of works, health & safety advisers)”
 - *AHWB Contract*: “Learning disability day options (multiple contracts)”.listed in Appendix 1 to the report, for the consideration of the Mayor/ Cabinet Member for Resources/ appropriate Cabinet Member with portfolio for the service area, and also their subsequent consultation and agreement to the proposed contract award; and
3. That, subject to Decision 2 above, the relevant Corporate Director who holds the budget for the service area be authorised, after consultation with the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services), to arrange for the execution of all necessary contract documents.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.2 of the report (CAB 026/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraph 4.1 of the report (CAB 026/112)

10.2 Budget 2012/13 - 2014/15 - Resource Allocation and Budget Review (CAB 027/112)

The Chair informed members of the Cabinet that Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources, had **Tabled a Motion** in relation to the recommendations set out in the report, a copy of which would be interleaved with the minutes.

Councillor Alibor Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Resources, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report and proposing the tabled motion for agreement by the Mayor/ Cabinet: -:

- Summarised the key points contained therein.
- Commented that:
 - In 2010/ 11 the Mayor/ Administration had faced the tough challenge of cutting the Authority's Budget for 2011/12 by £55 million, but had been able to achieve the agreement of a progressive Budget which had protected youth services, ideas stores, THEO's and social housing initiatives. He was confident a similar outcome would be achieved in 2011 and called on political opposition colleagues to work with the Mayor/ Administration to this end.
 - The Mayor/ Administration were currently engaged with Officers in a robust resource allocation process, underpinned by an integrated strategic and resource planning framework, to ensure that all elements of the Council's activities were scrutinised to ensure value for money. The focus of this would remain the protection of vulnerable elements of the community and the support they needed (as well as the quality of environment/ place they lived in) and consequently efficiency savings rather than reductions in frontline services or staff redundancies. The Mayor/ Administration were also building on themes developed in 2010/11 to optimise delivery maximum savings including: sweating the Council's assets, reduction of management layers, squeezing value from the Council's contractors; but also a strategic partnership to deliver both desired outcomes and required savings.
 - The Mayor/ Administration were committed to ensuring that the Authority's Budget setting process was transparent and would engage in a comprehensive dialogue with the all elements of the community in relation to this process and any difficult decisions that were part of it.

The **Mayor** commented, in **agreeing the motion as tabled**, that it was important to remember that he and the Authority were faced with such a difficult Budget position because of ideologically driven cuts to funding, the effect of which was magnified by front-loading, both at the hand of a Conservative led Coalition Government; and the consequences were severe for the vulnerable members of the community.

Decision

1. That the outcome of the review of the budget forecast for 2011/12 and officers advice on the risks of additional costs falling in 2011/12-

2014/15, and also the Medium Term Financial forecast for 2012/13-2014/15, as detailed in Appendix A to the report (CAB 027/112), be noted;

2. That the position in relation to funding for the capital programme, set out in the report (CAB 027/112), be noted, and it be agreed that non-ring fenced capital resources from Government should be treated in the same was as locally generated funding for capital planning purposes;
3. That the position in relation to the Housing Revenue Account set out in the report (CAB 027/112), be noted;
4. That the Chief Executive be instructed to require the Corporate Management Team to prepare service and financial planning submissions in accordance with the key principles of the Mayor;
5. That the approach to be taken to equality analysis of budget decisions in the 2012/13 cycle set out in the report (CAB 027/112) be noted, and it be agreed that all submissions are to be supported by an appropriate Equalities Impact Assessment in line with this approach;
6. That it be agreed that the Mayor and appropriate Cabinet members meet with officers over the next two months to review the budgets that form the basis of the projections in the report (CAB 027/112);
7. That the Chief Executive be instructed, after consultation with the Corporate Director Resources, to initiate and subsequently progress a budget consultation process with the public and the Authority's key stakeholders; and
8. That the timetable for the Budget Process, outlined at Section 12 of the report (CAB 027/112), be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

Not detailed.

Alternative Options Considered

Not detailed.

10.3 Provision of Temporary Staff (CAB 028/112)

Mr Naylor, Corporate Director Resources, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

An option was proposed that, as the process for bringing the provision of the managed service provider function in-house would be both complex and lengthy, the Mayor/ Cabinet should consider the positives/ negatives of an

alternative option of re-commissioning [contract for supply of a vendor neutral managed service provider function for the provision of temporary staff] as previously, but with the addition of an incentive arrangement for companies tendering for the contract which rewards the recruitment of local residents.

The **Mayor**, considered that it would be appropriate for the feasibility study [on the cost/ benefits of bringing the provision of the managed service provider function in-house] to include an examination of the benefits for the local community of the alternative option that had been proposed; and considered it would be appropriate to adjust the decision accordingly; and consequently **agreed** the following:

Decision

1. That it be agreed that the Corporate Director of Development and Renewal investigates the feasibility of setting up a local needs-based talent pool as part of the work on the Enterprise Strategy, and report back to Cabinet in due course;
2. That it be agreed that the award of a contract for a Managed Service Provider from September 2011 should proceed as planned and previously agreed by Cabinet; but for a limited period ideally of 12 months, but not more than 18 months; to allow for a full review and, subject to decision 3 below, a corresponding implementation plan for bringing the service in-house to be undertaken; and
3. That a further report be brought to Cabinet, subsequent to the feasibility study on the practicalities, costs, benefits and timescales of bringing the service in-house, or the positives/ negatives of re-commissioning as previously but with the addition of an incentive arrangement for companies tendering for the contract which rewards the recruitment of local residents.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report (CAB 028/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraph 4.1 of the report (CAB 028/112)

10.4 Disposals Report Update (CAB 029/112)

Mr Osibogun, Head of Valuation and Estates, Development and Renewal, at the request of the Mayor, in introducing the report, summarised the key points contained therein.

The **Mayor agreed** the recommendations as set out in the report.

Decision

1. That the current position on Phase I disposals be noted; and
2. That 31 Turner Street and the Sutton Street depot be declared surplus to [the Authority's] requirements, and their sale be authorised.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report (CAB 029/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraph 4.1 of the report (CAB 029/112)

11. ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS CONSIDERED TO BE URGENT

The Clerk advised that there were no business to be considered under this section of the agenda.

12. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR INFORMATION**12.1 Exercise of Corporate Directors' Discretions (CAB 030/112)**

The **Mayor agreed** the recommendation as set out in the report.

Decision

That the exercise of Corporate Directors' discretions, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report (CAB 030/112), be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

These are detailed in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.2 of the report (CAB 030/112)

Alternative Options Considered

These are detailed in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.2 of the report (CAB 030/112)

13. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The **Mayor agreed** the following:

Decision

That pursuant to regulation 21(1)(b) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000, the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting:

- (a) As it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted in Section Two of the agenda, that if members of the public were present during consideration of this business there would be disclosure of exempt information.
 - Exempt information is defined in section 100I and, by reference, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (“the 1972 Act”). To be exempt, information must fall within one of the categories listed in paragraphs 1 to 7 of Schedule 12A, must not fall within one of the excluded categories in paragraphs 8 and 9 and the public interest in maintaining the exemption must outweigh the public interest in disclosing the information.
 - Agenda item 14. “Exempt/ Confidential Minutes” (of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 6th July 2011) contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). In particular information relating to the financial affairs of the Council and two anonymised bidders.
- (b) As although there is a public interest favouring public access to local authority meetings, in this case the Cabinet concluded that given the information contained in:
 - Agenda item 14. “Exempt/ Confidential Minutes” (of the meeting of the Cabinet held 6th July 2011) relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). In particular information relating to the financial affairs of the Council and two anonymised bidders.

that the public interest in maintaining the exemption on the information outweighed the public interest in disclosing it.

SUMMARY OF EXEMPT PROCEEDINGS

14. EXEMPT / CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 6th July 2011 agreed.

15. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

15.1 Chair's advice of Key Issues or Questions in relation to Exempt / Confidential Business to be considered.

Nil Items.

15.2 Any Exempt / Confidential Decisions "Called in" by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Nil Items.

16. A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE

Nil Items.

17. A PROSPEROUS COMMUNITY

Nil Items.

18. A SAFE AND COHESIVE COMMUNITY

Nil Items.

19. A HEALTHY AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITY

Nil Items.

20. ONE TOWER HAMLETS

Nil Items.

21. ANY OTHER EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS CONSIDERED TO BE URGENT

Nil Items.

22. EXEMPT / CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS FOR INFORMATION

Nil Items.

The meeting ended at 6.40 p.m.

Chair, Mayor Lutfur Rahman
Cabinet

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6.1

Committee/Meeting: Cabinet	Date: 7 September 2011	Classification: Unrestricted	Report No: CAB 031/112
Report of: Corporate Director Aman Dalvi Originating officer(s) Jackie Odunoye Service Head Housing Strategy Regeneration and Sustainability Authors: John Kiwanuka: Housing Partnerships Manager		Title: Decent Homes Funding Gap Options for 2011-2015 Wards Affected: All	

Lead Member	Cllr: Rabina Khan
Community Plan Theme	One Tower Hamlets & A Great Place to Live
Strategic Priority	Ensuring value for money across the Council

1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 In January 2011 LBTH submitted a revised bid of £133.9 million to the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) for Decent Homes Backlog funding for the period 2011 to 2015. In February the HCA awarded LBTH £94.5 million for the DH backlog funding which was £39.4 million short of the bid value.
- 1.2 On 8th June 2011 Cabinet agreed a report which set the principles for ordering schemes included in the backlog DH programmes and also approved capital estimates for 2011/12 and 2012/13 . The adopted capital estimates of £12.94 million for 2011/12 and £29.1 million for 2012/13 were £1.94 million and £16.6 million more than the HCA funding levels for the respective periods. The total difference between the HCA funding and the funding requirement for the approved DH programme over the 2011-13 period is £18.54 million. However, the overall funding gap over the term of the DH backlog funding regime (2011 – 2015) is £39.4 million.
- 1.3 The Mayor has pledged to fund the entire Decent Homes backlog programme and this report seeks approval to adopt a financial strategy which will bridge the £39.4 million gap between the HCA's allocated funding

and the total funding needed to deliver the whole DH programme. In addition to the Decent Homes programme other major works will be undertaken to maintain and improve the housing assets. These will be considered in future reports to members as part of the budget process.

- 1.4 The report also asks Cabinet to note that additional resources of £398,000 will be required to fund the Donegal and Sovereign scheme for completion by December 2011. A revised capital estimate is sought, to be financed from savings elsewhere within the capital programme.

2. DECISIONS REQUIRED

- 2.1 Agree the options being proposed to bridge the funding gap for the Decent Homes Backlog Programme in 2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15, as outlined in Table 1, paragraph 6.11.2.
- 2.2 Authorise the Corporate Director Development and Renewal after consultation with the Corporate Director Resources and Cabinet Members for Housing and Resources to resolve the financing of the Decent Homes funding gap with a view to maximising use of available capital resources both to the HRA business plan and the Council as a whole and subject to any required confirmation in the annual budget going forward.
- 2.3 Note the projected overspend on the Donegal and Sovereign phase 2 scheme, and approve the adoption of an increase of £398,000 in the capital estimate, to be funded from savings elsewhere in the programme (paragraph 7).
- 2.4 Authorise the Corporate Director Development and Renewal, with the agreement of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal), to enter into all necessary documents to implement the decisions made in respect of this report.

3. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

- 3.1 Financial Regulations require capital schemes to be included within the Council's capital programme and capital estimates adopted in the annual budget prior to any expenditure being incurred. This report seeks the agreement of the options being proposed to bridge the funding gap for the Decent Homes Backlog Programme in 2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14, and 2014/15 totalling £39.4 million.
- 3.2 Financial Regulations also require Cabinet to be notified of variations in scheme budgets – whichever the lower- either equalling/or over £250,000, or 10% of the budget and this will apply to proposals on Donegal and Sovereign House

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 Schemes within the Decent Homes Programme are assessed by Tower Hamlets Homes in consultation with the Council and are prioritised in accordance with the principles outlined in the June 2011 report to Cabinet. Although alternative delivery programmes could be feasible, the schemes that were agreed by Cabinet in June are considered the best programme going forward in the current circumstances and therefore no alternate option is proposed.
- 4.2 It is also possible to restrict the programme to the HCA funding available but if no additional resources are applied it would not be possible to bring all our homes to the decent homes standard by 2015 as required by the government. Based on current assumptions if this plan was not adopted 3,875 homes, equating to 31% of our current housing stock would still remain non decent by the end of the four year programme in 2015.

5. BACKGROUND

- 5.1 At its May 2009 meeting, Cabinet agreed the Housing Strategy 2009-11 which contained the following objectives:
- § Delivering and maintaining decent homes
 - § Place making and sustainable communities
 - § Managing demand, reducing overcrowding
 - § New housing supply
- 5.2 The investment programme addresses these aims, where appropriate. The capital programme is informed by the latest stock condition survey and resident priorities, and agreed in detail for the current and following financial year, with new schemes added to the programme as appropriate to ensure it continues to roll forward effectively and informs the investment planning process for future years.

6. OPTIONS FOR DECENT HOMES GAP FUNDING

- 6.1 In February 2011 the HCA awarded LBTH £94.5 million for the DH backlog funding which was £39.4 million short of the bid value. Although this was the second highest award in the country it is still insufficient to bring all our stock to the decent homes standard. A range of funding sources will be required in addition to the HCA funding to address the DH Backlog Funding gap and to deliver the Decent Homes Programme for the four financial years 2011/12 to 2014/15. The overall financial strategy has to be considered within the new HRA self financing regime and the overall 30 year HRA business plan.
- 6.2 The principal funding sources that have been considered are shown in paragraph 6.11.2 (Table 1), and are explained below.

6.3 Major Repairs Reserve / Unsupported Housing Revenue Account Borrowing / HRA Balances

6.3.1 The financing regime for Local Authority Housing Finance is currently being reformed, with an expected implementation date of April 2012. Under this new system, in addition to capital funding generated internally, Councils will have scope to borrow resources provided they can afford to do so within the constraints of the system, and the conflicting resource demands within the rolling 30-year business plan. Although final details of the changes to the financing system will not be announced until the Autumn, it is anticipated that when considered in conjunction with the funding outlined in the following paragraphs, the Authority will have adequate resources available to finance the Decent Homes Programme.

6.4 Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) Street Properties Purchases Grant

6.4.1 In February 2009 as part of the overcrowding reduction initiatives Cabinet agreed a capital allocation of £19.4 million to be designated for buying back Council properties that were previously purchased by tenants through exercising their RTB. The money was planned to be spent equally over two financial years 2009/10 and 2010/11.

6.4.2 However, due to the huge response from, and the popularity of the programme to leaseholders, the scheme originally earmarked to span two years, was successfully delivered by December 2010. A total of 79 RTB leased council properties were bought back, allowing over 240 overcrowded families to be re-housed. Towards the end of the of the Buyback programme an opportunity arose for the Council to participate in the HCA's Street Properties Purchases Grant. The HCA required that only properties that had been completed prior to 31/03/2011 would be considered for the grant. We therefore proposed that the RTB buy back programme be considered for this grant.

6.4.3 LBTH delivered on the completion deadline, and accordingly, we were awarded £7.9m un-ring-fenced grant for the bought back properties, averaging £100k per property

6.5 Major Works Capital Contributions Reserve

6.5.1 The major works capital contributions reserve is composed of recoveries from recharged capital works to leaseholders. It is planned that £6 million of the DH funding will be sourced from this reserve. The major works capital contribution reserve is readily available for DH funding use subject to Cabinet approval.

6.6 New Homes Bonus

- 6.6.1 New Homes Bonus (NHB) is premised on housing supply failing to meet demand. The NHB is a Government scheme aimed at encouraging LAs to grant planning permissions for the building of new houses, in return for additional revenue. The NHB addresses the disincentive within the local government finance system for local areas to welcome growth. This will ensure that the economic benefits of growth are returned to the local authorities and communities where growth takes place.
- 6.6.2 NHB which commenced in April 2011 is not-ring-fenced, and will match fund the additional council tax raised for new homes and properties brought back into use, with an additional amount for affordable homes, for the following six years 2018. In 2011 LBTH was awarded £4,387,276 NHB, the largest allocation across the country. The calculation for the awarded bonus was based on net additional dwellings delivered in the authority between October 2009 and October 2010 discounting units demolished, long term empty homes and properties in receipt of 50% council tax discount formula grant.
- 6.6.3 LBTH will receive £25.8m of NHB for the six years from 2011 to 2018 due to delivery of new supply to date. That could increase to £69.9m based on current projections of future housing growth.

6.7 **Summary of how the DH and Non DH funding gap for 2011-15 is proposed to be bridged**

- 6.7.1 A variety of funding sources is proposed that can be accessed to fund the Decent Homes capital programme for the period 2011-2015. The total funding requirement for the net DH backlog funding is £133.89 million, however the Council will need to forward fund the works accruing to leaseholders totalling £15.6 million. Table 1 below summarises how the capital investment funding requirement of £154.49 million for 2011-15 can be met by the various funding sources.

6.7.2 **Table 1**
Decent Homes & Non Decent Homes Capital Funding Requirements for 2011-15 - Funding Options and Potential Resources

DH & Non DH Capital Funding Requirements for 2011-15	Amount £m	Funding Source	Amount £m
Decent Homes Programme	133.890	HCA Decent Homes Backlog Funding	94.500
Decent Homes Works Programme (Non Tenant)	15.600	Major Repairs Reserve / Unsupported HRA Borrowing / HRA Balances/ New Homes Bonus	25.490
		Leaseholder Contributions	15.600
		Homes & Community Agency	7.900
		Major Works Service Charge Reserve	6.000
Total	149.490		149.490

6.7.3 This financial strategy is grounded in the assumption that the Government's proposals for a ring fenced HRA will come into force as anticipated. It is these changes which will allow us to utilise both the Major Repairs Allowance and the additional borrowing elements shown above. A 30 year HRA business plan has been developed, and tested, and this demonstrates that both depreciation and borrowing are sustainable based on the funding streams shown in the table and their associated modelled cash flows. If the government amends its current proposals, now or in the future, it will be necessary to revisit the funding and cash flow assumptions.

6.7.4 In the past it has not been the practice to allocate Leasehold Major Works Service Charges directly to the scheme to which they related, hence a cash reserve is available as part of this strategy. Going forward however, it is essential that Leaseholder Charges are matched more directly to the schemes to which they relate as the HCA backlog funding is net of Leaseholder contributions. It is also absolutely crucial that these Major Works Service charges are collected, because otherwise the Council will be left with a major unfunded liability.

7. Donegal and Sovereign

- 7.1 Cabinet approved works worth £2.49 million to be carried out on Donegal & Sovereign Houses, and phase 1 of these works involving internals have been completed whilst Phase 2 relating to externals, commenced in January 2011. THH is projecting an over spend on the scheme as a result of:
- a. Requirement for special designed scaffolding for use over highways, public houses, extensions in rear gardens and entrances with wider access;
 - b. Occurrence of voids since the completion of phase 1 works;
 - c. Additional concrete repairs required due to identification of more areas with high chlorides and deeper carbonation than previously planned.
 - d. Additional preliminary costs as a result of extended period of works.
- 7.2 Cabinet is therefore asked to note that additional resources of £398,000 will be needed to fund the Donegal and Sovereign scheme for completion by December 2011. This will be funded by compensatory savings elsewhere in the decent homes pilot schemes and will therefore have no adverse impact on the overall programme.

8. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

- 8.1 Cabinet on 8 June 2011 approved the “*Adoption of Capital Estimates for the Housing Investment Programme 2011/12, Decent Homes Backlog Funding 2011/12 and 2012/13, and other Development and Renewal Directorate led Capital Initiatives*” report which included the specific approval of capital estimates for the first two years of the Decent Homes programme, as well as the procurement methods to be adopted.
- 8.2 A two year approval was sought to ensure that the programme runs smoothly and to minimise the risk of not meeting Government targets. Adopting a two year programme at this stage will minimise delays and will allow flexibility as to the timing of schemes. Funding for the third and fourth years of the Decent Homes programme (2013-14 and 2014-15) is dependent upon the successful delivery of years one and two.
- 8.3 The June report approved a programme of £12.9 million for the first year of the programme (2011-12) and an indicative year 2 programme of £29 million. This compares to DCLG grant resources of £11 million and £12.5 million respectively.
- 8.4 Although capital estimates have been adopted to this level, the programme (where works are anticipated to commence in October 2011) will be robustly managed in line with resources available, with no commitments being entered into beyond the secured funding level. The programme includes significant over-programming, again to ensure that resources are not put at

risk through non delivery in years one and two. However, the report highlighted the need for the identification of significant additional resources for 2012-13 and future years, with the programme initially being closely managed within the resource constraints. Contracts will only be entered into once funding is definitely secured.

8.5 This report outlines proposals for the four years of the decent homes programme which incorporates decent homes works of £149.49 million (including leaseholder works). The analysis of the proposed programme, plus suggested funding sources, is outlined in table 1.

8.6 The proposed resources can be divided into specific groups, all of which require different consideration and approval. These are outlined below.

8.7 **Decent Homes Funding**

8.7.1 The major element of the financing of the programme is Decent Homes Backlog Funding of £94.5 million from the Homes and Communities Agency. Over the four financial years of the decent homes programme (2011-12 to 2014-15), a programme of £133.89 million (tenanted properties) and £15.6 million of leaseholder recoverable works is planned. The Government's funding allocation is £94.5 million, profiled over 4 years as follows:

Year	Funding Allocation (£ million)
2011-12	11.00
2012-13	12.50
2013-14	25.00
2014-15	46.00
Total	94.50

8.7.2 It is important to note that only the first two years of the allocated funding is guaranteed, with funding for the 2013-14 and 2014-15 years being subject to the meeting of agreed performance and decent homes targets. As a result it is critical that the Authority delivers the allocated funding identified in the first two years and maximises its decent homes returns. It should also be noted that the funding of £71 million for years 2013-14 and 2014-15 is dependent upon the continuation of Government policy and resources.

8.8 **Reform of Council Housing Finance**

- 8.8.1 Members will be aware that as part of the Localisation Bill, the Coalition Government is continuing with the review of the Council Housing Finance system. The dismantling of the HRA Subsidy system will change the financing regime for Local Authority Housing Finance, both revenue and capital, and it is the Government's target that the reforms will be in place by April 2012. Under this new financing system all future capital investment must be financed either through prudential borrowing (financed on an annual basis from rental income), capital receipts, specific grants or available HRA balances. When the final implications for the authority are announced, the Authority will review the financing of the capital programme to identify the potential new funding options, although at this stage it is anticipated that the Authority will have the capacity to finance significant capital expenditure over the first few years of the programme. These projected resources are included within the funding sources suggested here.
- 8.8.2 In addition, there will be scope to borrow resources, within the constraints of the self-financing system. Again, details will be confirmed when the final details of the self-financing "offer" are published by the DCLG later this year.

8.9 **Housing Related Specific Resources**

- 8.9.1 Certain proposed funding sources are housing specific, and are secured and held in reserves. These are the Homes and Communities Agency funding and the recoveries from leaseholders for major works. These HRA specific resources are available to finance the programme immediately, subject to Cabinet approval.

8.10 **General Fund or Housing Revenue Account Resources**

- 8.10.1 Certain other resources are held in reserves that can be utilised for either General Fund or Housing Revenue Account activities. It is essential that any decisions to commit these resources are considered in the context of the on-going funding reductions that the Authority is facing and the wider budgetary processes currently being undertaken. The specific items are:

New Homes Bonus – this grant came into effect in 2011-12, with the Authority being awarded the highest allocation in the country, at £4.28 million. It is anticipated that the Council will be entitled to similarly significant sums over the next few years, with these resources being available to finance either General Fund or Housing Revenue Account activities. The current financial modelling suggests that up to £10 million of the New Homes Bonus could be required over the four years of the Decent Homes programme, but as mentioned above, decisions as to the extent of its use as opposed to prudential borrowing will need to be considered within the context of the Council's overall medium term financial strategy. Recommendation 2.2 seeks authority to delegate final capital financing

decisions to the Corporate Director Development & Renewal after consultation with the Corporate Director of Resources and Lead Members

8.11 **Leaseholder Contributions**

8.11.1 Due to the high numbers of leaseholders within the Authority, a significant element of the capital programme will be rechargeable to leaseholders.

8.11.2 Although the Decent Homes backlog works themselves will not involve leaseholders, it is proposed that additional external or communal area works are undertaken to blocks, as well as necessary works within the non-Decent Homes element of the programme. A significant element of these costs will be chargeable to leaseholders, and although the Authority will be required to finance the works initially, it is vital that all costs are appropriately recharged in accordance with the terms of the lease. It is estimated that the leaseholder contributions will total approximately £15.6 million, and members will be aware that we have a Legal duty to fully recover costs incurred. Failure to achieve this will present a significant risk to the ultimate resourcing of the programme.

8.12 **Donegal and Sovereign House**

8.12.1 This report also informs Members of additional estimated costs in relation to the programmed mainstream works being undertaken at Donegal and Sovereign Houses. The reasons for the overspend are outlined in paragraph 7, and in accordance with financial regulations, members are asked to approve a revised capital estimate for these works. The additional costs will be funded from savings elsewhere within the existing approved programme.

9. **CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL SERVICES)**

9.1. The report proposes use of money from a variety of sources to meet the shortfall required to complete the Council's Decent Homes programme. Cabinet may accept the proposals, but they will need to be executed having regard to the following matters.

9.2. To the extent that grant or project funding is to be used for this purpose, care will need to be taken to comply with the terms of the grant or agreement pursuant to which the monies are received by the Council.

9.3. In relation to the proposed use of housing revenue account (HRA) reserves, the Council must be mindful of its obligations under Part VI of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 regarding maintenance of the housing revenue account. The Council must act consistently with its own adopted proposals designed to secure that the HRA does not show a debit balance.

- 9.4. Borrowing forms a part of the funding proposals. Pursuant to section 1 of the Local Government Act 2003, the Council may borrow for any purpose relevant to its functions under any enactment (which would include its repairing obligations under the Housing Act 1985) and for the purposes of the prudent management of its financial affairs. The borrowing must be within the Council's affordable borrowing limit, which it has determined having regard to the "Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities" published by CIPFA. The New Homes Bonus will be reported in the annual budget going forward as part of capital expenditure.
- 9.5. Before making the proposed budget decisions, Cabinet will need to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who don't. Some form of equality analysis will be required before Cabinet can give the required consideration to the equality implications of the proposed decisions.

10. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

- 10.1 It is the Council's intention that over the course of the full four year Decent Homes programme, every tenanted Council owned dwelling that does not meet the Decent Homes Standard will receive a new kitchen and bathroom. Residents have been consulted on their preferences for kitchens and bathrooms. In addition Resident Liaison Officers will be on site to address resident concerns which will include specific equalities issues.
- 10.2 This report concerns progression of the identification of funding options that can be used to bridge the gap between the DH backlog funding from HCA and costs for delivering the Council' DH programme as whole. The extent to which this can be achieved and programme targets reached will have a direct bearing on helping to achieve the Council's objectives in regard to tackling some of the material effects of poverty in the borough.

11. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

- 11.1 Bridging the gap funding for the DP Programme is vital if the Council's homes are to be made decent. The DH Programme contains specific provision to improve the energy efficiency of the Council's own stock. For example, a significant proportion of the programme consists of renewing outdated, less efficient boilers with modern equivalents. In addition, all schemes, especially those involving new roofs, windows, heating and insulation are developed to maximise energy efficiency benefits. Work is also being undertaken to further develop this aspect of investment as part of the improvement plan arising from the Best Value review of the Council's major works function. These aspects of the programme help to ensure that resources are directed appropriately at local Agenda 21 objectives.

12. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 The risk management principles that underpin the operation of the capital programme are:
- 12.2 This report is driven by the major risk that Decent Homes Backlog funding is year specific, with resources only being available for years three and four if the Authority successfully delivers the year one and two outcomes in accordance with the Government specified requirements. Flexibility has therefore been built into this element of the programme to enable adaptations to be made if necessary to ensure targets are met.
- 12.3 Minimising the Risk of Under-spending. The DH Backlog Investment Programme is assembled with regard to the fact that homes, especially those which are currently none decent require improvements to reduce deterioration. However, in order to meet the desired spend over-programming is therefore built into the operation of the programme in order to provide the flexibility required to quickly re-programme in the case of any scheme where unforeseen delays occur.
- 12.4 Minimising the Risk of Overspending. No funding beyond that already confirmed and available has been assumed and regular monitoring of the programme is carried out to ensure that unacceptable levels of contractual commitments are not allowed to build up both in the current and future years.
- 12.5 The Council's forward funding of works accruing to leaseholders present a risk. Therefore, it is vital to ensure all capital funding investments owing to the Council by leaseholders are collected to ensure amicable delivery of the programme.
- 12.6 The delivery of the DH and other Capital Programmes in this report will be dependant on the availability of the earmarked funding sources in a timely manner in order to address the cashflow requirements. It is therefore, important that these funding sources are protected -"ring-fenced"- so as to guarantee delivery of these programmes.

13. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

- 13.1 Crime and Disorder reduction implications on the DH Backlog Investment Programme is limited; however working closely with the ASB teams and local residents, schemes for e.g. door entry systems and environmental improvements, like additional lighting, contribute to a reduction of crime and disorder.

14. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT

- 14.1 The contractors procured to deliver the programme have been organised in line with the findings of the Best Value review of the service and makes use of partnering principles to reduce overheads and tendering costs to a minimum in order that the service may operate in as efficient a way as possible.

15. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – June Agreed Decent Homes Backlog Programme 2012/13

**Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended)
List of “Background Papers” used in the preparation of this report**

Brief description of “background papers”	Name and telephone number of holder and address where open to inspection.
Housing Investment Programme Files LBTH Capital Board Documents	John Kiwanuka Development and Renewal Extensions 2616

This page is intentionally left blank

Decent Homes Backlog Funding

Work Prioritisation

Years 1 and 2 - 2011/12 and 2012/13

Year 1 - 2011/12

Estate	Total £	Average per dwelling (HCA) £	Non Decent dwellings
NHD01 Chicksand Estate	1587309.25	8533.920699	186
NHD14 St Stephens Estate	1314119.475	8939.588265	147
NHD14 Usher Estate	181650.325	10091.68472	18
NHD21 Brunton Wharf Estate	442558.9	9031.814286	49
NHD21 Limehouse Fields Estate	867889.65	9862.382386	88
NHD21 Mountmorres Estate	1943805.038	13688.76787	142
NHD21 Pitsea Estate	211556.2625	10074.10774	21
NHD21 Sims Estate	137476.4875	8086.852206	17
NHD21 Troon House Estate	237459.225	10324.31413	23
NHD22 Clichy Estate	2111270.863	8513.188962	248
NHD24 Martineau Estate	1239979.9	9612.247287	129
NHD24 Shadwell Gardens Estate	507533.9	10573.62292	48
NHD24 Solander Gardens Estate	1521357.575	9002.115828	169
NHD24 Tarling West Estate	637708.9	8390.906579	76
	12941675.75	9508.946179	1361

Decent Homes Backlog Funding

Work Prioritisation

Years 1 and 2 - 2011/12 and 2012/13

Year 2 - 2012/13

Estate	Total £	Average per dwelling (HCA) £	Non Decent dwellings
Bancroft Tenant Management Org	1179475	8023.639456	147
NHD01 Chicksand Estate	211073.6375	8442.9455	25
NHD02 Avebury Estate	1140912.15	8267.479348	138
NHD03 Granby Estate	25301.75	12650.875	2
NHD03 Hereford Estate	344000	8000	43
NHD04 Dorset Estate	24000	8000	3
NHD05 Boundary Estate	658977.025	9413.9575	70
NHD06 St Peters Estate	315800	8772.222222	36
NHD06 Teesdale Estate	534985.925	9553.320089	56
NHD07 Wellington Estate	538350	9613.392857	56
NHD08 Parkview Estate	192000	8000	24
NHD09 Cranbrook Estate	431730.1	9812.047727	44
NHD10 Digby Estate	268294.5	9581.946429	28
NHD10 Greenways Estate	72000	8000	9
NHD11 Collingwood Estate	1215382.1	9207.440152	132
NHD14 Rosebank Estate	72000	8000	9
NHD15 Bazely Estate	977178.2375	8964.937959	109
NHD15 Galloway Estate	112000	8000	14
NHD15 St Mathias Estate	509250.325	9793.275481	52
NHD16 Bazely Estate	136000	8000	17
NHD16 Birchfield Estate	270147.25	8714.427419	31
NHD16 Birchfield Estate E14	1356301.85	8530.200314	159
NHD16 Will Crooks Estate	1611474.275	9208.424429	175
NHD17 Barley Mow Estate	1647554.625	9634.822368	171
NHD17 No Estate	153375	9022.058824	17
NHD17 Roche Estate	1274025	8437.251656	151
NHD18 Locksley Estate	3249506.538	8226.598829	395
NHD21 Mountmorres Estate	137717.85	9181.19	15
NHD21 Pitsea Estate	1108268.625	9895.25558	112
NHD22 No Estate	262950	8217.1875	32
NHD22 St Dunstons Estate	525601.4875	8908.499788	59
NHD22 Stifford Estate	577476.4875	8020.506771	72
NHD23 Dorian Estate	303275	8919.852941	34
NHD23 Sidney Street Estate (North)	596469.75	4113.584483	145
NHD23 Sidney Street Estate (South)	1143536	9773.811966	117
NHD24 Solander Gardens Estate	300372.3125	10012.41042	30
NHD24 Watney Market Estate	692775.5875	10496.59981	66
NHD25 Berner Estate (North)	1115400	8646.511628	129
NHD25 Berner Estate (South)	676252.975	9392.402431	72
NHD26 Riverside Estate	71808.9	10258.41429	7
NHD26 Wapping Estate	763586.25	9665.648734	79
NHD27 Lincoln Estate (North)	1097847.95	10260.26121	107
NHD27 Lincoln Estate (South)	729071.6375	9593.047862	76
NHD27 No Estate	8000	8000	1

Withy Tmo Osier Estate In Withy Tmo

448325	8458.962264	53
29079831.1	8761.624315	3319

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9.1

Committee/Meeting: Cabinet	Date: 7 September 2011	Classification: Unrestricted	Report No: CAB 032/112
Report of: Corporate Director : Helen Taylor Originating officer(s) Barbara Disney, Service Manager, Strategic Commissioning. Neil Langley, Strategic Commissioning Manager.		Title: Award of contract for care and Housing Related Support in Extra Care Sheltered Housing Wards Affected: All	

Lead Member	Cllr. Abdul Assad
Community Plan Theme	A great place to live A safe and cohesive community
Strategic Priority	Author to insert Strategic Priority(ies) supported by the proposal

1. **SUMMARY**

1.1 This paper requests that Cabinet considers the award of the new contract for Extra Care Sheltered Housing (“**ECSH**”) within the Adults Health and Wellbeing Directorate. It is the Directorate policy to focus on maximising the independence of assessed adults and provide for them the opportunity to access Extra Care Sheltered Housing (housing with care in situ), rather than a placement within a care home. Officers of the Directorate’s Commissioning Section have conducted a tender process and identified a suitable provider to support vulnerable adults in two new schemes: a new build, St Thomas House, being built by Gateway Housing in Stepney and comprising of 40 units; and a refurbishment, Shipton Street, being completed by Peabody Trust specifically for people living with dementia and situated in Bethnal Green.

This contract will be for the provision of care and for Housing Related Support (Supporting People). The St Thomas House project is due to come on line in December 2011 and the Shipton Street project by February 2012.

2. **DECISIONS REQUIRED**

Cabinet is recommended to:-

2.1 Note the contents of this report; and

2.2 Agree the award of five year contracts for the provision of care and

support services in respect to the Extra Care Sheltered Housing schemes at St Thomas House, Stepney and Shipton Street, Bethnal Green to Bidder A, commencing on a date to be determined by the Corporate Director, Adults Health and Wellbeing.

2.3 Authorise the Corporate Director, Adults Health and Well Being after consultation with Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) to agree the terms of the contracts referred to at paragraph 2.2. above

2.4 Authorise the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal services) to enter into all necessary documents to implement the decisions in paragraph 2 of this report.

3. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

3.1 ECSH is seen as an alternative to care home provision and as such tenants at the higher end of the vulnerability scale will be accommodated in St Thomas House and Shipton Street. The care provider, Bidder A, will work with the Council and Gateway Housing (the Registered Social Landlord for St Thomas House), and with Peabody Trust (The RSL for Shipton Street) and will be expected to follow all national and local guidelines in the provision of support and will be expected to maximise the independence of each and every tenant whilst at the same time ensuring that their full potential for social inclusion is addressed. Each individual tenant will have their own Care Plan as assessed for by the authority's operational staff.

3.2 Where a placement in ECSH is appropriate to the needs of a Service User it gives greater value for money than a placement in a registered care home which would be the direct alternative to ECSH.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

4.1 The Council might choose not to proceed with the proposal to award these contracts, but this would limit the availability of ECSH and may require placement of service users in a residential care home. This might not be appropriate as the needs of the individual might not be such that the more intensive support provided in a registered care home may not be necessary, with the possible result of generating greater dependency and institutionalisation. Further, a placement in ECSH both maximises the independence of the individual and gives a better quality of life as well as being better value for money.

4.2 The Council might consider an alternative ECSH arrangement, but the proposed contracts are considered to be an appropriate way forward for the reasons given in the report.

5. BACKGROUND

5.1 Extra care sheltered housing is dedicated to maintaining older people in the community who may otherwise be at risk of entering institutional care. It combines the dignity, privacy and independence of your own front door – purpose built accommodation in individual self contained flats – with the security and level of care provided by an on-site personal care and support team, available 24 hours a day.

5.2 Tower Hamlets currently has 161 units of extra care sheltered housing distributed across four schemes at Duncan Court, Donnybrook Court, Sonali Gardens and Coopers Court.

5.3 Sanctuary Care is the care arm of Sanctuary Housing and is the care provider at all four of the current schemes. Sanctuary Housing is also the housing provider at Coopers Court, and manages the housing on behalf of Circle Anglia who own the other three schemes. The contract for the current provision is with Sanctuary Care and the AH&W Directorate will run a procurement process from August 2011 with a view to awarding the contract in June 2012. The contract runs for five years and is in its fourth year. This paper is for consideration and addresses the award of the contract for the two new schemes.

5.4 Extra care sheltered housing in Tower Hamlets is a success. The quality of the provision is amongst the best in the country and the Sonali Gardens scheme has won national and international awards. There is a high demand for all four schemes. The provision of Extra Care Sheltered Housing contributes to the overall strategy for the provision of care and support to vulnerable people in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. It is seen as a direct alternative to non-specialist residential care, as it maximises the potential for independence of the individual, whilst at the same time providing the support that enables people to remain an integral part of their community.

6. BODY OF REPORT

6.1 A large scale tender exercise has been undertaken to identify a provider for the care in the two new schemes. This was a joint undertaking between the AH&W Strategic Commissioning Team and the Supporting People Team with advice and support being provided by Corporate Procurement. The timetable for the tender is attached, giving details of the stages of the tender process undertaken, (Appendix 1).

6.2 The tender attracted considerable interest. A total of 24 Pre-Qualification Questionnaires were returned. Provider organisations were asked to answer a series of searching questions (14) relating to their experience, understanding and skills in the provision of care to vulnerable adults. These answers were assessed and shortlisted to a long-list of 8 organisations that were invited to

tender. An example of the marking sheet for the assessment of these questions is attached as an appendix (Appendix 2).

6.3 Five tenders were returned. There followed a rigorous examination of these Tenders, which included, a further set of three questions. Providers were asked to cover in detail specific areas of expertise, including dementia which is the focus of the Shipton Street scheme. The Tender also had a requirement for the provider organisations to submit a price which was assessed by the panel with regard to value for money. All five organisations progressed to the final selection stage, reflecting the high quality of their tenders.

6.4 At the tender final selection stage the tendering organisations were interviewed by a Panel consisting of the Service Manager, Strategic Commissioning, managers from Strategic Commissioning and Older People's operational teams from Adults Health and Wellbeing plus the Service Manager of the Supporting People Team. Each organisation was asked a set of standard questions and to complete a presentation designed to test their professional and technical competence and to establish the value for money they offered.

6.5 Since the conclusion of the Tender process the decision has also been taken to the Tollgate Panel (19th July 2011) where it was reviewed and agreed by senior, independent officers of the Council, including the Service Head, Procurement and Corporate Programmes and the Contracts Team Leader from Legal Services.

6.6 As a result of the tender process it is recommended that a five year contract, for the provision of care and support be offered to Bidder A (care arm) for both of the new extra care sheltered housing schemes, St Thomas House and Shipton Street. Bidder A's bid satisfied both essential quality and financial evaluative criteria.

6.7 Officers will work with the provider, prior to residents taking up their tenancies, to ensure the service is of high quality and meets the needs of the Service Specification. Regular monitoring will continue to ensure the outcomes and outputs of the Specification. Complaints and Safeguarding are an integral part of the monitoring arrangements. A full review of the service will take place annually and a break clause will be included in the contract which will be invoked, should the provision fail to deliver outcomes of sufficient quality and responsiveness.

6.8 The tenants who will be provided with support in the two new Extra Care Sheltered Housing schemes at Shipton Street (13 units) and St Thomas House (40 units) would be provided with high levels of assessed care. In the two new schemes they will be supported by on site carers, at a cost substantially less than if they were to be supported in a care home. They will also be assessed to ensure income maximisation and make a financial contribution towards the cost of their care where appropriate.

6.9 ECSH is seen as a viable alternative to residential care, maximising the independence of the individual but at a substantially lower cost. The Unit Cost (hourly rate) tendered by Bidder A is £15.36. At a base number of hours (12.25) this results in an annual cost to the Council of £518,569. Given an average cost of residential care for each prospective tenant of £500 per week, the cost of keeping the same service users in residential care would be £1,378,000 pa. The saving to the Council, therefore, could be estimated as being £859,431 pa or £4,297,155 over the 5 year lifetime of the contract.

6.10 The provider identified, Bidder A, is an organisation that manages schemes across London, and, for St Thomas House and Shipton Street, will be required to employ people local to Tower Hamlets wherever possible. Bidder A have demonstrated, throughout their submissions, a commitment to aspects of legislation, national and local policy and the good practice that govern both quality service delivery and the support of those employed to provide care to the most vulnerable residents of Tower Hamlets.

6.11 In addition, Bidder A pay front line staff the London Living Wage. This contributes to the provision of quality care by securing strong recruitment and retention of staff and continuity of care, something which is of paramount importance when providing care to the tenants within Extra Care schemes who are some of the most vulnerable of Service Users.

7. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

- 7.1 As per section two of this report, Cabinet are asked to note the contents of this report and agree the award of a five year contract for the provision of care and support services in respect to the Extra Care Sheltered Housing schemes at St Thomas House, Stepney and Shipton Street, Bethnal Green to Bidder A, commencing on a date to be determined by the Corporate Director, Adults Health and Wellbeing.
- 7.2 As per paragraph 5.3 of the report, in line with the existing contractual arrangements with Sanctuary Housing, a procurement process will commence in August 2011 to award a contract starting in June 2012 for the provision of care for the existing four extra care housing schemes.
- 7.3 Paragraphs 6.1 to 6.5 set out the procurement exercise carried out by the Directorate. The procurement was completed in line with the Council's Procurement Policy and was advertised in the Official Journal of the European Union.
- 7.4 As per paragraph 6.7 and 6.8 of the report, the proposal is to award a five year contract to Bidder A for both the new extra sheltered housing schemes (provision of care and support) at a rate of £15.36 per hour at a base 12.25 hours per week per client.
- 7.5 Extra care sheltered housing allows clients to be supported on site by carers, at a cost substantially less than if they were to be supported in a care home

(paragraph 4.1). The average cost of a residential placement is £500 per week where as the average cost for an extra care sheltered housing placement is £188 per week, representing a difference of £312.

- 7.6 The financial benefits of the extra care sheltered housing scheme at St Thomas House and Shipton Street are set out in paragraph 6.8. The cost of providing extra care sheltered housing as opposed to residential care would realise savings of some £0.8m per annum. From this value the Authority will need to deduct the cost of providing the existing care packages for the clients that will move into the schemes. At this time the clients are unknown.

Any efficiency savings that can be realised by the Authority in respect of this contract will be pursued through the annual budget setting process.

- 7.7 A summary of the financial calculations are set out below:

Extra Care Sheltered Housing

Hourly rate	£15.36
Number of hours per client per week	12.25
Number of clients	53
Weekly cost	£9,972
Annual cost	£0.5m

Residential Placement

Average weekly cost	£500
Number of clients	53
Weekly cost	£26,000
Annual cost	£1.3m

Efficiency saving before deducting the cost of supporting the client in the community: £0.8m

- 7.8 In line with the Council's extra care sheltered housing charging policy, all clients in extra care are required to make a financial contribution towards their care. The level of income will depend on the individual clients concerned as it is means tested. It is therefore unable to say at this time of the value of income that will accrue to the Authority.

- 7.9 Any efficiency savings that can be realised by the Authority in respect of this contract will be pursued through the annual budget setting process.

8. **CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL SERVICES)**

- 8.1. The report proposes the award of contracts to provide care services within two sheltered housing properties. The council has the power and, in some cases, the duty to provide adult community care services. This includes the obligation under section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948 to provide support services for specified categories of vulnerable adults who are ordinarily resident in Tower Hamlets. The council may enter into contracts to enable the delivery of services falling within its statutory functions. It will be for officers to ensure that the services described in the contract do fall within the council's statutory functions.
- 8.2. The council is obliged as a best value authority under section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999 to "make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness". The report outlines the procurement process that has been undertaken, which complies with the council's procedures and helps demonstrate compliance with the best value duty.
- 8.3. Before awarding the contracts the council will need to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful conduct under the Equality Act 2010, the need to advance equality of opportunity and the need to foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who don't. Some form of equality analysis will be required.

9. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1. The recipients of extra care sheltered housing services are among the most vulnerable members of the community and are provided with a high standard of accommodation and person centred care. Ability to meet the needs of the diverse community of Tower Hamlets effectively was a key criterion in the evaluation of the tenders and Bidder A demonstrated understanding and experience of providing support to all Service Users of Tower Hamlets.
- 9.2. The tender process focussed throughout on the ability of the tendering organisations to provide for the diversity of potential tenants in the two new schemes. This was in terms both of cultural diversity and of diversity of need. The pre-qualification questionnaire (PQQ) gave prospective providers a clear picture of what was required from them and there were 14 questions asked of them as part of the short-listing process. These questions are listed in the PQQ marking matrix in Appendix 2. Regard was had to additional documents such as the joint strategic needs assessment (JSNA) and the Dementia Strategy.
- 9.3. The schemes in the Report are new and prospective tenants will be offered a place based on their need as assessed for through the Directorate assessing officers (Social Workers, in the main). It is likely that allocation based on needs will lead to places being offered so as in fact to favour persons with particular protected characteristics within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010, such as older people and people with disabilities. To the extent that this occurs, it is clearly in pursuit of the legitimate aim of maintaining older

people in the community who may otherwise be at risk of entering institutional care. This approach outlined in this report is considered to be a proportionate means of achieving this legitimate aim.

10. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

10.1 There are no SAGE implications in this proposal.

11. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 There are a number of different risks associated with the award of the extra care contract. The key risks are:

- i.) Under utilisation of the schemes.
- ii.) the organisation may not in the event have the capacity to sustain the outputs and outcomes required.

11.2 The above risks are considered acceptable in view of the levels of occupancy achieved across the current extra care sheltered housing schemes and the successful track record of Bidder A in this area. However, a range of mechanisms will be employed to deal with unanticipated risks. These include:

- i.) The inclusion of a no fault termination clause to end the contract if its continuance ceases to be in the Council's interests.
- ii.) The incorporation of an anti-fraud clause in the contract.
- iii.) The regular monitoring of the service provided to drive continuous improvement and proactively deal with service issues.
- iv.) Ongoing work with the provider to ensure that outputs and targets are realistic and appropriate for the amount of secured funding.

12. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

There are no specific crime and disorder reduction implications.

13. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT

13.1 The ECSH tender was explicitly designed to maximise the efficiency and value for money of this service by identifying the provider who offered the best combination of quality and price. Further efficiencies have been obtained by offering contracts with 5 year terms which allow the successful provider to spread its start-up costs over a reasonable length of time and encourage it to invest in service development.

14. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – The tender timetable

Appendix 2 - The evaluation matrix for marking section F (quality and experience) of the PQQ.

Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended)
List of “Background Papers” used in the preparation of this report

Brief description of “background papers” Name and telephone number of holder
and address where open to inspection.

Non-exempt tender documents

Neil Langley or Barbara Disney
7th Floor, 2 Clove Crescent
East India Dock
London, E14 2BE
Telephone: 020 7364 2025

Appendix 1

Draft Timetable. Provision of care in new Extra Care Sheltered Housing Schemes: Shipton Street and St Thomas House

Activity	Timing	
	From	To
Stage One (Complete)		
Form Project Team	01.10.10	
Market research	01.01.10	30.06.10
Internal review of requirements	01.01.10	30.06.10
Outline Business Case	01.06.09	06.09.10
Tollgate Review (Competition Board)	06.09.10	30.09.10
End Stage One Report to Project Board	30.09.10	
Stage Two (21.10.10 – 11.02.11)		
Advertise for expressions of Interest (Internet)	21.10.10	
Undertake EQIA	01.10.10	31.10.10
Draft Tender documents	01.10.10	31.10.10
Closing date for EoI	19.11.10	
Despatch PQQ	22.11.10	
PQQ return date	07.01.11	
Evaluate PQQ	10.01.11	14.01.11
Agree list of Tenderers	14.01.11	
End Stage Two Report to Project Board / Sponsor	11.02.11	
Stage Three (14.02.11 – 02.05.11)		
Invite Tenders	07.03.11	
Reference site visits (week commencing)	07.03.11	
Return of Tenders	04.04.11	
Open Tenders	04.04.11	
Initial evaluation	WC 04.04.11	
Shortlisting	WC 04.04.11	
Shortlisted Tenderers' interview and presentations to Project team (week commencing)	02.05.11	
Formulate contract award recommendations	09.05.11	30.05.11
Seek award of contract (Corporate Director / Competition Board)	June 2011 (Competition Board date TBC)	
Seek award of Contract (Cabinet, if required by Competition Board)	June 2011 (Cabinet date TBC)	
Call-in and Alcatel periods (10 days alcatel plus 5 days call in – run in parallel not series)	June/July 2011 (assumes June 2011 for Cabinet date)	
Stage Four (17.02.11 – 30.06.11)		
Contract awarded – Letter of Acceptance sent	July 2011	
Lead in period with new provider	July 2011	October 2011
Contract commencement	01.11.11	

<p>7. What issues do you foresee for these schemes with the development of personalisation. How might these issues be addressed</p>						
<p>8. Please outline how you would demonstrate measurable outcomes in terms Care Planning/Support Planning and risk management plans for service users.</p>						
<p>9. Please outline your approach to the management of dementia related behaviour, and your use of new technology, which demonstrates the least restrictive option.</p>						
<p>10. Please outline how you would ensure effective recruitment, retention and professional development of your staff team.</p>						
<p>11. Staff employed at the two schemes must have a minimum of NVQ level 2/3 and management must have strong leadership qualities and / or management and leadership qualifications. Please outline your plans on how this will be consistently achieved.</p>						
<p>12. . Please outline, with evidence, how you have or how you would turn around poor or adequate rated services to Good or Excellent.</p>						
<p>13 . Please outline how you would ensure local quality assurance monitoring, and give examples of how you have achieved this..</p>						

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 10.1

Committee/Meeting: Cabinet	Date: 7 th September 2011	Classification: Unrestricted	Report No: CAB 033/112
Report of: Corporate Director Resources Originating officer(s) Peter Hayday, Service Head Financial Services, Risk & Accountability Michael Keating, Service Head One Tower Hamlets		Title: Strategic Performance and Corporate Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q1 2011/12 (Month 3) Report to the end of June 2011. Wards Affected: All	

Community Plan Theme	All
Strategic Priority	All

1 **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Effective performance monitoring and reporting is crucial to the way the Council drives improvement in services. This is the first combined performance report covering the Council's Strategic measures and financial position for the current financial year. It covers the first quarter April to June 2011. Combining our performance and financial reporting in this way strengthens the Council's robust performance management arrangements.
- 1.2 This report was considered by Overview & Scrutiny at its meeting on 6th September.
- 1.3 This performance report covers the authority's progress to date in 2011/12 (Quarter 1) against budget and service performance targets. This includes year end projection updates for the:
- General Fund Revenue and Housing Revenue Account;
 - Capital Programme; together with
 - An overview of performance for all of the reportable strategic measures.
- The Strategic Measures Set represents the key priorities for the Council in 2011/12.

1.4 Finance Overview

1.4.1 As at the end of the first quarter (30th June 2011) Directorates are forecasting spend in line with service budgets. However there are a number of risks that are detailed in the report, although at this stage it is anticipated that these can be contained through a mix of mitigating actions and specific risk provisions.

1.4.2 Cabinet is being asked to approve budget virements as set out in Appendix 3 of this report. There is no net impact on the Council's 2011-12 budget as a result of these virements: an allocation of £2.1m relates to the growth risks for which provision was included in the MTFP approved by Full Council in March 2011 and the other main virements relate to the movement of budgets between corporate costs and Children's (CSF) and Resources.

1.4.3 Housing Revenue Account

The projected outturn on the HRA is a break even position in line with the budget and the position reported last month.

1.4.4 Capital Programme

Directorates have spent 12.1% of their capital budgets for the year (£20.674m against budgets of £171.328m), and have projected a year-end underspend of £2.915m or 1.7% of the budget. However this assumes Cabinet approval to re-phase some £14 million of BSF works from 2011/12 across the 3-year programme. Any resources not spent in the current financial year would be required to fund the capital programme in future years. The overall programme remains affordable within available resources.

1.5 Strategic Measures

Quarter 1 data is currently available for 16 measures. Of these ten are within their target range, and six are below the target range. Eight measures have improved compared to last year's Quarter 1 performance.

1.6 More detailed performance and financial information is contained in the report and appendices, as follows:

- Appendix 1 - provides the estimate budget outturn and explanations of major variances for Directorates for the General Fund
- Appendix 1a - provides a subjective analysis of forecast variances
- Appendix 2 - provides the estimate budget outturn and explanations of major variances for the HRA
- Appendix 3 – a schedule of new virements requiring Cabinet approval.
- Appendix 4 – provides details of the capital programme and details of how the initial 2011/12 capital budget has changed.

- Appendix 5 – provides an overview of performance for all of the reportable strategic measures. The Strategic Measures Set represents the key priorities for the Council in 2011/12.

2. DECISIONS REQUIRED

Cabinet is recommended to:-

- 2.1. Review and note the Quarter 1 2011/12 performance;
- 2.2. Note the Council's financial position as outlined in paragraphs 3 and 4 and Appendices 1-4 of this report; and
- 2.3. Approve the budget virements detailed in Appendix 3.

Reasons for the Decision

Quarterly updates on the position of the capital programme and revenue expenditure against budgets are provided to Cabinet for information. This is the forecast position for the year as at the end of June 2011. The requested budget virements are to fund growth risks for which provision was included in the MTFP approved by Council in March 2011 and re-align service budgets as per paragraph 1.4.2 above.

Alternative Options

Non approval of the budget transfers will mean affected Directorates will not be in a position to provide services within budget limits.

3.1 The following table summarises the current expected outturn position for the General Fund.

SUMMARY	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance £'000
Adults Health and Wellbeing	99,424	22,090	22,056	(34)	99,424	0
Chief Executive	10,628	2,657	2,734	77	10,628	0
Children, Schools and Families+	82,210	20,552	82,998	62,446	82,210	0
Communities, Localities and Culture	70,400	14,096	14,020	(76)	70,400	0
Development and Renewal	16,995	4,249	4,146	(103)	16,995	0
Resources	10,373	2,594	3,284	690	10,373	0
Corporate Costs/Capital Financing	15,843	356	232	(124)	15,843	0
TOTAL	305,873	66,594	129,470	62,876	305,873	0

+ Variance to date explanations is included within paragraph 3.3

As can be seen from the table the Directorates are forecasting spend for the year in line with the net service budgets. However, there are a number of significant budget pressures in some service areas which are currently being managed and which are set out in detail below.

The table also shows a significant year-to-date variance in Children's, Schools and Families which is explained in Section 3.3 below. Other smaller year-to-date variances are explained in the detailed budget analysis in Appendix 1 with an analysis of budget variances against expenditure type detailed in Appendix 1A.

3.2 Adults, Health and Wellbeing

Projected variance Nil

Although at the end of month three Adults Health and Wellbeing are forecasting a break even position the Directorate continues to have a number of budget risks as a result of demographic changes:

A Transition Clients for Learning Disabilities

The Directorate submitted a growth bid as part of the 2011/12 budget setting process for Learning Disability clients entering the Directorate from the Children Schools and Families Directorate. The forecast funding requirement for this financial year was £0.6m.

The current forecast by the Directorate is that expenditure to be transferred from the Children Schools and Families Directorate for the 2011/12 financial year is £0.7; £0.1m more than had been expected. This represents the part year effect of 61 clients. The average unit cost per client is £12,125 which is higher than anticipated and has been affected by two care packages which are both over the cost of £50,000 per annum (one of these clients has a care package of £104,030).

B Dementia Clients

The Directorate submitted a growth bid as part of the 2011/12 budget setting process for Older People with dementia. The forecast funding requirement for this financial year was £2.1m.

The current forecast by the Directorate is that expenditure on supporting clients with dementia into elderly and mentally infirm residential placements is likely to be broadly in line with this projection.

C NHS Social Care Funding

The forecast increased budget pressure of the above areas of service demand totals £2.8m. However, it is currently planned to meet this additional cost through the application of additional funding made available through the NHS to support Social Care expenditure. This funding is the subject of a Section 256 agreement.

The total funding made available to the Directorate in 2011-12 through this agreement is £3.7m. The balance of £0.9m is needed to meet the joint objectives of the Primary Care Trust (PCT) and the Council which are set out in the agreement.

Whilst this will offer a potential savings opportunity in 2011-12 of up to £2.8m this may not be mirrored in 2012-13 as the funding for that year has still to be confirmed and the Directorate will need to agree a business plan with the PCT for the use of any future funding.

3.3 Children, Schools and Families Projected variance NIL

At present, the directorate is reporting that it will be able to operate within budget for 2011/12.

Nonetheless, underlying pressures of £0.9m in Building and Technical Services (BATS), Buildings & Development and Transport have no long-term funding to support them and will need to be addressed. This will involve:

- scaling down the activity in the BATS team on supporting schools' capital projects such that it operates sustainably;
- reprioritising support staff posts within CSF, through the Management and Administration review, to ensure that an affordable building development function is available; and

- considering policy changes to home-school travel in line with the recent internal review. This function, however, has a savings target of £0.3m over three years and the underlying budget pressure is in excess of £0.5m; the combination of these two may require some revisiting of the medium term financial forecast for this item, but not at this stage.

The expenditure to date for the department is significantly different to the profiled budget. The £62.4m variance includes full-year commitments of £46.5m and a further £10.2m of schools expenditure to be funded from the DSG. The balance of approximately £6.0m represents the difference between actual grant income received to date and the associated income profile. This is a timing difference which will un-wind over the course of the year.

3.4 Development and Renewal Projected variance NIL

A breakeven position is currently forecast, however the Directorate is actively reviewing the Third Sector requirement for savings opportunities where there is a net risk of a £0.2m overspend.

3.5 Corporate Costs & Capital Financing Projected variance NIL

The Corporate Cost and Capital Financing budget is currently forecast to spend in line with budget. However, a number of council wide risks are managed through this budget including the risk of one off unbudgeted costs that may arise through the year. At this stage in the financial year no significant risks or slippage to the approved savings programme have been identified.

3.6 HRA Projected variance NIL

The overall projected HRA break-even position is the net result of a number of projected under and overspends. The main variances are, firstly, estate parking, which is forecast to underspend due to the replacement of the previous removal-based parking enforcement contract with a new ticket-based contract that offers improved value for money; secondly, leaseholder & tenant service charge income is projected to be slightly higher than budgeted, although this is subject to the 2010/11 actualisation process; thirdly, it has previously been agreed that expenditure relating to the Housing Options Appraisal would be funded from HRA reserves.

3.7 Other Service Areas

There are no budget variances currently projected in Communities, Localities and Culture, Chief Executive and Resources with no significant budget risks currently identified.

3.8 Budget Virements

A number of budget virements have been requested which require Cabinet approval but are reflected in the forecast outturn figures in the above tables and the variance analysis in Appendices 1 and 1A. These virements do not have any net impact on the Council's 2011-12 budget and are set out in detail in Appendix 3.

The virements can be categorised into two broad groupings:

- those which reflect demand/cost growth for which specific budget provision was included in the Medium Term Financial Plan (Appendix B page 49) agreed by Full Council in March 2011 (references 1-4); and
- those where budgets had been divided between Corporate/Capital and the service directorates (Medium Term Financial Plan – Appendix A, page 47) with the view to identifying possible savings opportunities in the early part of 2011-12 which were over and above those in the approved savings programme (references 5-12).

3.9 Income Collection Performance Targets

Details of income collection during 2011/12 are shown below.

Income Stream	Collected in 2010/11 %	2011/12 Target to 30.06.11 %	2011/12 Collected to 30.06.11 %	Direction of Travel
Business Rates	99.60	24.49	29.88	↑
Central Income	90.00	70.00	69.00	↓
Council Tax	95.10	23.80	26.11	↑
Housing Rents	99.87	100.00	100.24	↑
PCNs	63.09	53.10	54.10	↑
Service Charges	110.40	27.60	32.80	↑

Income collection rates are currently broadly in line with target.

4. CAPITAL

- 4.1 The capital budget at the start of 2011/12 as approved by Cabinet on 9th February 2011 totalled £149.8m. This has now increased to £171.3m. This is due in the main part to slippage from 2010/11 being carried forward. Details of all the changes to the capital budget are set out in Appendix 4.

4.2 Total capital spend to the end of Quarter 1 represented 12.1% of the budget for 2011/12 as follows:

	Annual Budget as at 30-Jun-11 £m	Actual Spend as at 30-Jun-11 £m	%
TOTALS BY DIRECTORATE:			
Communities, Localities and Culture	17.860	1.131	6.3%
Children, Schools and Families	24.103	3.840	15.9%
Resources	1.951	0.004	0.2%
Adults, Health and Wellbeing	0.235	0.038	16.2%
Development and Renewal	12.027	5.440	45.2%
Building Schools for the Future (BSF)	78.701	7.162	9.1%
Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	36.451	3.059	8.4%
GRAND TOTAL	171.328	20.674	12.1%

4.3 Projected capital expenditure for the year, compared to budget is as follows:

	Annual Budget as at 30-Jun-11 £m	Forecast to 31-Mar-12 £m	Projected Variance £m
TOTALS BY DIRECTORATE:			
Communities, Localities and Culture	17.860	17.820	-0.040
Children, Schools and Families	24.103	23.172	-0.931
Resources	1.951	1.951	0.000
Adults, Health and Wellbeing	0.235	0.194	-0.041
Development and Renewal	12.027	10.453	-1.574
Building Schools for the Future (BSF)*	78.701	78.632	-0.069
Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	36.451	36.191	-0.260
GRAND TOTAL	171.328	168.413	-2.915

* This assumes that some £14.0m will be re-profiled into later years in the BSF programme.

Total projected expenditure for the year, as advised by Directorates managing capital schemes, totals £168.4m compared with the budget of £171.3m, a forecast underspend of £2.9m. The profiling of the BSF budget across the 3-year programme is currently being reviewed but it is anticipated that some £14.0m will need to be re-profiled into later years. A revised budget profile for BSF will be submitted in the next quarterly report to Cabinet. Any unspent resources at year-end will be required to be carried forward for use in future years.

4.4 Further details of the programme are provided in Appendix 4.

5. STRATEGIC PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- 5.1 The strategic measures enable the Council to monitor progress against its priorities outlined in the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Measures Set is reviewed on an annual basis as part of the refresh of the Strategic Plan to ensure that they are fit for purpose. Where necessary, there will also be in-year reviews of the measures.
- 5.2 The 2011/12 Strategic Plan has been developed in the context of the biggest savings the Council has ever had to make. There have also been significant national changes that will affect local services. The Strategic Plan and measures reflect these important challenges and opportunities for the Council.
- 5.3 The abolition of a number of centrally set performance processes and reporting systems has allowed us to streamline and narrow down our strategic measures, ensuring that they reflect what matters most locally. This is evident in the significantly reduced number of strategic measures in this year's Set. We currently have 38 measures which we will continue monitoring on a quarterly basis.
- 5.4 Changes have also been made to the way we report performance of the strategic measures. A bandwidth approach to monitoring performance has been introduced. Each measure has a target range comprising of a lower bandwidth, which indicates the minimum performance level, and the target. A traffic light system is being used to indicate performance against the target range. Where performance is below the range this will be coloured RED and GREEN where within range. To get a more detailed performance picture, we will also be noting the variance between actual performance and the target. Where actual performance is more than 10% off the target this will be RED, within 10% or less of the target AMBER, and GREEN where it is at or above target. This can be fully seen in Appendix 5.
- 5.5 Performance analysis included within the report is currently based on incomplete data as performance data for some indicators is not yet available. The majority of this is due to time lags in reporting of some measures
- 5.6 Strategic Indicator Performance – Quarter 1 April - June 2011**
- 5.7 Performance against our strategic measures for Quarter 1 2011/12 is set out in Appendix 5.
- 5.8 The number of strategic measures available for reporting fluctuates between periods due to the different reporting frequencies of the measures. Of the 38

measures in the Strategic Set, 16, including subset of measures, (42%) are reportable in this quarter.

5.9 Of the 16 reportable indicators:

- 11 (69%) are within their target range
- 4 (25%) met or exceeded their target;
- 8 (50%) improved based on 2010/11 Quarter 1 outturn; and
- 5 (31%) were below their target range, but 2 of these were less than 10% off their Quarter 1 target.

5.10 We exceeded target on measures, including:

Housing

Number of affordable homes delivered – gross (Strategic208, National155); Number of social rented housing completions for family housing - gross figures only (Strategic223)

A number of affordable homes schemes and work on family rented units were pushed into 2011/12 which has affected this year's figures significantly. However these changes have been incorporated successfully into this year's targets and progress is looking positive. This is in line with the Council's commitment to housing as one of our key priorities. This is a challenging area of work but we have maintained our commitment and are set to develop this area further as we begin to refresh our Housing Strategy and respond to national policy changes in a local context.

5.11 We have improved performance on a number of measures, compared to this time last year, including:

Housing

Number of affordable homes delivered – gross (Strategic208, National155); Number of social rented housing completions for family housing - gross figures only (Strategic223)

Customer Access

Overall Satisfaction (Strategic110a)

We have seen a significant increase in our overall customer access satisfaction rate compared to this time last year, going from 86.8% – 91%. This is reflective of our commitment to providing supportive and responsive services to our residents, and in sustaining this even through more difficult periods of reduced resources and strains on the public sector.

High Risk Measures

- 5.12 As part of the analysis of each quarter, a risk analysis is undertaken to identify those measures which are at risk of not achieving their targets. This is based on a number of criteria including, whether or not they are currently meeting their Quarter 1 target; whether they are more than 10% off target; whether they are in the top half of performance in relation to London Councils' benchmarking; and whether performance has improved from this time last year. This results in a score out of 4. The following measures have been highlighted as they have produced a risk score of 3 or above.

Great Place to Live

- **Net additional homes provided (Strategic207, National154)**

This indicator does not measure a process which provides an even performance across the year. Completed housing units come in batches, as individual building projects complete, and the completion dates are never evenly distributed throughout the year. 34 units have been cleared and counted on the London Development Database (LDD). This is a provisional outturn only; a large number of net additional units have been completed, however they are currently non reportable via the LDD due to missing plot level breakdowns. If this information is collected from developers an additional 413 units would be reportable. Although developers are under no legal obligation to provide the Council with detailed completions information, processes are still being strengthened to collect outstanding information from them to maximise the numbers reported.
- **Overall employment rate - working age (Strategic311, National151)**

Employment remains one of our top priorities, as we develop and progress a new approach to reducing unemployment and worklessness in Tower Hamlets through our new Employment Strategy. Alongside national initiatives, such as the Work Programme, we are also putting in place a range of programmes and support mechanisms to reach the hard to reach and the most vulnerable in our communities. This is an ongoing commitment which we are confident will see progress over time.

Safe and Cohesive

- **Number of most serious violent crimes per 1,000 population (Strategic402, National015)**

There are number of ongoing activities planned to reduce most serious violent crime including the setting up of the Whitechapel Town Centre Team with the strength of 8 Police Constables to address cross ward issues with a key focus on violence.

- **Number of serious acquisitive crimes per 1,000 population (Strategic403, National016)**

Resources have been made available during 2011/12 to enable proactive operations to continue to arrest prolific offenders as well as deter opportunistic criminals. Targets are expected to be met and exceeded at the end of the year.

6. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

- 6.1 Under Financial Regulations it is the responsibility of senior managers to spend within budgets and, where necessary, management actions will need to be taken over the remainder of the financial year to avoid overspend.
- 6.2 Any overspend we incur at the end of 2011/12, or at any time over the forthcoming period, will risk the financial position and would increase the savings targets required to meet spending cuts, with a potential impact on front-line services. We need to be prepared to demonstrate to Members that everything possible has been done to contain expenditure within budgets

7. CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL SERVICES)

- 7.1 The report provides performance information, including by reference to key performance indicators and the budget.
- 7.2 It is consistent with good administration for the Council to consider monitoring information in relation to plans and budgets that it has adopted.
- 7.3 Section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999 requires the Council as a best value authority to “make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness”. Monitoring of performance information is an important way in which that obligation can be fulfilled.
- 7.4 The Council is required by section 151 of the Local Government Act 1972 to make arrangements for the proper administration of its financial affairs. The Council’s chief finance officer has established financial procedures to ensure the Council’s proper financial administration. These include procedures for budgetary control. It is consistent with these arrangements for Members to receive information about the revenue and capital budgets as set out in the report.

7.5 Cabinet is asked to agree the virements and budget adjustments set out in Appendix 3. It is for Full Council to set the budget, but the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules permit virements within the limits established by the Financial Procedure Rules.

8. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

The Council's Strategic Plan and Strategic Indicators are focused upon meeting the needs of the diverse communities living in Tower Hamlets and supporting delivery of One Tower Hamlets. In particular, Strategic priorities include the reduction of inequalities and the fostering of strong community cohesion and are measured by a variety of strategic indicators.

9. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

An element of the monitoring report deals with environmental milestones within the Safe and Supportive agenda.

10. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

In line with the Council's risk management strategy, the information contained within the Strategic Indicator Monitoring will assist the Cabinet, Corporate Directors and relevant service managers in delivering the ambitious targets set out in the Strategic Plan. Regular monitoring reports will enable Members and Corporate Directors to keep progress under regular review.

There is a risk to the integrity of the authority's finances if an imbalance occurs between resources and needs. This is mitigated by regular monitoring and, where appropriate, corrective action. This report provides a corporate overview to supplement more frequent monitoring that takes place at detailed level.

The explanations provided by the Directorates for the budget variances also contain analyses of risk factors.

11. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

The Strategic Indicator set contain a number of crime and disorder items under the Safe & Supportive theme, however there are no specific crime and disorder reduction implications.

12. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT

Efficiencies for 2011/12 are incorporated within the estimated forecast outturn.

13. APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 - provides the estimate budget outturn and explanations of major variances for Directorates for the General Fund
- Appendix 1a - provides a subjective analysis of forecast variances
- Appendix 2 - provides the estimate budget outturn and explanations of major variances for the HRA
- Appendix 3 – a schedule of new virements requiring Cabinet approval.
- Appendix 4 – provides details of the capital programme and details of how the initial 2011/12 capital budget has changed.
- Appendix 5 – provides an overview of performance for all of the reportable strategic measures. The Strategic Measures Set represents the key priorities for the Council in 2011/12.

Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended) List of “Background Papers” used in the preparation of this report

No “background papers” were used in writing this report

2% to 5%
Amber
>5% Red

CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

	FULL YEAR									
	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn) £'000	%	
ADULTS HEALTH & WELLBEING										
Expenditure	111,548	114,553	22,155	22,188	33	115,085	114,511	(42)	(0)	
Income	(12,745)	(15,129)	(65)	(132)	(67)	(16,058)	(15,087)	42	(0)	
Net Expenditure	98,803	99,424	22,090	22,056	(34)	99,027	99,424	0	0	
CHIEF EXECUTIVES										
Expenditure	20,375	18,278	4,570	4,202	(367)	18,278	18,278	0	0	
Income	(7,700)	(7,650)	(1,913)	(1,468)	444	(7,650)	(7,650)	0	0	
Net Expenditure	12,675	10,628	2,657	2,734	77	10,628	10,628	0	0	
CSF SCHOOLS BUDGET (DSG)										
Expenditure	322,084	321,608	80,402	44,573	(35,829)	321,702	321,190	(418)	(0)	
Income	(322,084)	(321,608)	(80,402)	(22,608)	57,794	(321,702)	(321,190)	418	(0)	
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	21,965	21,965	0	0	0	(0)	
CSF GENERAL FUND										
Expenditure	123,510	129,120	32,280	69,982	37,702	134,104	132,086	2,966	2	
Income	(46,911)	(46,910)	(11,728)	(8,949)	2,779	(48,984)	(49,876)	(2,966)	6	
Net Expenditure	76,599	82,210	20,552	61,033	40,481	85,120	82,210	0	0	
COMMUNITIES, LOCALITIES & CULTURE										
Expenditure	111,539	114,299	25,273	19,536	(5,737)	113,028	114,299	0	0	
Income	(41,402)	(43,899)	(11,177)	(5,516)	5,661	(42,727)	(43,899)	0	0	
Net Expenditure	70,137	70,400	14,096	14,020	(76)	70,301	70,400	0	0	
DEVELOPMENT & RENEWAL										
Expenditure	88,906	79,961	19,990	17,461	(2,529)	82,356	83,370	3,409	4	
Income	(71,403)	(62,966)	(15,741)	(13,315)	2,426	(65,243)	(66,374)	(3,409)	5	
Net Expenditure	17,503	16,995	4,249	4,146	(103)	17,114	16,995	(0)	(0)	
RESOURCES										
Expenditure	263,633	263,730	65,933	82,728	(14,530)	263,170	263,170	0	0	
Income	(253,359)	(253,357)	(63,339)	(79,444)	15,220	(252,797)	(252,797)	0	0	
Net Expenditure	10,274	10,373	2,594	3,284	690	10,373	10,373	0	0	
CORPORATE COSTS & CAPITAL FINANCING										
Expenditure	19,385	15,843	356	738	382	15,843	15,843	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	(506)	(506)	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	19,385	15,843	356	232	(124)	15,843	15,843	0	0	
TOTAL										
Expenditure	1,060,980	1,057,392	250,958	261,408	(20,875)	1,063,566	1,062,747	5,915	1	
Income	(755,604)	(751,519)	(184,365)	(131,939)	83,751	(755,161)	(756,873)	(5,915)	1	
Net Expenditure	305,376	305,873	66,594	129,470	62,876	308,406	305,873	(0)	(0)	

<2% Green
2% - 5% Amber
>5% Red

2% to 5% Amber
>5% Red

APPENDIX F - CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

ADULTS, HEALTH & WELLBEING	FULL YEAR										RAG Status	
	Actual to Date					Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn)						Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates
	Original Budget	Latest Budget	Budget to Date	Actual to Date	Variance to Date	Previous Forecast	Latest Forecast	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn)	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn)			
£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	%			
A53 Commissioning and Strategy M&A	Expenditure	1,672	1,713	420	423	3	1,633	1,682	(31)	(2)	3	Vote Budget Manager: D.Cohen Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 30/06/2011
	Income	(96)	(96)	0	0	0	(96)	(96)	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	1,576	1,617	420	423	3	1,537	1,586	(31)	(2)	3	
A04 Preventative Technology	Expenditure	82	82	0	2	2	82	82	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: K.Sugars Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:
	Income	(82)	(82)	0	0	0	(82)	(82)	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	
A05 Carers Grant	Expenditure	1,116	1,117	220	217	(3)	1,098	1,098	(19)	(2)	0	Vote Budget Manager: B.Disney Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:
	Income	0	0	0	17	17	(25)	(25)	(44)	(4)	0	
	Net Expenditure	1,116	1,117	220	234	14	1,073	1,073	(44)	(4)	0	
A41 Personalisation	Expenditure	550	550	160	167	7	531	531	(19)	(3)	0	Vote Budget Manager: C.Hannan Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed:
	Income	(550)	(550)	0	0	0	(531)	(531)	19	(3)	0	
	Net Expenditure	0	0	160	167	7	0	0	0	0	0	
Older People Commissioning	Expenditure	22,940	24,957	3,700	3,731	31	24,244	24,755	(202)	(1)	2	The gross expenditure and income were both increased to allow for the Section 256 income from NHS Tower Hamlets which is to support social care expenditure. The extra funding is to support in part demographic pressures. The underspend is predominantly on residential and nursing care (£3,161k) however this is offset with supporting clients in the community in particular on domiciliary care (£3,023k).
	Income	(3,210)	(5,355)	0	(29)	(29)	(5,432)	(4,399)	956	(18)	(19)	
	Net Expenditure	19,730	19,602	3,700	3,702	2	18,812	20,356	754	4	8	
A43 Learning disabilities Commissioning	Expenditure	22,289	22,294	3,100	3,125	25	23,650	24,234	1,940	9	2	The gross expenditure is a result of supporting clients in the community, in particular on domiciliary care (variance of £1,446k).
	Income	(4,078)	(4,249)	0	10	10	(4,637)	(4,471)	(222)	5	(4)	
	Net Expenditure	18,211	18,045	3,100	3,135	35	19,013	19,763	1,718	10	4	
A44 Mental Health Commissioning	Expenditure	9,569	9,595	1,860	1,863	3	9,736	9,404	(191)	(2)	(3)	The increase in gross expenditure is a result of supporting residential/nursing placements predominantly and an increase in prevention and support expenditure. The surplus of income is the result of an increase in income for shared care packages which are partly funded by NHS Tower Hamlets.
	Income	(1,617)	(1,617)	(40)	(40)	0	(1,894)	(1,892)	(275)	17	0	
	Net Expenditure	7,952	7,978	1,820	1,823	3	7,852	7,512	(466)	(6)	(4)	
A45 Physical Disabilities Commissioning	Expenditure	7,067	7,067	2,050	2,080	30	8,023	7,743	676	10	(3)	There has been an increase in the number of clients in the physical disabilities client group, which has led to an increase in gross expenditure. Part of this has been offset by income. The surplus of income is the result of an increase in income for shared care packages which are partly funded by NHS Tower Hamlets.
	Income	(1,236)	(1,236)	0	(19)	(19)	(1,491)	(1,491)	(255)	21	0	
	Net Expenditure	5,831	5,831	2,050	2,061	11	6,532	6,252	421	7	(4)	

ADULTS, HEALTH & WELLBEING	FULL YEAR										RAG Status	
	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast)		Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn)		
								Outturn	Outturn			£'000
A08 Older People Mental Health	390	395	85	86	1	395	395	0	0	0	0	0%
Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	390	395	85	86	1	395	395	0	0	0	0	
A09 Older People Assess & Care Mngmt	1,788	1,814	450	456	6	1,686	1,691	(123)	(7)	0	0	-7%
Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	1,788	1,814	450	456	6	1,686	1,691	(123)	(7)	0	0	
A15 Occupational Therapy	1,794	1,794	320	325	5	1,801	1,820	26	1	1	1	1%
Expenditure	(18)	(18)	0	0	0	(18)	(18)	0	0	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	1,776	1,776	320	325	5	1,783	1,802	26	1	1	1	
A16 Community Equipment Service	919	919	230	230	0	1,054	1,095	176	19	4	0	0%
Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	(176)	(176)	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	919	919	230	230	0	1,054	919	0	0	(13)	0	
A20 Adult Resources Sub Div M&A	88	89	25	23	(2)	89	88	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	-1%
Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	88	89	25	23	(2)	89	88	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	
A31 Physical Disabilities Establishments	660	664	90	89	(1)	568	568	(96)	(14)	0	0	-1.4%
Expenditure	(1)	(1)	0	0	0	(1)	(1)	0	0	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	659	663	90	89	(1)	567	567	(96)	(14)	0	0	
A33 Older People Day Centres	1,639	1,653	300	304	4	1,733	1,733	80	5	0	0	4%
Expenditure	(37)	(37)	0	(10)	(10)	(51)	(51)	(14)	38	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	1,602	1,616	300	294	(6)	1,682	1,682	66	4	0	0	
A34 Home Care	6,158	6,558	1,500	1,466	(34)	6,155	5,978	(580)	(9)	(3)	0	-8%
Expenditure	(97)	(97)	0	0	0	(5)	(5)	92	(95)	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	6,061	6,461	1,500	1,466	(34)	6,150	5,973	(488)	(8)	(3)	0	
A02 Disabilities & Health Divisional M&A	175	195	60	57	(3)	195	195	0	0	0	0	0%
Expenditure	0	(20)	0	0	0	(20)	(20)	0	0	0	0	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure	175	175	60	57	(3)	175	175	0	0	0	0	

ADULTS, HEALTH & WELLBEING	FULL YEAR											RAG Status	
	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast)		Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast)			
								Outturn	Outturn	Outturn	Outturn		
A11 Physical Disabilities Sub Div M&A	93	95	15	16	1	146	66	(29)	(31)	(55)	(55)	-31%	Vote Budget Manager: L.Keast Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 30/06/2011
	Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	93	95	15	16	1	146	66	(29)	(31)	(55)		
A12 P.D. Assess & Care Management	1,057	1,071	240	241	1	983	983	(88)	(8)	0	0	-10%	Vote Budget Manager: L.Keast Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 31/05/2011
	Expenditure	0	0	0	0	(22)	(22)	(22)	0	0	0		
	Income	0	0	0	0	961	961	(110)	(10)	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	1,057	1,071	240	241	1	961	(110)	(10)	0	0		
A13 Learning Dis Sub Division M&A	83	83	20	21	1	60	60	(23)	(28)	0	0	-48%	Vote Budget Manager: D.Sheridan Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:
	Expenditure	(35)	(35)	0	(9)	(35)	(35)	0	0	0	0		
	Income	48	48	20	12	25	25	(23)	(48)	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	48	48	20	12	25	25	(23)	(48)	0	0		
A14 Learning Dis Assess & Care Mngmt	951	951	240	238	(2)	862	928	(23)	(2)	8	8	-3%	Vote Budget Manager: D.Sheridan Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:
	Expenditure	(79)	(79)	0	(20)	(79)	(79)	0	0	0	0		
	Income	872	872	240	218	(22)	849	(23)	(3)	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	872	872	240	218	(22)	849	(23)	(3)	0	0		
A17 Vulnerable Adults and Drugs	372	377	90	90	0	313	313	(64)	(17)	0	0	-10%	Vote Budget Manager: L.Keast Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:
	Expenditure	(36)	(36)	0	0	(6)	(6)	30	(83)	0	0		
	Income	336	341	90	90	307	307	(34)	(10)	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	336	341	90	90	307	307	(34)	(10)	0	0		
A18 Hospital Social Work Teams	1,147	1,163	290	293	3	1,118	1,118	(45)	(4)	0	0	-8%	Vote Budget Manager: L.Keast Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 31/05/2011
	Expenditure	0	0	0	0	(52)	(52)	0	0	0	0		
	Income	1,147	1,163	290	293	1,066	1,066	(97)	(8)	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	1,147	1,163	290	293	1,066	1,066	(97)	(8)	0	0		
A19 Adult Protection	310	352	40	43	3	352	352	0	0	0	0	1%	Vote Budget Manager: A.Tyrer Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:
	Expenditure	(42)	(42)	0	0	(39)	(39)	3	(7)	0	0		
	Income	268	310	40	43	313	313	3	1	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	268	310	40	43	313	313	3	1	0	0		
A23 Mental Health Sub Division M&A	83	83	25	23	(2)	83	90	7	8	8	8	####	Vote Budget Manager: S.Diffey Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:
	Expenditure	(81)	(81)	0	0	(81)	(90)	(9)	11	11	11		
	Income	2	2	25	23	2	0	(2)	(100)	(100)	(100)		
	Net Expenditure	2	2	25	23	2	0	(2)	(100)	(100)	(100)		
A24 Area Mental Health Teams	2,588	2,624	570	573	3	2,668	2,670	46	2	0	0	2%	Vote Budget Manager: S.Diffey Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:
	Expenditure	(427)	(427)	0	0	(436)	(435)	(8)	2	(0)	(0)		
	Income	2,161	2,197	570	573	2,232	2,235	38	2	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	2,161	2,197	570	573	2,232	2,235	38	2	0	0		
A25 Mental Health Day Centres	484	515	110	109	(1)	515	515	0	0	0	0	2%	Vote Budget Manager: L.A.Johnson Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 30/06/2011
	Expenditure	(34)	(34)	0	(5)	(23)	(23)	11	(32)	0	0		
	Income	450	481	110	104	492	492	11	2	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	450	481	110	104	492	492	11	2	0	0		
A32 Learning disabilities Day Centre	456	457	110	114	4	408	408	(49)	(11)	0	0	-11%	Vote Budget Manager: D.Sheridan Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:
	Expenditure	(5)	(5)	0	(1)	(5)	(5)	0	0	0	0		
	Income	451	452	110	113	403	403	(49)	(11)	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	451	452	110	113	403	403	(49)	(11)	0	0		

ADULTS, HEALTH & WELLBEING		FULL YEAR										RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Forecast to Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	
A37 Emergency Duty Social Work Service												55%
Expenditure	281	284	100	103	3	314	429	145	51	37	Vote Budget Manager: I.Williamson Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:	
Income	(20)	(20)	0	0	0	(20)	(20)	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	261	264	100	103	3	294	409	145	55	39		
Adult Social Care												-4%
Expenditure	21,516	22,136	4,910	4,900	(10)	21,498	21,495	(641)	(3)	(0)	Service Head: K.Marks	
Income	(912)	(932)	0	(45)	(45)	(893)	(1,077)	(145)	16	21		
Net Expenditure	20,604	21,204	4,910	4,855	(55)	20,605	20,418	(786)	(4)	(1)		
A66 Learning and Development												0%
Expenditure	587	587	145	147	2	587	587	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: P.Thorogood Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	587	587	145	147	2	587	587	0	0	0		
A68 Supported Employment												-45%
Expenditure	20	20	0	0	0	11	11	(9)	(45)	0	Vote Budget Manager: P.Thorogood Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	20	20	0	0	0	11	11	(9)	(45)	0		
A71 Finance Services												-1%
Expenditure	791	801	185	186	1	788	790	(11)	(1)	0	Vote Budget Manager: P.Thorogood Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:	
Income	(39)	(39)	0	0	0	(34)	(34)	5	(13)	0		
Net Expenditure	752	762	185	186	1	754	756	(6)	(1)	0		
A82 Payroll On cost												0%
Expenditure	1,554	0	0	0	0	1,394	0	0	0	(100)	Vote Budget Manager: P.Thorogood Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	1,554	0	0	0	0	1,394	0	0	0	(100)		
A90 Support Services Holding A/C												0%
Expenditure	3,301	3,301	830	828	(2)	3,301	3,301	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: P.Thorogood Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	3,301	3,301	830	828	(2)	3,301	3,301	0	0	0		
A91 Adult Services Holding Accounts												0%
Expenditure	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: P.Thorogood Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:	
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0		
Other												0%
Expenditure	6,253	4,709	1,160	1,162	2	6,081	4,689	(20)	(0)	(23)	Service Head: P.Thorogood	
Income	(39)	(39)	0	0	0	(34)	(34)	5	(13)	0		
Net Expenditure	6,214	4,670	1,160	1,162	2	6,047	4,655	(15)	(0)	(23)		
TOTAL FOR ADULTS HEALTH & WELLBEING												0%
Expenditure	111,548	114,553	22,155	22,188	33	115,085	114,511	(42)	(0)	(0)	Director: H.Taylor	
Income	(12,745)	(15,129)	(65)	(132)	(67)	(16,058)	(15,087)	42	(0)	(6)		
Net Expenditure	98,803	99,424	22,090	22,056	(34)	99,027	99,424	0	0	0		

2% to 5% Green
 2% to 5% Amber
 >5% Red

CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

CHIEF EXECUTIVES		FULL YEAR										RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Forecast - Latest Forecast Outturn) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast - Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	
C14 Communications												0%
Expenditure	2,833	2,883	721	681	(40)	2,883	2,883	0	0	0	Problems in the traditional print advertising sector continue into 2011-12 and so there is a risk that the forecast levels of budgeted income will be lower and so increase the pressure on 2011-12 budget. However, there are a number of mitigating actions planned to reduce costs in the service and bring the budget into balance.	0%
Income	(3,237)	(3,236)	(809)	(525)	284	(3,236)	(3,236)	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	(404)	(353)	(88)	156	244	(353)	(353)	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Takki Sulaiman High Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed: 22/07/2011	0%
TOTAL FOR COMMUNICATIONS												0%
Expenditure	2,833	2,883	721	681	(40)	2,883	2,883	0	0	0		0%
Income	(3,237)	(3,236)	(809)	(525)	284	(3,236)	(3,236)	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	(404)	(353)	(88)	156	244	(353)	(353)	0	0	0	Service Head: Takki Sulaiman	0%
C16 Strategy & Performance												0%
Expenditure	555	759	190	189	(1)	759	759	0	0	0		0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Michael Keating Low Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed: 18/07/2011	0%
Net Expenditure	555	759	190	189	(1)	759	759	0	0	0	Program finishes end Jul 11	0%
C21 Healthy Boroughs until end July 2011												0%
Expenditure	0	0	0	0	(8)	0	0	0	0	0		0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Keith Williams Low Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed: 20/06/2011	0%
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	0	(8)	0	0	0	0	0		0%
TOTAL FOR STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE												0%
Expenditure	555	759	190	181	(9)	759	759	0	0	0		0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	555	759	190	181	(9)	759	759	0	0	0	Service Head: Michael Keating	0%
C52 Legal Services												0%
Expenditure	3,601	3,601	900	866	(34)	3,601	3,601	0	0	0		0%
Income	(3,635)	(3,635)	(909)	(790)	119	(3,635)	(3,635)	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	(34)	(34)	(9)	76	85	(34)	(34)	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Shelley Lewis High Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed: 20/06/2011	0%
C58 Electoral Registration												0%
Expenditure	596	596	149	102	(47)	596	596	0	0	0		0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Shelley Lewis Medium Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed: 20/06/2011	0%
Net Expenditure	596	596	149	102	(47)	596	596	0	0	0		0%
C60 Borough Elections												0%
Expenditure	30	30	8	1	(7)	30	30	0	0	0		0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Shelley Lewis Low Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed: 20/06/2011	0%
Net Expenditure	30	30	8	1	(7)	30	30	0	0	0		0%
TOTAL FOR LEGAL & ELECTORAL SERVICES												0%
Expenditure	4,227	4,227	1,057	969	(88)	4,227	4,227	0	0	0		0%
Income	(3,635)	(3,635)	(909)	(790)	118	(3,635)	(3,635)	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	592	592	148	179	30	592	592	0	0	0	Variance to date reflects timing differences in the funding of schemes' expenditure	0%
Expenditure	0	447	112	2	(110)	447	447	0	0	0		0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Michael Keating High Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed: 18/07/2011	0%
Net Expenditure	0	447	112	2	(110)	447	447	0	0	0		0%
C54 One Tower Hamlets												0%
Expenditure	2,343	1,805	451	290	(161)	1,805	1,805	0	0	0		0%
Income	(10)	(9)	(2)	(19)	(17)	(9)	(9)	0	0	0	Variance to date reflects timing differences in the funding of schemes' expenditure	0%
Net Expenditure	2,333	1,796	449	271	(178)	1,796	1,796	0	0	0		0%
TOTAL FOR ONE TOWER HAMLETS												0%
Expenditure	2,343	2,252	563	292	(271)	2,252	2,252	0	0	0		0%
Income	(10)	(9)	(2)	(19)	(17)	(9)	(9)	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	2,333	2,243	561	273	(268)	2,243	2,243	0	0	0	Service Head: Michael Keating	0%
C56 Registration of Births, Deaths												0%
Expenditure	862	862	216	231	16	862	862	0	0	0		0%
Income	(479)	(479)	(120)	(128)	(8)	(479)	(479)	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: John S Williams Medium Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed: 02/08/2011	0%
Net Expenditure	383	383	96	103	7	383	383	0	0	0		0%
C62 Democratic Services												0%
Expenditure	2,732	2,771	693	709	16	2,771	2,771	0	0	0		0%
Income	(7)	(7)	(2)	(1)	(1)	(7)	(7)	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: John S Williams High Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed: 02/08/2011	0%
Net Expenditure	2,725	2,764	691	708	17	2,764	2,764	0	0	0		0%

CHIEF EXECUTIVES	FULL YEAR										RAG Status	
	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn) £'000		Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %		Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates
								£'000	%			
C78 Demo Representation & Mgt	830	582	146	207	62	582	582	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: John S Williams Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 02/08/2011
TOTAL FOR DEMOCRATIC & REGISTRARS SERVICES	4,424	4,215	1,054	1,147	93	4,215	4,215	0	0	0	0%	
C80 Corporate Management	3,162	3,592	898	842	(86)	3,729	3,729	0	0	0	0%	Service Head: John S Williams
	(33)	(35)	(9)	0	(56)	3,592	3,592	0	0	0	0%	
	3,129	3,557	899	842	(47)	3,557	3,557	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Kevan Collins Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 07/07/2011
C84 Information Governance & Complaints	350	350	88	91	4	350	350	0	0	0	0%	
	(249)	(249)	(62)	(5)	57	(249)	(249)	0	0	0	0%	
	101	101	25	86	61	101	101	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Tim Williams Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 20/06/2011
TOTAL FOR CHIEF EXECUTIVES	17,894	18,278	4,570	4,202	(367)	18,278	18,278	0	0	0	0%	
	(7,650)	(7,650)	(1,913)	(1,468)	444	(7,650)	(7,650)	0	0	0	0%	
	10,244	10,628	2,657	2,734	77	10,628	10,628	0	0	0	0%	Director: Kevan Collins

SERVICE TRANSFER TO/FROM OTHER DIRECTORATES

C18 Third Sector Team - to D&R	Expenditure	2,481
	Income	(50)
	Net Expenditure	2,431

REVISED TOTAL FOR CHIEF EXECUTIVES	Expenditure	20,375
	Income	(7,700)
	Net Expenditure	12,675

<2% Green
2% - 5% Amber
>5% Red

<2% to 5% Amber
>5% Red

CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (Dedicated Schools Grant)	FULL YEAR										RAG Status	
	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn)		Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn)		Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates
								£'000	%			
TOTAL FOR PRE-PRIMARY	4,733 (103)	4,689 (59)	1,172 (15)	713 (288)	(459) (273)	4,733 (103)	4,689 (59)	0	0	(1) (43)	0%	Service Head Kate Bingham High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
Net Expenditure	4,630	4,630	1,158	425	(733)	4,630	4,630	0	0	0	0%	
TOTAL FOR PRIMARY EDUCATION	149,415 (4,840)	148,966 (4,391)	37,242 (1,098)	13,009 (10,234)	(24,233) (8,136)	149,415 (4,840)	148,966 (4,391)	0	0	(0) (9)	0%	Service Head Kate Bingham High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
Net Expenditure	144,575	144,575	36,144	2,775	(33,369)	144,575	144,575	0	0	0	0%	
TOTAL FOR SECONDARY EDUCATION	129,287 (17,412)	129,323 (17,448)	32,331 (4,362)	16,958 (10,702)	(15,373) (6,340)	128,903 (17,412)	128,976 (17,412)	(947)	(36)	(0) (0)	0%	Proposed reduction to contingency to ensure nil balance on DSG overall
Net Expenditure	111,875	111,875	27,969	6,256	(21,713)	111,491	111,564	(311)	(0)	(0)	0%	Service Head Kate Bingham High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
TOTAL FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION	13,586 (911)	13,567 (892)	3,392 (223)	843 (3,375)	(2,549) (3,152)	13,586 (911)	13,567 (892)	0	0	(0) (2)	0%	Service Head Kate Bingham High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
Net Expenditure	12,675	12,675	3,169	(2,532)	(6,701)	12,675	12,675	0	0	0	0%	
G17 Support For Learning Serv DSG	3,973	3,973	993	899	(94)	3,947	3,947	(26)	(1)	0	4%	Income £141K lower than predicted (Training SLA not well subscribed and Early Years SI withdrawn at short notice) and staffing costs slightly higher than predicted. Will be reducing staff with effect from September and have cut supplies and services. Still unclear about Autumn SLAs but these look as if they may rise so income may increase later in year.
Net Expenditure	2,882	2,882	721	889	169	2,997	2,997	115	4	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Liz Vickerie Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
G29 Pupil Referral Unit	4,925 (727)	4,925 (727)	1,231 (182)	990 (180)	(241) 2	4,925 (727)	4,925 (727)	0	0	0	0%	Variance to date due to cost incurred (including 5 agency staff) to the value of £142,000 paid through the PRU bank account April - June not yet disbursed to revenue account.
Net Expenditure	4,198	4,198	1,050	810	(240)	4,198	4,198	0	0	0	0%	Stephen Pugh High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
H10 Learning & Achiev'm't M & A DSG	160	160	40	160	120	160	160	0	0	0	0%	Variance to date due to IDR Full year support to Learning & Achievement MA
Net Expenditure	160	160	40	160	120	160	160	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Anne Canning Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
H11 Early Years Service DSG	3,135	3,135	784	1,185	401	3,135	3,135	0	0	0	0%	Variance to date due to Forward Payments for Voluntary sector
Net Expenditure	3,135	3,135	784	1,185	401	3,135	3,135	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Monica Forty Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (Dedicated Schools Grant)		FULL YEAR										RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	
H16 Special Educ Needs DSG												
Expenditure	9,049	9,049	2,262	7,495	5,233	8,871	8,871	(178)	0	0	Actual expenditure includes committed orders for fees for full year.	0%
Income	(2,427)	(2,427)	(607)	2,200	2,807	(2,238)	(2,238)	189	(8)	0	Both actual expenditure and income include effects of substantial residual accruals	0%
Net Expenditure	6,622	6,622	1,656	9,695	8,040	6,633	6,633	11	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: David Carroll Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	0%
H18 Educ Psychology Serv DSG												
Expenditure	128	128	32	0	(32)	128	128	0	0	0	Transfer of relevant expenditure from revenue account to be processed at closure of accounts	0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	128	128	32	0	(32)	128	128	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: David Carroll Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	0%
H27 14-19 Years DSG												
Expenditure	459	459	115	107	(8)	407	407	(52)	(11)	0	Expenditure reflecting Academic year activity. Income requires academic year drawdown.	0%
Income	(77)	(77)	(19)	0	19	(25)	(25)	52	(68)	0		0%
Net Expenditure	382	382	96	107	12	382	382	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Di Wame Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	0%
H78 Pupil Admissions & Excl DSG												
Expenditure	681	681	170	199	29	818	763	82	12	(7)	The forecasted employee expenditure includes the additional staffing required for the development of the LA's 'Equal Chance System' and the further development of the Central Pupil Database (MPULSE). This was agreed by Cabinet in June and I am awaiting for the 120k to be added to G78. However employee costs for this area of work is lower than budgeted because only two of the three posts have been filled at this point. The forecast expenditure for supplies and services include the actual costs associated with the LA's statutory requirement to service school admission appeals. This expenditure is hard to predict, but is expected to remain well above the current budget, given the continuing demand for school places. Invoices for SLA income still to be raised	15%
Income	(117)	(117)	(29)	(19)	10	(117)	(117)	0	0	0		15%
Net Expenditure	564	564	141	180	39	701	646	82	15	(6)	Vote Budget Manager: Terry Bryan Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	1%
TOTAL FOR LEARNING & ACHIEVEMENT												
Expenditure	22,510	22,510	5,628	11,035	5,408	22,391	22,336	(174)	(1)	(0)		1%
Income	(4,439)	(4,439)	(1,110)	1,991	3,101	(4,057)	(4,057)	382	(9)	0		1%
Net Expenditure	18,071	18,071	4,518	13,026	8,508	18,334	18,279	208	1	(0)	Service Head: Anne Canning	1%
H55 Children Looked After DSG												
Expenditure	279	279	70	62	(8)	279	279	0	0	0		0%
Income	(40)	(40)	(10)	0	10	(40)	(40)	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	239	239	60	62	2	239	239	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Jenny Boyd Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	0%
H62 Attendance & Welfare Service												
Expenditure	55	55	14	0	(14)	55	55	0	0	0	DSG recharge not posted	0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	55	55	14	0	(14)	55	55	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: David Hough Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	0%
TOTAL FOR CHILDRENS SOCIAL CARE												
Expenditure	334	334	84	62	(22)	334	334	0	0	0		0%
Income	(40)	(40)	(10)	0	10	(40)	(40)	0	0	0		0%
Net Expenditure	294	294	74	62	(12)	294	294	0	0	0	Service Head: Children's Social Care	0%
H79 CSF Resources Management												
Expenditure	1,352	1,352	338	1,166	828	1,473	1,455	103	8	(1)	DSG recharges posted early in order that attention not required later in the financial year	8%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		8%
Net Expenditure	1,352	1,352	338	1,166	828	1,473	1,455	103	8	(1)	Vote Budget Manager: Kate Bingham Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	8%

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (Dedicated Schools Grant)		FULL YEAR										RAG Status			
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast) £'000	Proposed mitigating action and dates				
H83 CSF Human Resources DSG		Expenditure	867	867	217	787	570	867	867	0	0	0	0	0%	Actual spend includes commitment of 408k; actual expenditure exceeding the budget charged to vote G83
		Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
		Net Expenditure	867	867	217	787	570	867	867	0	0	0	0	Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	
TOTAL FOR CHILDRENS SERVICES RESOURCES		Expenditure	2,219	2,219	555	1,953	1,398	2,322	2,322	103	5	(1)	0	5%	Service Head: Kate Bingham
		Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
		Net Expenditure	2,219	2,219	555	1,953	1,398	2,322	2,322	103	5	(1)	0		
TOTAL FOR EXTERNAL FUNDING (H68)		Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Service Head: Kate Bingham High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
		Income	(294,339)	(73,585)	(73,585)	(294,339)	(294,339)	(294,339)	(294,339)	0	0	0	0		
		Net Expenditure	(294,339)	(73,585)	(73,585)	(294,339)	(294,339)	(294,339)	(294,339)	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL FOR CSF SCHOOLS BUDGET (DSG)		Expenditure	322,084	321,608	80,402	44,573	(35,829)	321,702	321,190	(418)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0%	Director: Isobel Cattermole
		Income	(322,084)	(321,608)	(80,402)	(22,608)	57,794	(321,702)	(321,190)	418	(0)	(0)	(0)		
		Net Expenditure	0	0	0	21,965	21,965	0	0	0	0	0	(0)		

CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (General Fund Budget)		FULL YEAR										RAG Status		
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates			
TOTAL FOR PRE-PRIMARY EDUCATION GF		134	40	10	0	(10)	40	40	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	134	40	10	0	(10)	40	40	0	0	0	0		Service Head Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
TOTAL FOR PRIMARY EDUCATION GF		4,003	4,564	1,141	0	(1,141)	4,564	4,564	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	4,003	4,564	1,141	0	(1,141)	4,564	4,564	0	0	0	0		Service Head Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
TOTAL FOR SECONDARY EDUCATION GF		5,338	4,768	1,192	57	(1,135)	4,768	4,768	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	5,338	4,768	1,192	57	(1,135)	4,768	4,768	0	0	0	0		Service Head Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
TOTAL FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION		481	731	183	0	(183)	731	731	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Expenditure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	481	731	183	0	(183)	731	731	0	0	0	0		Service Head Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
G10 Learning & Achievement M & A GF		175	175	44	41	(3)	175	175	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Expenditure	(160)	(160)	(40)	(160)	(120)	(160)	(160)	0	0	0	0		
	Income	15	15	4	(119)	(123)	15	15	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	15	15	4	(119)	(123)	15	15	0	0	0	0		Vote Budget Manager: Anne Ganning Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
G11 Early Years Service GF		2,967	2,967	742	576	(166)	2,967	2,967	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Expenditure	(2,890)	(2,890)	(723)	(34)	689	(2,890)	(2,890)	0	0	0	0		
	Income	77	77	19	542	523	77	77	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	2,967	2,967	742	576	(166)	2,967	2,967	0	0	0	0		Vote Budget Manager: Monica Forty Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
G12 Local Authority Day Nurseries		2,777	2,625	656	672	16	2,625	2,625	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Expenditure	(2,570)	(2,570)	(643)	(69)	574	(2,570)	(2,570)	0	0	0	0		
	Income	207	55	14	603	589	55	55	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	2,777	2,625	656	672	16	2,625	2,625	0	0	0	0		Vote Budget Manager: Monica Forty Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
G13 Childrens Centres		10,033	10,065	2,516	2,686	170	10,065	10,065	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Expenditure	(10,033)	(10,032)	(2,508)	44	2,552	(10,032)	(10,032)	0	0	0	0		
	Income	0	33	8	2,730	2,722	33	33	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	10,033	10,065	2,516	2,686	170	10,065	10,065	0	0	0	0		Vote Budget Manager: Mohammed Joll Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011
G14 School Improvement Primary		461	461	115	462	347	461	461	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Expenditure	(453)	(453)	(113)	(104)	9	(453)	(453)	0	0	0	0		
	Income	8	8	2	358	356	8	8	0	0	0	0		
	Net Expenditure	461	461	115	462	347	461	461	0	0	0	0		Vote Budget Manager: Monica Forty Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (General Fund Budget)		FULL YEAR										RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast) £'000	Proposed mitigating action and dates	
<p>G16 Special Educational Needs GF</p> <p>Pressure on school places has resulted in increased costs of home-school travel, with the laying on of extra buses. These costs are able to be offset by one-off grant and some of the salary costs (£170k) are to be supported by Standards Funds brought forward from 2010/11, as a one-off. Actual expenditure includes commitments for external transport for full year. Grant (Standards Fund & DSG) to be drawn down at closure.</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: David Carroll Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												
Expenditure	4,580	4,580	1,145	3,773	2,628	5,225	5,209	629	14	(0)		-4%
Income	(228)	(228)	(57)	(3)	54	(1,029)	(1,043)	(815)	357	1		
Net Expenditure	4,352	4,352	1,088	3,770	2,682	4,196	4,166	(186)	(4)	(1)		
<p>G18 Educational Psychology Serv GF</p> <p>Actual expenditure includes committed orders for staff training for full year Grant (DSG) to be drawn down at closure of accounts</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: David Carroll Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												
Expenditure	1,307	1,307	327	385	58	1,460	1,460	153	12	0		-14%
Income	(694)	(694)	(174)	(168)	6	(1,003)	(934)	(240)	35	(7)		
Net Expenditure	613	613	153	217	64	457	526	(87)	(14)	15		
<p>G20 School Governance & Information</p> <p>Actual spend includes committed orders for full year payments to various voluntary organisations and actual income includes expected funding for full year.</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Hania Franek Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												
Expenditure	153	153	38	145	107	238	204	51	33	(14)		1%
Income	0	0	0	(40)	(40)	(50)	(50)	(50)	0	0		
Net Expenditure	153	153	38	105	67	188	154	1	1	(18)		
<p>G22 Student Awards</p> <p>Expenditure relates to academic year costs Trust fund payments, income from trust fund to be posted at year end.</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Di Warne Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												
Expenditure	68	68	17	109	92	68	68	0	0	0		0%
Income	(68)	(68)	(17)	(68)	17	(68)	(68)	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	109	109	0	0	0	0	0		
<p>G26 School Improvement Secondary</p> <p>Expenditure includes staff costs which will be covered from C/fwd Std Fund Grants. Income std fund drawdowns to be undertaken.</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Anne Canning Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												
Expenditure	1,150	1,151	288	557	269	1,151	1,151	0	0	0		0%
Income	(1,063)	(1,063)	(266)	(599)	(333)	(1,063)	(1,063)	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	87	88	22	(42)	(64)	88	88	0	0	0		
<p>G27 14 to 19 Year GF</p> <p>DSG support end of year drawn down covers expenditure</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Kevin Munday Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												
Expenditure	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0		0%
Income	0	0	0	19	19	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	0	0	0		
<p>G30 Arts & Music Service</p> <p>Standard Fund carried forward from 2010-11 Expenditure & Income budgets to be supplemented by C/fwd Std Fund Grant, which in turn will reflect potential profiled expenditure & income</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Karen Brock / Shabbir Ahmed Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												
Expenditure	1,081	1,081	270	369	99	1,384	1,081	0	0	(22)		0%
Income	(1,081)	(1,081)	(270)	(398)	(128)	(1,384)	(1,081)	0	0	(22)		
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	(29)	(29)	0	0	0	0	0		
<p>G33 E-Learning</p> <p>Overpend to be funded by Standard Fund carried forward from 2010-11 Expenditure incurred for the supply of I.T. to schools on borough-wide contract to be recovered from schools. Any excess to budget will be funded from residual SF funding for academic year to August 2011</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Terry Patterson Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												
Expenditure	114	114	29	288	260	178	114	0	0	(36)		0%
Income	0	0	0	(55)	(55)	(64)	0	0	0	(100)		
Net Expenditure	114	114	29	233	205	114	114	0	0	0		

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (General Fund Budget)		FULL YEAR										RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	
<p>H17 Support for Learning Service</p> <p>Expenditure 53 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</p> <p>Income 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</p> <p>Net Expenditure 53 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Liz Vickerie Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												0%
<p>TOTAL FOR LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT</p> <p>Expenditure 24,919 24,747 6,187 10,074 3,887 25,997 833 3 (2)</p> <p>Income (19,240) (19,239) (4,810) (1,567) 3,243 (20,766) (1,105) 6 (2)</p> <p>Net Expenditure 5,679 5,508 1,377 8,507 7,130 5,231 5,236 (272) (5) 0</p> <p>Service Head: Anne Canning</p>												-5%
<p>G37 Youth & Community Learning M&A</p> <p>Expenditure 224 224 56 80 24 220 220 0 0 0 0</p> <p>Income 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</p> <p>Net Expenditure 224 224 56 80 24 220 220 (4) (2) 0</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Mary Durkin Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												-2%
<p>G19 Parental Engagement & Support</p> <p>Expenditure 1,124 1,124 281 352 71 1,116 1,116 (8) (1) 0</p> <p>Income (346) (346) (87) (157) (71) (346) (346) 0 0 0</p> <p>Net Expenditure 778 778 195 195 1 770 770 (8) (1) 0</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Jill McGinley Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p>												-1%
<p>G39 Youth & Connexions Service</p> <p>Expenditure 8,975 9,114 2,279 2,133 (146) 9,375 243 3 (0)</p> <p>Income (4,002) (4,002) (1,001) (58) 943 (4,245) (243) 6 0</p> <p>Net Expenditure 4,973 5,112 1,278 2,075 797 5,130 0 0 (0) 0</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Dinar Hossain Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p> <p>Includes budget for new Connexions Careers Service (£800k) to be transferred to H40. Virement required. Funded from EIG. Also the variance in gross expenditure and gross income is due to the Peer Work team securing £205,000 from PCT each year for the next 3 years. £2.8 million EIG to be raised</p>												0%
<p>H40 Careers Service</p> <p>Expenditure 0 0 0 87 87 200 0 0 0 0</p> <p>Income 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</p> <p>Net Expenditure 0 0 0 87 87 200 0 0 (100) 0</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Steve Grocott Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p> <p>New service. Budget currently in G39. Virement required to move budget. One-off costs of £105k to be covered by additional budget for EIG</p>												0%
<p>G41 Healthy Lives</p> <p>Expenditure 369 369 92 50 (42) 425 369 0 0 (13)</p> <p>Income (262) (262) (66) 0 66 (318) (262) 0 0 (18)</p> <p>Net Expenditure 107 107 27 50 23 107 107 0 0 0</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Lorraine Hachou Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p> <p>Not all staff in post. Forecasted payments to schools and training to be actioned. Year end draw down of grant to match approved expenditure.</p>												0%
<p>G42 Community Languages Services</p> <p>Expenditure 777 777 194 278 84 777 198 25 25</p> <p>Income (60) (60) (15) (60) (45) (60) (122) 203 203</p> <p>Net Expenditure 717 717 179 218 39 717 793 76 11</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Jamal Uddin Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p> <p>Expenditure reflecting academic year activity</p>												11%
<p>G44 Extended Schools</p> <p>Expenditure 734 662 166 363 198 782 662 0 0 (15)</p> <p>Income (95) (95) (24) (20) 4 (215) (95) 0 0 (56)</p> <p>Net Expenditure 639 567 142 343 201 567 567 0 0 0</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Lorraine Hachou / Claire Hatton Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p> <p>Projected overspend to be funded by Standards Fund carried forward from 2010-11.</p>												0%
<p>G45 Play</p> <p>Expenditure 0 72 18 0 0 (18) 72 0 0 0</p> <p>Income 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</p> <p>Net Expenditure 0 72 18 0 0 (18) 72 0 0 0</p> <p>Vote Budget Manager: Claire Hatton Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011</p> <p>Budget & actuals to be transferred to G44. Virement required</p>												0%

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (General Fund Budget)		FULL YEAR										RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Forecast Outturn) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	
G60 Youth Offending Service												
Expenditure	1,436	1,436	359	465	106	1,670	1,670	234	16	0	Activity is supported by £200k for social workers growth and EIG funding of £34k, budget to be updated in July 2011.	
Income	(784)	(784)	(195)	0	196	(784)	(1,018)	(234)	30	30	Not included in the budget is the additional growth bid of £. 200k.	
Net Expenditure	652	652	163	465	302	886	652	0	0	(26)	Vote Budget Manager: Stuart Johnson Budget Risk: Medium	
Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011												
TOTAL FOR YOUTH AND COMMUNITY LEARNING												
Expenditure	13,639	13,778	3,445	3,808	364	14,637	14,441	663	5	(1)		
Income	(5,549)	(5,549)	(1,387)	(295)	1,092	(5,968)	(6,148)	(599)	11	3		
Net Expenditure	8,090	8,229	2,057	3,513	1,456	8,669	8,293	64	1	(4)	Service Head: Mary Durkin	
Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011												
G49 Childrens Social Care M&A												
Expenditure	198	198	50	84	35	198	198	0	0	0		
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	198	198	50	84	35	198	198	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Helen Lincoln Budget Risk: Low	
Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011												
G50 Child Protection & Reviewing												
Expenditure	2,181	2,181	545	581	36	2,335	2,335	154	7	0	£278k of activity supported by social worker growth bid, virement to be undertaken in July 2011. However to reflect the successful £278k growth bid a virement will be shown in the JDE accounts for July as a target adjustment only	
Income	(124)	(124)	(31)	(2)	29	(278)	(154)	(154)	124	0		
Net Expenditure	2,057	2,057	514	579	65	2,335	2,057	0	0	(12)	Vote Budget Manager: Ann Roach Budget Risk: High	
Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011												
G51 Childrens Res M&A												
Expenditure	685	685	171	182	11	685	685	0	0	0		
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	685	685	171	182	11	685	685	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Hilary Bull Budget Risk: Low	
Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011												
G52 Childrens Res Residential												
Expenditure	1,483	1,497	374	412	38	1,525	1,525	28	2	0		
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	1,483	1,497	374	412	38	1,525	1,525	28	2	0	Vote Budget Manager: Hilary Bull Budget Risk: Low	
Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011												
G53 Childrens Res Family Placement												
Expenditure	2,689	2,689	672	666	(6)	2,689	2,689	0	0	0		
Income	(66)	(66)	(17)	(37)	(21)	(68)	(68)	(2)	3	0		
Net Expenditure	2,623	2,623	655	629	(27)	2,621	2,621	(2)	(0)	0	Vote Budget Manager: Hilary Bull Budget Risk: Low	
Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011												
G54 Childrens Res Commissioning												
Expenditure	16,612	16,578	4,145	12,942	8,798	16,453	16,356	(222)	(1)	(1)	The budget is currently showing an underspend as it is based on an expected LAC figure of 326. However current LAC nos are 315. It should be noted however that this is a very volatile budget and it will only take one or two high cost placements to materially affect the projected spend. Monitoring is undertaken monthly. The income reflects anticipated funding for legal costs (part of social worker growth) that will be included as a budget in July 2011.	
Income	(434)	(434)	(109)	(12)	97	(434)	(100)	(100)	23	23	Forward Purchases of social care packages have distorted this expenditure picture. Whilst the income contains a savings projection for service levels agreements, and Unaccompanied asylum seeking children grant paid primarily in quarterly arrears.	
Net Expenditure	16,178	16,144	4,036	12,930	8,894	16,019	15,822	(322)	(2)	(1)	Vote Budget Manager: Hilary Bull Budget Risk: High	
Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011												

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (General Fund Budget)		FULL YEAR										RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	
G55 Children Looked After GF												
Expenditure	2,064	2,064	516	521	5	2,107	2,064	0	0	(2)	Vote Budget Manager: Jenny Boyd Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	2,064	2,064	516	521	5	2,107	2,064	0	0	(2)		
G56 Leaving Care												
Expenditure	2,368	2,368	592	789	197	2,368	2,368	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Helen Lincoln Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	0%
Income	(164)	(164)	(41)	(7)	34	(164)	(164)	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	2,204	2,204	551	782	231	2,204	2,204	0	0	0		
G57 Fieldwork Advice & Assessment												
Expenditure	4,286	4,245	1,061	1,145	84	4,515	4,515	270	6	63	Vote Budget Manager: Paul McGee High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	0%
Income	(427)	(427)	(107)	(19)	88	(427)	(697)	(270)	63	63		
Net Expenditure	3,859	3,818	955	1,126	172	4,088	3,818	0	0	(7)		
G58 Children with Disabilities												
Expenditure	3,223	3,223	806	2,945	2139	3,450	3,450	227	7	0	Vote Budget Manager: Khalida Khan Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	-1%
Income	(914)	(914)	(229)	0	229	(1,164)	(250)	(23)	27	0		
Net Expenditure	2,309	2,309	577	2,945	2,368	2,286	2,286	(23)	(1)	0		
G59 Emergency Duty Team												
Expenditure	318	318	80	105	26	439	439	121	38	0	Vote Budget Manager: Paul McGee Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	44%
Income	(44)	(44)	(11)	0	11	(44)	(44)	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	274	274	69	105	37	395	395	121	44	0		
G61 Children with Mental Health												
Expenditure	1,445	1,445	361	228	(133)	1,416	1,416	(29)	(2)	0	Vote Budget Manager: Bill Williams Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	-2%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	1,445	1,445	361	228	(133)	1,416	1,416	(29)	(2)	0		
G62 Attendance & Welfare Serv GF												
Expenditure	1,437	1,437	359	447	88	1,737	1,437	0	0	(17)	Vote Budget Manager: David Hough Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	0%
Income	(509)	(509)	(127)	(28)	99	(809)	(509)	0	0	(37)		
Net Expenditure	928	928	232	419	187	928	928	0	0	(54)		
H57 Family Support & Protection												
Expenditure	4,482	4,482	1,121	1,192	72	4,601	4,928	446	10	7	Vote Budget Manager: Sukriti Sen Low Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011	1%
Income	(822)	(822)	(206)	(215)	(10)	(822)	(1,237)	(415)	50	50		
Net Expenditure	3,660	3,660	915	977	62	3,779	3,691	31	1	(2)		

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (General Fund Budget)		FULL YEAR										RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	
G75 IT Social Care		562	562	141	159	19	562	0	0	0	0	0%
Income		(347)	(347)	(87)	0	87	(347)	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure		215	215	54	159	105	215	0	0	0	0	
Vote Budget Manager:		Andrew Cross Low										0%
Date forecast last reviewed:		24/06/2011										
TOTAL FOR CHILDRENS SOCIAL CARE		44,033	43,972	10,993	22,398	11,405	45,080	995	2	(0)	18	0%
Income		(3,851)	(3,851)	(963)	(320)	643	(4,279)	(1,191)	31	(18)		
Net Expenditure		40,182	40,121	10,030	22,078	12,048	40,801	(196)	(0)	(2)		
Service Head:		Helen Lincoln										
G65 Transformation Project		222	222	56	34	(22)	118	(104)	(47)	0	0	-45%
Income		(50)	(50)	(13)	0	13	(24)	26	(52)	0	0	
Net Expenditure		172	172	43	34	(9)	94	(78)	(45)	0	0	
Vote Budget Manager:		Anthony Walters Low										
Date forecast last reviewed:		24/06/2011										
G71 Strategy & Policy		686	686	172	108	(64)	686	(108)	(13)	0	0	1%
Income		(17)	(17)	(4)	0	4	(13)	4	(24)	0	0	
Net Expenditure		669	669	167	108	(59)	673	(78)	(45)	0	0	
Vote Budget Manager:		Layla Richards Low										
Date forecast last reviewed:		24/06/2011										
G74 Equalities Development		802	802	201	94	(107)	694	(108)	(13)	0	0	-13%
Income		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure		802	802	201	94	(107)	694	(108)	(13)	0	0	
Vote Budget Manager:		Sasia Miah Low										
Date forecast last reviewed:		24/06/2011										
TOTAL FOR DIRECTOR'S SERVICES		1,710	1,710	428	236	(192)	1,498	(212)	(12)	0	0	-11%
Income		(67)	(67)	(17)	0	17	(37)	30	(45)	0	0	
Net Expenditure		1,643	1,643	411	236	(175)	1,461	(182)	(11)	0	0	
Service Head:		Isobel Cattermole										
G79 CSF Resources Manage		227	227	57	58	1	227	0	0	0	0	0%
Income		(47)	(47)	(12)	0	12	(47)	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure		180	180	45	58	13	180	0	0	0	0	
Vote Budget Manager:		Kate Bingham Low										
Date forecast last reviewed:		24/06/2011										
G67 Commissioned Services		1,509	1,509	377	816	439	2,022	513	34	0	0	0%
Income		(43)	(43)	(11)	(250)	(239)	(371)	(513)	1,193	50	0	
Net Expenditure		1,466	1,466	367	566	200	1,651	0	(11)	0	0	
Vote Budget Manager:		Karen Badgery Low										
Date forecast last reviewed:		24/06/2011										
G68 Major Government Grant Funding		0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Income		0	0	0	(4)	(4)	0	0	0	0	0	
Net Expenditure		0	0	0	(3)	(3)	0	0	0	0	0	
Vote Budget Manager:		David Tully Low										
Date forecast last reviewed:												
G70 Childrens Information Systems		265	285	66	114	48	294	29	11	0	0	27%
Income		(73)	(73)	(18)	0	18	(51)	22	(30)	0	0	
Net Expenditure		192	192	48	114	66	243	51	27	0	0	
Vote Budget Manager:		Iqbal Vaza Low										
Date forecast last reviewed:		24/06/2011										

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (General Fund Budget)		FULL YEAR										Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Forecast Outturn) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %			
	Income	(13,686)	(13,686)	(3,422)	(2,091)	1,331	(13,131)	(13,227)	459	(3)	1	The huge number of changes to the establishment report which will finally come clear in July is expected to make some changes to the split of costs across the three operating strands. We are currently awaiting the final amendments to be made to this by HR.	-7%
	Net Expenditure	0	0	0	6,706	6,706	0	0	0	(7)	0	The restructure will be completed and in place from 1st September and it is possible that further posts will be lost through natural wastage before then - until completion it is difficult to project the savings that this may generate but these will be included in future projections.	
	Expenditure	5,843	5,690	1,423	2,225	803	7,678	6,308	618	11	(18)	The £750k on the Management Account again this month is to cover the management salaries and Toby lane central charges which will be, as previously agreed, distributed amongst the three trading strands at the year end. This costs has been included in the summary so no surprises are found at that point. however a further £40k has been added to meet the costs of the proposed redundancies.	
	Net Expenditure	5,843	5,690	1,423	2,225	803	7,678	6,308	618	11	(18)	The news that Adults DMT have still resisted agreeing to our uplifted prices for 2010/11 has meant we have reduced our income projections slightly on the Welfare account until a final agreement has been made how	11%
Vote Budget Manager: Michael Hales Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011													
Budget includes £8m accommodation & central support service recharges which will eventually be allocated to services. However, savings targets & structural changes require charges to be re-based. Awaiting revised figures from Corporate Finance. It also includes savings targets of £536k. Viements are pending and will be processed in July 2011.													
Vote Budget Manager: David Tully Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011													
Vote Budget Manager: Neil Bartlett Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 24/06/2011													0%
H87 Building & Technical Expenditure 1,080 Income (1,080) Net Expenditure 0													
H82 Holding Account & Support Services Expenditure 5,843 Income 5,690 Net Expenditure 1,423													
TOTAL FOR CHILDRENS SERVICES RESOURCES Expenditure 27,356 Income (16,307) Net Expenditure 11,049													4%
H87 Building & Technical Expenditure 1,080 Income (1,080) Net Expenditure 0													
H82 Holding Account & Support Services Expenditure 5,843 Income 5,690 Net Expenditure 1,423													
TOTAL FOR CHILDRENS SERVICES RESOURCES Expenditure 27,356 Income (16,307) Net Expenditure 11,049													4%

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (General Fund Budget)	FULL YEAR										Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	RAG Status				
	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast) £'000	Outturn %			Outturn %			
G91 Revenue Holding Accounts	1,897	1,897	474	17,930	17,456	1,897	1,897	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Various Budget Risk: Various Date forecast last reviewed:	0%
Income	(1,897)	(1,897)	(474)	(4,102)	(3,628)	(1,897)	(1,897)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	13,828	13,828	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
G95 CCN Pooled Budgets	0	34	9	0	(9)	34	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Khalida Khan Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:	0%
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	0	34	9	0	(9)	34	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL FOR HOLDING ACCOUNTS	1,897	1,931	483	17,930	17,447	1,931	1,931	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Income	(1,897)	(1,897)	(474)	(4,102)	(3,628)	(1,897)	(1,897)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Net Expenditure	0	34	9	13,828	13,820	34	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Helen Lincoln	
TOTAL FOR CSF GENERAL FUND	123,510	129,120	32,280	69,982	37,702	134,104	132,086	2,966	2	(2)	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Income	(46,911)	(46,910)	(11,728)	(8,949)	2,779	(48,984)	(49,876)	(2,966)	6	2	0	0	0	0	Isobel Cattermole	
Net Expenditure	76,599	82,210	20,552	61,033	40,481	85,120	82,210	0	0	(3)	0	0	0	0	Director:	

2% to 5% Amber
 -2% Green
 2% - 5% Amber
 -5% Red

CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

COMMUNITIES, LOCALITIES & CULTURE		Original Budget	Latest Budget	Budget to Date	Actual to Date	Variance to Date	Previous Forecast	Latest Forecast	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast)	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast)	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k	Proposed mitigating action and dates	RAG Status
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	%			
E01 Management & Support		Expenditure	2,284	3,581	895	1,082	187	3,581	0	0			0%
		Income	(2,284)	(3,581)	(895)	(831)	64	(3,581)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	0	0	0	251	0	0	0	0			0%
												Robin Beattie Low June 2011	
E10 Public Realm M&A		Expenditure	656	817	201	150	656	817	0	0			0%
		Income	(656)	(656)	(164)	(51)	(656)	(656)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	0	161	37	(14)	(51)	161	0	0			0%
												Jamie Blake Low June 2011	
E12 Transportation & Highways		Expenditure	10,394	10,720	1,665	1,167	10,815	10,720	0	0			0%
		Income	(2,704)	(2,704)	(415)	(250)	(2,704)	(2,704)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	7,690	8,016	1,250	917	8,111	8,016	0	0			0%
												Margaret Cooper High June 2011	
E15 Clean & Green		Expenditure	33,425	33,363	6,863	4,480	33,582	33,363	0	0			0%
		Income	(5,665)	(5,666)	(1,178)	2,420	(5,665)	(5,666)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	27,760	27,697	5,685	6,900	27,917	27,697	0	0			0%
												Simon Baxter High June 2011	
E23 Concessionary Fares		Expenditure	5,749	5,770	1,443	1,793	5,770	5,770	0	0			0%
		Income	(3)	(24)	(6)	0	(24)	(24)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	5,746	5,746	1,437	1,793	5,746	5,746	0	0			0%
												John Chilton Low June 2011	
E24 Parking Control		Expenditure	7,457	7,457	1,735	1,359	7,457	7,457	0	0			0%
		Income	(7,457)	(7,457)	(3,377)	(3,097)	(7,457)	(7,457)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	0	0	(1,642)	(1,738)	0	0	0	0			0%
												John Chilton Low June 2011	
Public Realm Total		Expenditure	57,681	58,127	11,907	8,949	58,280	58,127	0	0			0%
		Income	(16,485)	(16,507)	(5,140)	(1,091)	(16,506)	(16,507)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	41,196	41,620	6,767	7,858	41,774	41,620	0	0			0%
												Jamie Blake Service Head	
E80 Safer Communities Management		Expenditure	152	136	34	192	158	129	0	0			0%
		Income	(155)	(155)	(39)	0	(155)	(155)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	(3)	(19)	(5)	192	(26)	(19)	0	0			0%
												Andy Bamber Low June 2011	
E81 Community Safety Partnership, DV & HC		Expenditure	1,506	1,981	495	83	1,502	1,981	0	0			0%
		Income	(60)	(556)	(139)	(186)	(47)	(556)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	1,446	1,425	356	(103)	(459)	1,425	0	0			0%
												Emily Fieran-Reed Medium June 2011	
E83 Enforcement & Intervention		Expenditure	2,415	2,486	621	650	2,429	2,486	0	0			0%
		Income	(114)	(154)	(39)	(29)	(114)	(154)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	2,301	2,332	582	621	2,315	2,332	0	0			0%
												Community Safety Fund from GLA	
E84 Drugs Action Team		Expenditure	5,161	5,734	1,433	559	5,142	5,734	0	0			0%
		Income	(3,761)	(4,306)	(31)	1,045	(3,761)	(4,306)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	1,400	1,428	357	528	1,381	1,428	0	0			0%
												Community Safety Fund from GLA	
E85 Env Commercial Services		Expenditure	4,431	4,554	1,124	941	4,434	4,554	0	0			0%
		Income	(1,354)	(1,442)	(345)	(475)	(1,361)	(1,442)	0	0			0%
		Net Expenditure	3,077	3,112	779	466	3,073	3,112	0	0			0%
												Collin Perrins Medium June 2011	

COMMUNITIES, LOCALITIES & CULTURE										RAG Status
Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates										
	Original Budget	Latest Budget	Budget to Date	Actual to Date	Variance to Date	Previous Forecast	Latest Forecast	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast)	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast)	
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	%	%
COMMITTEES, LOCALITIES & CULTURE										
E86 Env Health Protection Services										
Expenditure	4,482	4,422	1,105	892	(213)	4,438	4,422	0	0	(0)
Income	(953)	(952)	(240)	(119)	121	(953)	(952)	0	0	1
Net Expenditure	3,529	3,460	865	773	(92)	3,485	3,460	0	0	(1)
Variance to date due to delay in Quarter 1 payment to Coroner's Court										
Vote Budget Manager:	Andrew Weaver									
Budget Risk:	Medium									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
Safer Communities Total										
Expenditure	18,147	19,313	4,812	3,317	(1,495)	18,074	19,313	0	0	7
Income	(6,397)	(7,575)	(1,878)	(840)	1,038	(6,404)	(7,575)	0	0	18
Net Expenditure	11,750	11,738	2,934	2,477	(457)	11,670	11,738	0	0	1
Service Head:	Bryan Jones									
E40 Divisional Management										
Expenditure	134	134	33	49	16	134	134	0	0	0
Income	(134)	(134)	(93)	(6)	27	(134)	(134)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	0	0	43	43	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vote Budget Manager:	Heather Bonfield									
Budget Risk:	Low									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
E41 Idea Stores										
Expenditure	8,931	8,897	2,164	1,482	(682)	8,776	8,897	0	0	1
Income	(1,185)	(1,185)	(296)	(225)	71	(1,185)	(1,185)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	7,746	7,652	1,868	1,257	(611)	7,591	7,652	0	0	1
Vote Budget Manager:	Judith St John									
Budget Risk:	Low									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
E42 Sports & Physical Activity										
Expenditure	4,767	4,277	743	731	(12)	4,245	4,277	0	0	1
Income	(986)	(986)	(89)	185	273	(986)	(986)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	4,381	3,891	655	916	261	3,859	3,891	0	0	1
Vote Budget Manager:	Lisa Pottinger									
Budget Risk:	High									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
E43 Parks & Open Spaces										
Expenditure	3,285	3,303	752	594	(158)	3,279	3,303	0	0	1
Income	(339)	(339)	(85)	(24)	61	(339)	(339)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	2,946	2,964	667	570	(97)	2,940	2,964	0	0	1
Vote Budget Manager:	Michael Rowan									
Budget Risk:	Medium									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
E44 Arts & Events										
Expenditure	2,243	2,252	546	604	58	2,249	2,252	0	0	0
Income	(1,120)	(1,120)	(280)	(457)	(177)	(1,120)	(1,120)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	1,123	1,132	266	147	(119)	1,129	1,132	0	0	0
Vote Budget Manager:	Steve Murray									
Budget Risk:	Low									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
E45 Mile End Park										
Expenditure	787	787	197	123	(74)	785	787	0	0	0
Income	(787)	(787)	(197)	(293)	(96)	(787)	(787)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	(170)	(170)	(2)	0	0	0	(100)
Vote Budget Manager:	Michael Rowan									
Budget Risk:	Low									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
E47 Lifelong Learning										
Expenditure	4,476	4,821	1,007	732	(275)	4,821	4,821	0	0	0
Income	(3,585)	(3,585)	(110)	(42)	68	(3,585)	(3,585)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	891	1,236	897	690	(207)	1,236	1,236	0	0	0
Vote Budget Manager:	Judith St John									
Budget Risk:	Low									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
Cultural Services Total										
Expenditure	24,623	24,411	5,442	4,315	(1,127)	24,289	24,411	0	0	1
Income	(7,536)	(7,536)	(1,089)	(662)	227	(7,536)	(7,536)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	17,087	16,875	4,353	3,453	(900)	16,753	16,875	0	0	1
Service Head:	Heather Bonfield									
E71 Service Integration										
Expenditure	104	167	42	103	61	104	167	0	0	61
Income	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	104	167	42	103	61	104	167	0	0	61
Vote Budget Manager:	Shazia Hussain									
Budget Risk:	Medium									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
Service Integration Total										
Expenditure	909	909	227	363	136	909	909	0	0	0
Income	(909)	(909)	(227)	(184)	43	(909)	(909)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	179	179	0	0	0	0	0
Vote Budget Manager:	John Stevens									
Budget Risk:	Low									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									
E31 Passenger Transport										
Expenditure	5,171	5,171	1,293	992	(301)	5,171	5,171	0	0	0
Income	(5,171)	(5,171)	(1,293)	(930)	363	(5,171)	(5,171)	0	0	0
Net Expenditure	0	0	0	62	62	0	0	0	0	0
Vote Budget Manager:	John Stevens									
Budget Risk:	Low									
Date forecast last reviewed:	June 2011									

COMMUNITIES, LOCALITIES & CULTURE										RAG Status
Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	RAG Status
E32 DSO Vehicle Workshop										
489	489	122	111	(11)	489	489	0	0		
(489)	(489)	(122)	(54)	68	(489)	(489)	0	0		
Net Expenditure	0	0	57	57	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: John Stevens	0%
Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: June 2011										
E82 Street Trading										
2,131	2,131	533	304	(229)	2,131	2,131	0	0		
(2,131)	(2,131)	(533)	(724)	(191)	(2,131)	(2,131)	0	0		
Net Expenditure	0	0	(420)	(420)	0	0	0	0	Vote Budget Manager: Gavin Dooley	0%
Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: June 2011										
TOTAL FOR COMMUNITIES, LOCALITIES & CULTURE										
11,539	114,299	25,273	19,536	(5,737)	113,028	114,299	0	1		
(41,402)	(43,899)	(11,177)	(5,516)	5,661	(42,727)	(43,899)	0	3		
Net Expenditure	70,137	14,096	14,020	(76)	70,301	70,400	0	0	Director: Stephen Halsey	0%

<2% Green
2% - 5% Amber
>5% Red

CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

DEVELOPMENT & RENEWAL GENERAL FUND										RAG Status
Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k. Proposed mitigating action and dates										
	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual Date	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	
J04 Major Project Development										
Expenditure	2,799	3,264	816	881	65	3,462	3,417	153	5	(1)
Income	(1,146)	(1,352)	(338)	321	(1,540)	(1,540)	(188)	14	(2)	(2)
Net Expenditure	1,653	1,911	478	864	386	1,921	1,877	(35)	(2)	(2)
Vote Budget Manager: Owen Whalley Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										
J06 Development Decisions										
Expenditure	2,212	2,500	625	538	(87)	2,609	2,582	81	3	(1)
Income	(2,292)	(2,334)	(584)	(516)	68	(2,334)	(2,340)	(6)	0	0
Net Expenditure	(80)	166	42	22	(20)	274	242	76	46	(12)
Vote Budget Manager: Owen Whalley Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										
K99 Building Control Trading Account										
Expenditure	2,227	1,206	301	176	(125)	1,206	1,206	0	0	0
Income	(2,227)	(1,206)	(302)	(113)	189	(1,206)	(1,206)	0	(0)	(0)
Net Expenditure	0	(0)	(0)	63	63	(0)	(0)	0	(70)	(70)
Vote Budget Manager: Owen Whalley Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										
K98 Local Land Charges Trading Account										
Expenditure	392	392	98	11	(87)	362	391	(1)	(0)	(0)
Income	(430)	(430)	(108)	(58)	50	(443)	(430)	0	0	(3)
Net Expenditure	(38)	(38)	(10)	(47)	(37)	(82)	(39)	(1)	3	(52)
Vote Budget Manager: Owen Whalley Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										
TOTAL FOR DEVELOPMENT & BUILDING CONTROL										
Expenditure	7,630	7,362	1,840	1,606	(234)	7,637	7,595	234	3	(1)
Income	(6,095)	(5,322)	(1,331)	(704)	627	(5,524)	(5,516)	(193)	4	(0)
Net Expenditure	1,535	2,039	510	902	393	2,114	2,080	40	2	(2)
Service Head: Owen Whalley										
J08 Programmes and Projects Funding										
Expenditure	1,605	50	13	33	21	50	53	3	5	5
Income	(1,580)	(50)	(13)	0	13	(50)	(53)	(3)	5	5
Net Expenditure	25	0	0	33	33	0	0	0	0	0
Vote Budget Manager: Chris Holme Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										
112 Resources										
Expenditure	3,143	2,645	661	681	20	2,778	2,815	170	6	1
Income	(662)	(713)	(178)	0	178	(875)	(875)	(161)	23	(0)
Net Expenditure	2,481	1,932	483	681	198	1,903	1,941	9	0	2
Vote Budget Manager: Chris Holme Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										
TOTAL FOR RESOURCES										
Expenditure	4,748	2,695	674	714	40	2,828	2,868	173	6	1
Income	(2,242)	(763)	(191)	0	191	(925)	(927)	(164)	21	0
Net Expenditure	2,506	1,932	483	714	231	1,903	1,941	9	0	2
Service Head: Chris Holme										
J14 Management & Support Services										
Expenditure	3,577	3,892	973	1,317	344	4,064	4,085	143	4	(0)
Income	(13)	(58)	(15)	(76)	(61)	(277)	(277)	(219)	376	(0)
Net Expenditure	3,564	3,833	958	1,241	283	3,777	3,758	(76)	(2)	(1)
Vote Budget Manager: Aman Dalvi Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										
J16 Asset Management										
Expenditure	1,492	1,492	373	324	(49)	1,574	1,528	36	2	(3)
Income	(1,024)	(1,024)	(256)	(55)	201	(1,129)	(1,138)	(114)	11	1
Net Expenditure	468	468	117	269	152	445	390	(78)	(17)	(17)
Committed spend relating to community buildings safety works is reflected in a correspondingly higher assumed drawdown from reserves. Service Head: Andy Algar Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										
J18 Olympics										
Expenditure	947	863	216	225	9	874	770	(93)	(11)	(11)
Income	(166)	(166)	(41)	16	57	(166)	(116)	50	(30)	(30)
Net Expenditure	781	697	174	241	67	708	654	(43)	(6)	(6)
Vote Budget Manager: Nick Smales Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										
J20 Strategy, Regeneration and Sustainability										
Expenditure	3,153	3,347	837	524	(313)	3,347	2,653	(694)	(21)	(21)
Income	(2,007)	(2,007)	(502)	(30)	472	(2,037)	(1,395)	612	(31)	(31)
Net Expenditure	1,146	1,340	335	494	159	1,310	1,258	(82)	(6)	(6)
Vote Budget Manager: Jackie Oduoye Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 4th July 2011										

<2% Green
2% - 5% Amber
>5% Red

CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

DEVELOPMENT & RENEWAL GENERAL FUND										RAG Status	
Expenditure Income Net Expenditure	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	Budget Risk: Date forecast last reviewed:
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	%	%		
J22 Housing Regeneration	506 (588) (82)	506 (588) (82)	127 (147) (20)	199 0 199	72 147 219	517 (587) (60)	517 (587) (60)	11 (9) 2	2 1 (3)	0	Chris Worby Medium 4th July 2011
J24 Employment & Enterprise	2,163 (1,237) 926	2,326 (1,520) 806	582 (380) 202	393 71 464	(189) 451 262	2,326 (1,543) 784	2,349 (1,543) 806	23 (23) (0)	1 2 (0)	3	Nick Smales Low 4th July 2011
J26 Lettings	2,535 (1,658) 877	2,535 (1,658) 877	634 (415) 219	471 (1) 470	(163) 414 251	2,535 (1,660) 874	2,628 (1,660) 967	93 (2) 90	4 0 10	4	The establishment map has been reviewed and the budget will be re-aligned to reflect the establishment, hence the outturn will be in line with the revised budget. Colin Cormack Low 4th July 2011
J30 BSF Programme	1,442 (940) 502	1,192 (940) 252	298 (235) 63	854 (770) 84	566 (593) 21	1,170 (940) 230	3,086 (2,833) 253	1,894 (1,893) 1	159 201 0	164 201 10	Additional costs relating to the Building Schools for the Future PFI contract will be funded by an agreed drawdown from reserves. Ann Sutcliffe Medium 4th July 2011
J32 Admin Buildings	22,399 (18,289) 4,110	19,631 (18,289) 1,343	4,908 (4,572) 336	5,017 (4,174) 843	109 (4,174) 507	20,299 (18,789) 1,451	20,372 (19,085) 1,286	740 (796) (56)	4 4 (4)	4	The forecast includes a projected £500k additional liability relating to National Non-Domestic Rates (NDR). This pressure forms part of the growth contingency established as part of the 2011/12 budget process, and the forecast outturn assumes that this contingency is applied to offset this pressure. Andy Algar High 4th July 2011
J34 Depots	476 (459) 17	364 (459) (95)	91 (115) (24)	32 (113) (81)	(59) 1 (58)	473 (459) 14	473 (459) 14	109 0 109	30 0 (115)	0	The forecast overspend is due to pressures relating to the Sutton Street and Toby Lane depots. Andy Algar Medium 4th July 2011
J40 Homeless & Housing Advice	37,838 (36,885) 1,153	31,274 (30,121) 1,153	7,818 (7,530) 288	5,432 (7,459) (2,027)	(2,366) 71 (2,315)	32,301 (31,148) 1,153	31,909 (30,758) 1,150	635 (638) (3)	2 2 (0)	(1)	The forecast includes assumed drawdowns from the Homelessness reserve. Vote Budget Manager: High 4th July 2011
TOTAL FOR DEVELOPMENT & RENEWAL	88,906 (71,403) 17,503	77,480 (62,916) 14,564	19,370 (15,729) 3,641	17,108 (13,295) 3,813	(2,262) 2,434 172	79,875 (66,193) 14,683	80,783 (66,305) 14,478	3,303 (3,389) (86)	4 5 (1)	1 2 (1)	Aman Dalvi Director: 4th July 2011
SERVICE TRANSFER TO/FROM OTHER DIRECTORATES											
C18 Third Sector Team - transfer from OE		2,481	620	353	(267)	2,481	2,587	106	4	4	Risk: A review of this budget has identified that there is an ongoing pressure relating to staff salaries. The Directorate is actively reviewing the 3rd sector requirement for savings opportunities where there is a net risk of a £0.2million overspend Vote Budget Manager: High 4th July 2011
REVISSED TOTAL FOR DEVELOPMENT & RENEWAL	88,906 (71,403) 17,503	79,961 (62,966) 16,995	19,990 (15,741) 4,249	17,461 (13,315) 4,146	(2,529) 2,426 (103)	82,356 (65,243) 17,114	83,370 (66,374) 16,995	3,409 (3,409) (0)	4 5 (0)	1 2 (1)	Aman Dalvi Director: 4th July 2011

2% to 5% Amber
 >5% Red
 -2% Green
 2% - 5% Amber
 >5% Red

CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

RESOURCES	FULL YEAR										RAG Status	
	Original Budget		Latest Budget		Budget to Date		Actual to Date		Variance to Date			Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000		
R34 Internal Audit	Expenditure	799	799	200	0	799	799	0	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(973)	(973)	(243)	0	(973)	(973)	0	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	(174)	(174)	(44)	(43)	(174)	(174)	0	0	0	0	
R40 Risk Management	Expenditure	681	681	170	118	681	681	(52)	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(592)	(592)	(148)	(110)	(592)	(592)	38	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	89	89	22	8	89	89	(14)	0	0	0	
TOTAL FOR AUDIT & RISK	Expenditure	1,480	1,480	370	318	1,480	1,480	(52)	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(1,565)	(1,565)	(391)	(353)	(1,565)	(1,565)	38	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	(85)	(85)	(21)	(35)	(85)	(85)	0	0	0	0	
R36 Council Tax & NNDR	Expenditure	33,865	33,865	8,466	8,856	33,865	33,865	390	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(31,197)	(31,197)	(7,799)	(8,189)	(31,197)	(31,197)	(390)	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	2,668	2,668	667	667	2,668	2,668	0	0	0	0	
R42 Debtors Income Service	Expenditure	1,218	1,218	305	275	1,218	1,218	(30)	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(1,185)	(1,185)	(296)	(316)	(1,185)	(1,185)	(20)	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	33	33	8	(41)	33	33	(49)	0	0	0	
R44 Cashiers	Expenditure	480	480	120	151	480	480	31	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(508)	(508)	(127)	(95)	(508)	(508)	32	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	(28)	(28)	(7)	56	(28)	(28)	63	0	0	0	
R48 Information Services	Expenditure	8,948	9,342	2,336	2,367	9,342	9,342	32	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(9,674)	(9,673)	(2,418)	(2,449)	(9,673)	(9,673)	(31)	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	(726)	(331)	(83)	(82)	(331)	(331)	1	0	0	0	
R50 Customer Access	Expenditure	6,745	6,650	1,663	1,593	6,650	6,650	(70)	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(3,305)	(3,305)	(826)	(56)	(3,305)	(3,305)	770	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	3,440	3,345	836	1,537	3,345	3,345	701	0	0	0	
R54 Housing Benefits	Expenditure	187,969	187,969	46,992	62,655	187,969	187,969	(15,663)	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(187,474)	(187,474)	(46,869)	(62,531)	(187,474)	(187,474)	15,663	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	495	495	124	124	495	495	(0)	0	0	0	
R58 Benefits Admin	Expenditure	8,034	8,034	2,009	1,973	8,034	8,034	(36)	0	0	0	0%
	Income	(6,217)	(6,217)	(1,554)	(1,519)	(6,217)	(6,217)	35	0	0	0	
	Net Expenditure	1,817	1,817	454	454	1,817	1,817	(0)	0	0	0	

RESOURCES	FULL YEAR										RAG Status					
	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast		Latest Forecast		Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast)						
						Outturn	£'000	Outturn	£'000	Outturn		£'000	Outturn	£'000	%	%
R60 Reprographics	421	(425)	(4)	105	124	19	421	421	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Steve Burr Low Date forecast last reviewed: 27/07/2011
Net Expenditure	(4)	(425)	(4)	(1)	71	(72)	(4)	(4)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL FOR CUSTOMER ACCESS & ICT	247,680	247,979	61,985	77,994	(15,326)	(15,326)	247,979	247,979	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Steve Burr Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 27/07/2011
Net Expenditure	(239,986)	(239,984)	(59,986)	(75,208)	16,113	(16,113)	(239,984)	(239,984)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
R38 Procurement	1,008	(752)	256	252	(322)	(77)	1,008	1,008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Service Head: Claire Symonds The budget to date versus the actuals to date reflects a Comensura refund which is a one-off in 2011-12 and has been earmarked for additional procurement training.
Net Expenditure	256	(752)	64	(97)	(161)	(161)	256	(752)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
R46 Payments	634	(803)	(169)	159	121	(38)	634	634	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Richard Parsons Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed: 20/07/2011
Net Expenditure	(169)	(803)	(42)	(79)	(37)	(37)	(169)	(803)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL FOR PROCUREMENT & PAYMENTS	1,642	1,642	411	346	(65)	(65)	1,642	1,642	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Richard Parsons Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 23/06/2011
Net Expenditure	87	(1,555)	22	(522)	(133)	(133)	87	(1,555)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
R432 Corporate Finance	2,281	(2,281)	0	570	(70)	(198)	2,281	2,281	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Service Head: Richard Parsons The budget to date versus the actuals to date reflects a Comensura refund which is a one-off in 2011-12 and has been earmarked for additional procurement training.
Net Expenditure	20	(2,281)	5	(565)	0	0	20	(2,281)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
R82 Non-Distributed Costs	1,395	1,209	302	322	(20)	(20)	1,209	1,209	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Peter Hayward Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 20/07/2011
Net Expenditure	1,395	1,209	302	302	(0)	(0)	1,209	1,209	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL FOR CORPORATE FINANCE & NDC	3,676	3,490	873	892	(65)	(20)	3,490	3,490	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Peter Hayward Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 20/07/2011
Net Expenditure	(2,281)	(2,281)	(565)	(565)	(20)	(20)	(2,281)	(2,281)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
R62 Business Development	560	(560)	(140)	140	(799)	(659)	560	560	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Service Head: Peter Hayward Project related expenditure to be funded at year-end.
Net Expenditure	(560)	(560)	(140)	(799)	(659)	(659)	(560)	(560)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
R90 HR Strategy	1,486	(1,253)	233	372	457	86	1,486	1,486	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Jens Gemmeil/Ekbal Hussain Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 02/08/2011
Net Expenditure	233	(1,253)	58	166	108	108	233	(560)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
TOTAL FOR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT	560	(560)	(140)	140	(799)	(659)	560	(560)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Jens Gemmeil/Ekbal Hussain Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 02/08/2011
Net Expenditure	0	(560)	0	0	0	0	0	(560)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
R92 HR Consultancy	3,021	(2,914)	755	790	(804)	(76)	3,021	3,021	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Simon Kilbey Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 02/08/2011
Net Expenditure	107	(2,914)	27	(14)	(41)	(41)	107	(2,914)	0	0	0	0	0	0		
R94 HR Operations	2,376	(2,582)	(206)	594	750	156	2,376	2,376	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	Vote Budget Manager: Simon Kilbey Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 02/08/2011
Net Expenditure	(206)	(2,582)	(52)	(646)	(543)	103	(206)	(2,582)	0	0	0	0	0	0		

RESOURCES	FULL YEAR										Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k Proposed mitigating action and dates	RAG Status
	Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast Outturn £'000	Latest Forecast Outturn £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast Outturn)		Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %		
								£'000	%			
R96 PAS Schemes	1,190 (683)	1,190 (683)	298 (171)	274 (339)	(24) (168)	1,190 (683)	1,190 (683)	0	0	0	0	0%
	507	507	127	(65)	(192)	507	507	0	0	0	0	0%
Vote Budget Manager: Simon Kilbey Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: 02/08/2011												
TOTAL FOR HR SERVICES	8,073 (7,432)	8,073 (7,432)	2,018 (1,858)	2,271 (1,977)	253 (119)	8,073 (7,432)	8,073 (7,432)	0	0	0	0	0%
	641	641	160	294	134	641	641	0	0	0	0	0%
R80 Directors Office	522	506	127	108	(19)	506	506	0	0	0	0	0%
	506	506	127	108	(19)	506	506	0	0	0	0	0%
Vote Budget Manager: Sam Shand Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: 02/08/2011												
TOTAL FOR RESOURCES	263,633 (253,959)	263,730 (253,957)	65,933 (63,339)	82,728 (79,444)	(14,500) 15,220	263,170 (252,797)	263,170 (252,797)	0	0	0	0	0%
	10,274	10,373	2,594	3,284	690	10,373	10,373	0	0	0	0	0%
Director: Chris Naylor												

CORPORATE MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

		FULL YEAR										RAG Status
		Original Budget £'000	Latest Budget £'000	Budget to Date £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Variance to Date £'000	Previous Forecast £'000	Latest Forecast £'000	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast) £'000	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast Outturn) %	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k	Proposed mitigating action and dates
CORPORATE COSTS & CAPITAL FINANCING		19,385	15,843	356	738	382	15,843	15,843	0	0		
Expenditure												
Income				0	(506)	(506)						
Net Expenditure		19,385	15,843	356	232	(124)	15,843	15,843	0	0		
											0%	
											C Naylor Director	

Subjective Analysis of Forecast Variances

LBTH Summary Position
Month 3 (June 2011)

	Latest Budget £'000	Actual to Date £'000	Projected £'000	Variance £'000	Comments
Expenditure					
Total Employee	189,677	47,427	189,231	(446)	
Premises	50,796	11,542	52,435	1,639	D&R - The forecast overspend relates to increased NDR costs within Facilities Management, and increased rental payments to landlords for accommodation for Homeless families.
Transport	15,751	6,523	16,624	873	
Supplies & Services	48,726	13,993	51,264	2,538	D&R - £1.3m relates to the Building Schools for the Future PFI contract; this will be funded by an agreed drawdown from reserves. The directorate also has other one-off project-based items of expenditure, which will be funded from reserves included withi
Third Party Payments	139,908	39,549	141,030	1,122	CSF - higher level of commissioned services funded by additional Government grants
Transfer Payments	229,836	84,042	229,817	(19)	
Support Services	54,301	22,133	54,425	124	
Capital Financing	6,153	(14)	6,152	(1)	
Total Expenses	735,148	225,195	740,978	5,830	
Income					
Govt Grants	(248,928)	(72,107)	(249,275)	(347)	
Other Grants & Reimbursement	(24,739)	(836)	(29,036)	(4,296)	D&R - This relates to assumed drawdown from reserves for NDR, Homelessness & BSF supplies & services (see above).
Customer & Client Receipts	(88,647)	(20,644)	(89,488)	(841)	
Recharges Within Authority	(66,960)	(23,597)	(67,307)	(346)	
Interest & Investment	(1)	(505)	(1)	0	
Total Income	(429,275)	(117,689)	(435,107)	(5,830)	
Net Position	305,873	107,506	305,871	0	

This page is intentionally left blank

2% to 5% Amber
 >5% Red
 <2% Green
 2% - 5% Amber
 >5% Red

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT MONTHLY BUDGET MONITORING - JUNE 2011

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT	FULL YEAR										RAG Status
	Original Budget	Latest Budget	Budget to Date	Actual to Date	Variance to Date	Previous Forecast	Latest Forecast	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast)	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast)	Explanation of any variance that is considered to be significant and all variances greater than £100k	
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	%	Proposed mitigating action and dates

DIRECTLY CONTROLLED INCOME BUDGETS

Dwelling & Non Dwelling Rents	Income	(61,747)	(61,747)	(15,437)	(16,801)	(1,364)	(61,731)	(61,727)	20	(0)	When this budget was set, an assumption was made as to the percentage of voids that would arise from the decant of the Ocean & Blackwall estates, and as at the end of Q1 this higher level of voids is not reflected in the actual spend. The annual rental income from commercial properties is forecast to be £30k higher than budget due to the revision of various lease agreements, leading to an overall forecast virtual break even position for the year-end.
	Net Expenditure	(61,747)	(61,747)	(15,437)	(16,801)	(1,364)	(61,731)	(61,727)	20	(0)	Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: Tower Hamlets Homes
Tenant & Leaseholder Service Charges	Income	(16,069)	(16,069)	(4,017)	(12,251)	(8,234)	(16,202)	(16,155)	(66)	1	The actual income is based on annual estimates issued to leaseholders and is shown on the ledger from the start of the year. This budget will be re-profiled to better reflect the anticipated spend pattern. The year-end forecast is a favourable variance of £86k. RISK: The 2010-11 actualisation process is still to be finalised and there may be issues around energy costs and in particular, the climate charge levy.
	Net Expenditure	(16,069)	(16,069)	(4,017)	(12,251)	(8,234)	(16,202)	(16,155)	(66)	1	Vote Budget Manager: Tower Hamlets Homes Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: Tower Hamlets Homes

INDIRECT INCOME BUDGETS

Housing Revenue Account Subsidy	Income	(11,611)	(11,611)	(2,903)	0	2,903	(12,114)	(12,114)	(503)	4	The year to date variance is due to the fact that actuals are processed at year-end, and this budget will be re-profiled to better reflect the anticipated spend pattern. The forecast variance is due to additional Subsidy arising from the recent Decant Homes announcement. (This variance is offset by the forecast variance in 'Capital Financing Charges' budget line shown below.) RISK: A major constituent of the grant relates to capital charges which are subject to fluctuation in relation to any changes in interest rates.
	Net Expenditure	(11,611)	(11,611)	(2,903)	0	2,903	(12,114)	(12,114)	(503)	4	Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed: Chris Holme
Investment Income Received	Income	(200)	(200)	(50)	0	50	(200)	(197)	3	(2)	
	Net Expenditure	(200)	(200)	(50)	0	50	(200)	(197)	3	(2)	Vote Budget Manager: Chris Holme Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: Chris Holme
General Fund Contributions	Income	(519)	(519)	(130)	0	130	(166)	(166)	353	(68)	The year to date variance is due to the fact that actuals are processed at year-end, and this budget will be re-profiled to better reflect the anticipated spend pattern. A year-end shortfall of £353k Supporting People income is forecast, however, this will be matched by a corresponding reduction in Support Service recharges within the 'Supervision & Management' budget heading.
	Net Expenditure	(519)	(519)	(130)	0	130	(166)	(166)	353	(68)	Vote Budget Manager: Chris Holme Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed: Chris Holme
TOTAL INCOME	Total Income	(90,146)	(90,146)	(22,537)	(29,052)	(6,516)	(90,413)	(90,359)	(213)	0	
	Net Expenditure	(90,146)	(90,146)	(22,537)	(29,052)	(6,516)	(90,413)	(90,359)	(213)	0	Service Head: Chris Holme

HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT	FULL YEAR										RAG Status
	Original Budget	Latest Budget	Budget to Date	Actual to Date	Variance to Date	Previous Forecast	Latest Forecast	Variance (Latest Budget to Latest Forecast)	Variance (Previous & Latest Forecast)	Proposed mitigating action and dates	
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	%	£'000

DIRECTLY CONTROLLED EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Repairs & Maintenance	Expenditure	20,511	5,128	4,132	(995)	20,516	20,498	(13)	(0)	(0)	(0)	The year to date variance is due to a lower than budgeted spend to date on planned and responsive repairs. The year-end position forecast is a slight underspend. Vote Budget Manager: Tower Hamlets Homes Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed:	0%
	Net Expenditure	20,511	5,128	4,132	(995)	20,516	20,498	(13)	(0)	(0)	(0)		
Supervision & Management	Expenditure	24,504	6,126	3,952	(2,174)	25,016	24,784	280	1	(1)	(1)	The year to date variance is due to the fact that part of this budget area (support service recharges) are processed at year-end. In addition, payments relating to water bills are made primarily in the latter part of the year. These budgets will be re-allocated to better reflect these anticipated spend patterns. The projected year-end overspend relates primarily to costs incurred by the current Housing Options Appraisal project. Vote Budget Manager: Chris Holme Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:	1%
	Net Expenditure	24,504	6,126	3,952	(2,174)	25,016	24,784	280	1	(1)	(1)		
Special Services, Rent Rates & Taxes	Expenditure	16,322	4,081	2,441	(1,640)	15,516	15,763	(559)	(3)	2	2	Spend to date is below the budget to date due to timing differences in energy costs. The year-end projected underspend is primarily due to a review of the Estate Parking arrangements which is projected to result in c. £500K higher than budgeted income. RISK: 2011/12 energy contract prices will increase by an average of 10% compared to 2010/11, and therefore the year-end spend is subject to uncertainty, particularly if the 2011 winter is severe. Vote Budget Manager: Tower Hamlets Homes Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:	3%
	Net Expenditure	16,322	4,081	2,441	(1,640)	15,516	15,763	(559)	(3)	2	2		

INDIRECT EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

Provision for Bad & Doubtful Debts	Expenditure	900	225	0	(225)	900	900	0	0	0	0	The year to date variance is due to the fact that actuals are processed at year-end, and this budget will be re-allocated to better reflect the anticipated spend pattern. Forecast spend is projected to be in line with the budget. Vote Budget Manager: Chris Holme Budget Risk: Medium Date forecast last reviewed:	0%
	Net Expenditure	900	225	0	(225)	900	900	0	0	0	0		
Capital Financing Charges	Expenditure	28,244	7,061	0	(7,061)	28,788	28,748	504	2	(0)	(0)	The year to date variance is due to the fact that actuals are processed at year-end, and this budget will be re-allocated to better reflect the anticipated spend pattern. The forecast is higher than the current budget due to additional capital charges arising from the recent Decent Homes announcement. (This variance is offset by the forecast variance in 'Housing Revenue Account Subsidy' budget line shown above.) Vote Budget Manager: Chris Holme Budget Risk: High Date forecast last reviewed:	2%
	Net Expenditure	28,244	7,061	0	(7,061)	28,788	28,748	504	2	(0)	(0)		
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	Expenditure	90,481	22,620	10,526	(12,095)	90,736	90,694	213	0	(0)	(0)	Service Head: Chris Holme	0%
	Net Expenditure	90,481	22,620	10,526	(12,095)	90,736	90,694	213	0	(0)	(0)		
Contributions from Reserves	Total Net Expenditure	335	84	(18,527)	(18,610)	323	335	(0)	(0)	(200)	(200)	Service Head: Chris Holme	0%
	Net Expenditure	(335)	(84)	0	84	(335)	(335)	0	0	0	0		Vote Budget Manager: Chris Holme Budget Risk: Low Date forecast last reviewed:
TOTAL FOR HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT	Total Net Expenditure	0	(0)	(18,527)	(18,526)	(12)	(0)	(0)	0	0	0	Director: Aman Dalvi	

General Fund - Virements Requiring Cabinet Approval

Ref	Directorates	From	To	Description
1	Growth Risk Provision Adults Health & Wellbeing	(602,000)	602,000	Growth Allocation - Learning Disabilities Commissioning Budget GRO/AHWB/01 (11)
2	Growth Risk Provision Development & Renewal	(100,000)	100,000	Growth Allocation - Local land charges GRO/DR/01 (11)
3	Growth Risk Provision Development & Renewal	(550,000)	550,000	Growth Allocation - Administrative Buildings NNDR GRO/DR/02 (11)
4	Growth Risk Provision Communities Localities & Culture	(832,000)	832,000	Growth Allocation - Concessionary Fares GRO/CLC/06 (11)
5	Corporate Costs Resources	(307,700)	307,700	Adjustment to HR base budget for internal target saving for the level of resources required to support the redeployment process
6	Corporate Costs Resources	(737,478)	737,478	Adjustment to HR base budget for internal target saving for developing and implementing the Council's Workforce planning and implementation process
7	Corporate Costs Resources	(650,000)	650,000	Adjustment to Access Services base budget for internal target saving for the reduction in recharge to Tower Hamlet Homes for One Stop Shops service provision.
8	Corporate Costs Resources	(350,000)	350,000	Adjustment to Access Services base budget for internal target saving for the reduction in recharge to Tower Hamlet Homes for Contact Centre service provision.
9	Corporate Costs Children Schools & Families	(269,000)	269,000	Adjustment to base budget for Improved Performance of full year impact of one-off savings achieved in 2010/11
10	Corporate Costs Children Schools & Families	(971,000)	971,000	Adjustment to base budget for Vacancy Management of full year impact of one-off savings achieved in 2010/11
11	Corporate Costs Children Schools & Families	(388,000)	388,000	Adjustment to base budget for Sickness Management of full year impact of one-off savings achieved in 2010/11
12	Corporate Costs Children Schools & Families	(100,000)	100,000	Adjustment to base budget for Travel Allowances of full year impact of one-off savings achieved in 2010/11
		(5,857,178)	5,857,178	

This page is intentionally left blank

CAPITAL BUDGET RECONCILIATION QUARTER 1 2011/12	£'000
Initial Capital Budget 2011/12 (as reported at Cabinet on 9th February 2011)	149,756
<u>Adult Health and Well Being</u>	
Slippage on schemes in 2010/11 – Mental Health services, Improving the Care Home Environment for Older People and Efficiency Project - System/technology	176
Budget Adjustment on Mental Health services	-1
<u>Chief Executive & Resources</u>	
Slippage on ICT Telephony Invest to save & Accommodation Strategy & dilapidations	1,731
<u>Communities Localities and Culture:</u>	
Total slippage on schemes in 2010/11	3,353
Bancroft Library (Approved May 2011 Cabinet)	500
Contaminated land survey & works budget Re-profiled	-238
Developers Contribution (Approved May 2011 Cabinet £1m) RCDA - May 2011 (£376k) & Re-profiled budgets (-£446k)	930
TFL schemes including safety, cycling & walking (Approved May 2011 Cabinet; £2.198m), TFL schemes Re-profiled (-£743k)	1,455
Victoria Park Masterplan - Budget Re-profiled (Initial budget approved September Cabinet 2008)	264
Watney Market (RCDA 11 05 – June 2011) - Enable construction phase of scheme to progress	250
Public Realm Improvements (Approved May 2011 Cabinet)	410
Leamouth Depot Salt Barn (RCDA 10 25 – May 2011)	103
Olympic Park (RCDA 10 42 – May 2011)	121
Other Re-profiled budgets includes LPP schemes (-£187k) and various mainstream schemes (-£60k)	-247
<u>Children, Schools and Families:</u>	
Total Slippage on schemes in 2010/11	4,415
Following confirmed funding 2011/12, June 2011 cabinet approved CSF Capital programme report outlining schemes to be approved for the year. Net adjustment to original estimate	-5,135
<u>Building Schools for the Future:</u>	
ICT budget slippage for 2010/11	1,100
Budget re-profiling from 2011/12 to 2012/13	-14,000
<u>Development and Renewal (including Housing):</u>	
Slippage on schemes 2010/11	16,311
Decent Homes backlog (Approved in June 2011 Cabinet)	12,942
Housing Capital programme - Aids and Adaptation (£750,000), Capitalisation of Voids (£1,500m) and Capitalisation of fees and charges (£650,000), Overcrowding initiatives (£500k) - June 2011 Cabinet approval following confirmed MRA - 2011/12	3,400
Contingency to cover risks associated with the delivery of a major capital programme - Approved in June 2011 Cabinet	1,000
St Andrew's Health and Well Being Centre - Section 106 health monies - June 2011 cabinet approval - Full cost of £5.2m, Unspent S106 - £4,776,500, remainder of £423,500 is to be sought from S106 allocation held for health purposes.	423
Other HRA Budgets Re-profiled includes Regional Housing Pot (-£554k), Housing Capital Programme (-£2.376m) & Blackwall reach (-£1.217m)	-4,147
D&R and Housing GF budgets Re-profiled includes Millenium quarter (-£191k); Bishop square (-£114k); Roman Road shops (-228k); White Chapel centre (-£4k) & High Street 2012 (-£3.007m)	-3,544
Capital Budget Q1- June 2011	171,328

CAPITAL MONITORING Q1

SUMMARY

Budget at 30-Jun-11	Spend to 30-Jun-11	Projection 31-Mar-12	% Budget Spent	Projected Variance from Budget
£m	£m	£m	%	£m

MAINSTREAM PROGRAMME

Communities, Localities and Culture	15.259	0.583	15.219	3.8%	-0.040
Children, Schools and Families	23.365	3.840	22.446	16.4%	-0.919
Adults, Health and Wellbeing	0.235	0.038	0.194	16.1%	-0.041
D&R (excl BSF)	5.563	4.915	5.563	88.4%	0.000
BSF	77.601	7.162	77.532	9.2%	-0.069
HRA	31.451	1.742	30.551	5.5%	-0.900
MAINSTREAM TOTAL	153.474	18.280	151.505	11.9%	-1.969

LOCAL PRIORITIES PROGRAMME

Communities, Localities and Culture	2.601	0.548	2.601	21.1%	0.000
Children, Schools and Families	0.738	-0.001	0.726	-0.1%	-0.012
Chief Executive	1.951	0.004	1.951	0.2%	0.000
D&R (excl BSF)	6.464	0.525	4.890	8.1%	-1.574
BSF	1.100	0.000	1.100	0.0%	0.000
HRA	5.000	1.317	5.640	26.3%	0.640
LPP TOTAL	17.854	2.394	16.908	13.4%	-0.946
GRAND TOTAL	171.328	20.674	168.413	12.1%	-2.915

TOTALS BY DIRECTORATE:

Communities, Localities and Culture	17.860	1.131	17.820	6.3%	-0.040
Children, Schools and Families	24.103	3.839	23.172	15.9%	-0.931
Chief Executive	1.951	0.004	1.951	0.2%	0.000
Adults, Health and Wellbeing	0.235	0.038	0.194	16.1%	-0.041
D&R (excl BSF)	12.027	5.440	10.453	45.2%	-1.574
BSF	78.701	7.162	78.632	9.1%	-0.069
HRA	36.451	3.059	36.191	8.4%	-0.260
TOTALS BY DIRECTORATE:	171.328	20.674	168.413	12.1%	-2.915

CAPITAL MONITORING Q1

COMMUNITIES, LOCALITIES AND CULTURE

	Budget at 30-Jun-11	Spend to 30-Jun-11	Projection 31-Mar-12	% Budget Spent	Projected Variance from Budget		
	£m	£m	£m	%	£m	REASONS FOR VARIANCES TO DATE	REASONS FOR PROJECTED VARIANCES
MAINSTREAM PROGRAMME							
Transport							
TfL schemes including safety, cycling and walking	4.827	0.369	4.827	8%	0.000	Schemes progressing as per the programme, majority of expenditure expected in Q3 and Q4	
TfL Cycle Superhighway 2 Supporting Measures	0.112	0.001	0.112	1%	0.000	Sites have been identified and works are expected to commence in Q2.	
TfL Cycle Superhighway 3 Complementary Measures	0.040	0.000	0.040	0%	0.000	Works have now started on site and will be complete by the end of September as programmed.	
Public Realm Improvements	0.520	0.075	0.520	14%	0.000	Schemes progressing as per the programme.	
Olympic Delivery Authority	0.000	0.008	0.000	N/A	0.000		
Developers Contribution	2.106	0.130	2.106	6%	0.000	Some schemes have been designed and will be progressing soon. We are waiting on developer on one scheme and another has legal issues.	
OPTEMS section 106	0.045	-0.041	0.045	N/A	0.000	The credit balance will be settled once the report from the contractor is approved and the expenditure for the current year is expected in Q4.	
Leamouth Depot Salt Barn	0.160	0.004	0.160	3%	0.000	Scheme programme has been slightly delayed due to preliminary grounds testing, this will be complete by the end of July and the scheme will then progress as scheduled.	
Parks							
Millwall Park/Island Gardens	0.005	0.000	0.005	0%	0.000	Scheme is being reviewed.	
Poplar Park	0.086	0.000	0.086	0%	0.000	New project manager reviewing the scope of works.	
St Johns Park	0.011	0.002	0.011	18%	0.000		
Schoolhouse Lane Multi Use Ball Games Area	0.027	0.000	0.027	N/A	0.000	Scheme is in design stage with works programmed for Q2-Q3.	
Braithwaite Park	0.017	0.000	0.017	0%	0.000	Scheme is being reviewed.	
Chicksand Ghat	0.000	-0.085	0.000	N/A	0.000		
Bethnal Green Improvements	0.111	0.000	0.111	0%	0.000	Phase 2 is currently in design stage with works programmed for Q3.	
Victoria Park Masterplan (1)	2.852	0.064	2.852	2%	0.000	Expenditure reflected in LPP section below.	
Cotton Street Open Space Landscape Improvements	0.043	0.000	0.043	0%	0.000	Scheme is being reviewed.	
Culture and major projects							
Banglatown Art Trail & Arches	0.000	-0.007	0.000	N/A	0.000	Outstanding invoices to be settled.	
Brady Centre	0.148	0.000	0.148	0%	0.000	Programme of work is currently being agreed.	
Kobi Nazrul	0.054	0.000	0.054	0%	0.000	Works complete - Invoices to be processed.	
Mile End Leisure Centre - Security Enhancements	0.009	0.009	0.009	96%	0.000	Complete	
Poplar Baths	0.028	-0.002	0.028	N/A	0.000	Works are progressing	
Creation of Mobile Public Art	0.070	0.000	0.030	0%	-0.040	Outstanding invoice to be processed.	
Cable Street Mural	0.056	0.002	0.056	4%	0.000	Programme of work is currently being agreed.	
Mile End Park Capital	0.049	0.001	0.049	2%	0.000	Programme of work is currently being agreed.	
Bancroft Library	0.500	0.000	0.500	0%	0.000	Programme of work is currently being agreed.	
Other							
High Visibility Vehicles	0.007	-0.003	0.007	N/A	0.000	Outstanding invoices to be settled.	
Generators @ Mulberry Place & Anchorage Hse	0.014	0.000	0.014	0%	0.000	Awaiting Landlord formal agreement.	
Contaminated land survey and works	0.060	0.013	0.060	21%	0.000		
585-593 Commercial Road (Parking Pound)	0.000	-0.002	0.000	N/A	0.000	Outstanding invoices to be settled.	
Watney Market Ideas Store (1)	3.181	0.000	3.181	0.0%	0.000	Works in progress	
Olympic Park	0.121	0.044	0.121	37%	0.000		
MAINSTREAM TOTAL	15.259	0.583	15.219	4%	-0.040		
LOCAL PRIORITIES PROGRAMME							
Victoria Park Masterplan (2)	2.071	0.553	2.071	27%	0.000		
Essential Health & Safety	0.011	0.006	0.011	54%	0.000	Scheme progress accelerated	
Major Projects - LPP	0.122	0.000	0.122	0%	0.000	New contractor required to carry out outstanding works.	
Culture - LPP	0.013	0.000	0.013	0.0%	0.000	Phase 2 of the scheme is currently being programmed	
Watney Market Ideas Store (2)	0.384	-0.010	0.384	-3%	0.000	Works in progress	
LPP TOTAL	2.601	0.548	2.601	21%	0.000		
GRAND TOTAL	17.860	1.131	17.820	6.3%	-0.040		

CAPITAL MONITORING Q1

CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES

	Budget at 30-Jun-11	Spend to 30-Jun-11	Projection 31-Mar-12	% Budget Spent	Projected Variance from Budget		
	£m	£m	£m	%	£m	REASONS FOR VARIANCES TO DATE	REASONS FOR PROJECTED VARIANCES
MAINSTREAM PROGRAMME							
Condition and Improvement	1.467	0.028	1.200	2%	-0.267	New works start in summer school holidays. Expenditure will be incurred in Quarters 2 and 3	Some projects not yet committed so spend may occur in 12-13
Basic Need/Expansion	12.387	0.961	11.800	8%	-0.587	Some new projects in development stage - main spend when on site.	Some phasing and projections cautious to reflect delay in govt allocations for 12-13.
Sure Start	0.375	0.387	0.387	103%	0.012	Overspend in Q1 covered within Early Years budget	Budget under review.
Primary Capital Programme	6.387	2.180	6.387	34%	0.000		
Early Years	0.283	0.206	0.206	73%	-0.077	Final spend against completed programme.	
Bishop's Square	0.352	0.025	0.352	7%	0.000	Planning issues (Report to Dev C'ttee July 11)	
Osmani - Redevelopment (1)	0.400	0.000	0.400	0%	0.000	Spend in Q2	
RCCO	0.124	0.054	0.124	43%	0.000	Payments in respect of final account adjustment.	
TCF Kitchen & Dining	0.124	0.000	0.124	0%	0.000	Main spend due Q2/3	
ICT	1.466	0.000	1.466	0%	0.000	Project allocation to be identified and agreed.	
MAINSTREAM TOTAL	23.365	3.840	22.446	16%	-0.919		
LOCAL PRIORITIES PROGRAMME							
Osmani - Redevelopment (2)	0.088	0.000	0.088	0%	0.000	Full spend in Q2	
Bishop Challoner - Community Facilities	0.600	0.000	0.600	0%	0.000	Land issues to be resolved.	
Toby Lane	0.014	0.000	0.014	0%	0.000	Spend later in year.	
Harry Gosling	0.012	0.000	0.000	0%	-0.012		
Youth Service (BMX Mile End)	0.024	-0.001	0.024	-2%	0.000	Final account to be settled.	
LPP TOTAL	0.738	-0.001	0.726	0%	-0.012		
GRAND TOTAL	24.103	3.839	23.172	15.9%	-0.931		

CAPITAL MONITORING Q1

CHIEF EXECUTIVE & RESOURCES

	Budget at 30-Jun-11	Spend to 30-Jun-11	Projection 31-Mar-12	% Budget Spent	Projected Variance from Budget		
	£m	£m	£m	%	£m	REASONS FOR VARIANCES TO DATE	REASONS FOR PROJECTED VARIANCES
LOCAL PRIORITIES PROGRAMME							
Resources							
ICT - Software Licences	0.186	0.000	0.186	0%	0.000	Expenditure to go through in Q3 or Q4.	
Telephony Invest to Save	0.391	0.000	0.391	0%	0.000	Budget expected to be utilised in Q3	
ICT	0.000	0.004	0.000	N/A	0.000		
Priority Service Remediation/Backup Expansion	0.220	0.000	0.220	0%	0.000	Expenditure to be processed towards the end of Q2 or in Q3 due to invoice disputes.	
Corporate							
Accommodation Strategy	1.154	0.000	1.154	0%	0.000		
TOTAL LPP	1.951	0.004	1.951	0.2%	0.000		

CAPITAL MONITORING Q1

ADULTS, HEALTH AND WELLBEING

	Budget at 30-Jun-11	Spend to 30-Jun-11	Projection 31-Mar-12	% Budget Spent	Projected Variance from Budget		
	£m	£m	£m	%	£m	REASONS FOR VARIANCES TO DATE	REASONS FOR PROJECTED VARIANCES
MAINSTREAM PROGRAMME							
Mental health services	0.137	0.032	0.137	23%	0.000		
Safety works	0.000	0.002	0.000	N/A	0.000		
Improving the Care Home Environment for Older People	0.020	0.000	0.000	0%	-0.020		AHWP met its programme objectives without using these resources and therefore the capital commitment is no longer required.
Efficiency Project - System/technology	0.078	0.005	0.057	6%	-0.021	The projected scheme costs are committed. The main items of expenditure are £22k project management costs to be charged in July and an interface being developed that will cost 28k.	A review of the scheme costs has shown that there is likely to be an underspend of £21k.
MAINSTREAM TOTAL	0.235	0.038	0.194	16.1%	-0.041		

CAPITAL MONITORING Q1
DEVELOPMENT & RENEWAL

	Budget at 30-Jun-11	Spend to 30-Jun-11	Projection 31-Mar-12	% Budget Spent	Projected Variance from Budget		
	£m	£m	£m	%	£m	REASONS FOR VARIANCES TO DATE	REASONS FOR PROJECTED VARIANCES
MAINSTREAM PROGRAMME							
Millennium Quarter	0.100	0.029	0.100	29%	0.000	This project is fully financed from Section 106 resources.	Full spend is projected.
Bishops Square	0.150	0.061	0.150	41%	0.000	The D&R element of the Bishops Square Section 106 scheme incorporates a budget of £150,000 in this financial year.	Full spend is projected.
Roman Road Shops	0.050	0.037	0.050	74%	0.000	This project is fully financed from historic Local Authority Business Growth Initiative (LABGI) resources.	Full spend is projected.
St Andrew's Health and Well-Being Centre	5.200	4.777	5.200	92%	0.000	This Section 106 funded scheme to develop a new Health and Well Being Centre on the former St Andrew's Hospital site was approved by Cabinet on 10 March 2010 and 8 June 2011. The first tranche payment was made to the PCT in June 2011, with the final instalment paid in July 2011.	Full spend is projected.
Whitechapel Centre	0.063	0.011	0.063	17%	0.000	This scheme is mainly funded through Big Lottery and ERDF grants. Expenditure is being incurred in accordance with grant conditions and it is anticipated that full spend will be incurred by year-end.	Full spend is projected.
MAINSTREAM TOTAL	5.563	4.915	5.563	88%	0.000		
LOCAL PRIORITIES PROGRAMME							
High Street 2012	3.353	0.422	3.353	13%	0.000	This scheme was initially approved by Cabinet in May 2009, but significant additional resources were secured from external agencies and agreed by Cabinet at the January and March 2010 meetings.	The spend during the financial year is anticipated to be in accordance with budget, however the phasing of the scheme is being reprofiled to ensure that resources carried forward from previous years will be utilised in accordance with grant conditions.
Emergency Property Works Contingency	1.000	0.000	0.000	0%	-1.000	This is a demand led budget. Expenditure for the first three months of the financial year is in accordance with expectations, with outstanding commitments increasing expenditure over the remainder of the year.	
Disabled Facilities Grant	1.000	0.103	1.000	10%	0.000	This is a demand led budget. Expenditure for the first three months of the financial year is in accordance with expectations, with outstanding commitments increasing expenditure over the remainder of the year.	
Genesis Housing Group - Brodlove Lane - Local Authority Grant	0.363	0.000	0.363	0%	0.000	This Local Authority Grant payment to Genesis Housing Group will be fully paid during the current financial year.	Full spend is projected.
Installation of Automatic Energy Meters	0.174	0.000	0.174	0%	0.000	This scheme was commissioned towards the end of 2009-10 with the unutilised resources carried forward. The residual balance is anticipated to be fully spent in the current financial year.	Full spend is projected.
Facilities Management (DDA)	0.574	0.000	0.000	9%	-0.574		
LPP TOTAL	6.464	0.525	4.890	8%	-1.574		
GRAND TOTAL	12.027	5.440	10.453	45.2%	-1.574		

CAPITAL MONITORING Q1
HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT

	Budget at 30-Jun-11	Spend to 30-Jun-11	Projection 31-Mar-12	% Budget Spent	Projected Variance from Budget		
	£m	£m	£m	%	£m	REASONS FOR VARIANCES TO DATE	REASONS FOR PROJECTED VARIANCES
MAINSTREAM PROGRAMME							
Decent Homes Backlog Programme	12.942	0.000	12.942	0%	0.000	Following the Authority's allocation of Decent Homes Funding, Cabinet approved the initial refurbishment programme and the procurement methodology in June 2011. Works are expected to commence in September 2011, with full spend to be incurred in the current financial year in accordance with grant conditions and available resources.	Full spend is projected.
Housing Capital Programme	12.709	1.592	12.709	13%	0.000	The mainstream Housing Capital programme is managed by Tower Hamlets Homes on behalf of the Authority and incorporates work to the Council's own stock. Tower Hamlets Homes closely monitors this budget and the spend to the end of June is approximately in line with the target profile for this stage of the financial year. The initial budget agreed by Cabinet in February 2011 was £6.6 million, however this programme was revised by Cabinet in June 2011 in light of confirmation of available resources, including those carried forward from 2010-11. It is anticipated that all resources will be fully utilised in the current financial year.	Full spend is projected.
Ocean New Deal for Communities	4.900	0.101	4.000	2%	-0.900	This project is funded from mainstream Capital Resources of £4.9m in 2011-12, following the final year of NDC grant entitlement in 2010-11. Minimal expenditure has been incurred to 30 June, however large contract payments are programmed later in the financial year.	A review of the profiling of the scheme payments indicates that an underspend is anticipated in the current financial year, with the resources being carried forward to finance the resulting commitment in 2012-13.
Regional Housing Pot	0.900	0.049	0.900	5%	0.000	Funding of approximately £7.27 million has been secured from the DCLG to facilitate the regeneration of the St Clement's Hospital site and to undertake masterplanning on the Malmesbury and Birchfield Estates. The masterplanning contracts have been let and on-going expenditure will be incurred during 2011-12. Funds are not specific to a particular financial year and delays in respect of decisions on the St Clement's Hospital site mean that resources will be carried forward for utilisation in later years as necessary.	
MAINSTREAM TOTAL	31.451	1.742	30.551	6%	-0.900		
LOCAL PRIORITIES PROGRAMME							
Council Housebuilding Initiative	1.500	0.948	1.500	63%	0.000	This project is funded through a mixture of Government grant, Section 106 receipts and Council resources. The scheme is being managed in accordance with the grant conditions in line with agreed delivery target dates. A review of the project is currently underway following difficulties that have been encountered on-site. The budget profile is being reviewed and will be updated in the second quarter's capital monitoring cycle.	Full spend is projected.
Blackwall Reach	3.500	0.369	4.140	11%	0.640	The Blackwall Reach project represents a £13m commitment over several financial years. Latest estimates are that expenditure of £4,140,000 will be incurred in 2011-12, with the remaining leasehold properties being acquired during 2012-13 and 2013-14. Current indications are that the 2011-12 budget may be exceeded, however this profile is flexible, with resources in place to adapt the profiled expenditure as necessary.	
LPP TOTAL	5.000	1.317	5.640	26%	0.640		
HRA TOTAL	36.451	3.059	36.191	8.4%	-0.260		

CAPITAL MONITORING Q1

BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE (BSF)

	Budget at 30-Jun-11	Spend to 30-Jun-11	Projection 31-Mar-12	% Budget Spent	Projected Variance from Budget		
	£m	£m	£m	%	£m	REASONS FOR VARIANCES TO DATE	REASONS FOR PROJECTED VARIANCES
MAINSTREAM PROGRAMME							
Wessex	0.000	0.025	0.025	N/A	0.025		
St Paul's Way	3.193	0.010	2.500	0%	-0.693	Based on on-site progress	
Bethnal Green Tech. College	0.000	0.003	0.300	N/A	0.300	Based on on-site progress	
Morpeth	6.281	1.161	6.900	18%	0.619	Based on on-site progress	
Oaklands	4.147	0.294	6.296	7%	2.149	Based on on-site progress	
Sir John Cass	5.675	1.826	7.100	32%	1.425	Based on on-site progress	
Ian Mikardo	1.088	0.657	1.100	60%	0.012	Based on projected final account	
Beatrice Tate	2.000	0.002	0.600	0%	-1.400	Fees only in 2011/12	Subject to financial contract close
Bowden House	1.951	0.228	8.418	12%	6.467	Based on on-site progress	
PRU Harpley	2.552	1.691	4.211	66%	1.659	Based on on-site progress	
Swanlea	6.538	0.815	8.869	12%	2.331	Based on on-site progress	
Raines	8.138	0.105	4.682	1%	-3.456	Based on on-site progress	
Central Foundation	8.977	0.030	4.804	0%	-4.173	Based on current on-site start date	Subject to financial contract close
Langdon Park	10.607	0.143	4.261	1%	-6.346	Based on current on-site start date	Subject to financial contract close
Phoenix	3.724	0.067	2.645	2%	-1.079	Based on current on-site start date	Subject to financial contract close
Stepney Green	7.288	0.105	5.421	1%	-1.867	Based on current on-site start date	Subject to financial contract close
Bow Boys	14.500	0.002	2.500	0%	-12.000	Fees only in 2011/12	Subject to financial contract close
New School	0.822	0.000	0.000	0%	-0.822		
George Greens	3.020	0.000	1.100	0%	-1.920	Fees only in 2011/12	Subject to financial contract close
ICT infrastructure schemes	1.100	0.000	5.800	0%	4.700		Based on current financial spend model
Budget reprofiling to reflect actual progress on schemes	-14.000	0.000	0.000	0%	14.000	A full budget reprofiling will be undertaken during the second quarter of the financial year to reflect a full review of the programme updated to incorporate the actual progress of the individual schemes.	
MAINSTREAM TOTAL	77.601	7.162	77.532	9%	-0.069		
LOCAL PRIORITIES PROGRAMME							
Wave 5 BSF	1.100	0.000	1.100	0%	0.000	To be claimed at end of year	
LPP TOTAL	1.100	0.000	1.100	0%	0.000		
GRAND TOTAL	78.701	7.162	78.632	9.1%	-0.069		

This page is intentionally left blank

PI Ref No	PI Description	Previous years' performance				2011/12 Performance				Analysis of performance			
		Actual		Target	Actual	Q1 Actual	Target	Lower Bandwidth Target	Target	Q1 Actual	Within Target Range (RED / GREEN)	Variance (performance against Q1 target)	Direction of Travel (comparing 11/12 and 10/11 Q1 actual)
		2009/10	2010/11	2010/11	2010/11	(June 10/11)	2011/12		(June 11/12)				
	<p>Theme 1: One Tower Hamlets</p> <p>Month Actual: 2009/10 Outturn</p> <p>Target - Aspirational</p> <p>Target - Lowest Performance</p>	Responsible Officer & Directorate											
	<p>Percentage of earners that are LP07 or above of Local Authority staff that are women</p> <p>Measured in: % (This indicator was a former BVPI and is monitored as part of the Council's Workforce to Reflect the Community Strategy)</p> <p>Good Performance: Higher</p> <p>Quarter 1: Performance is below the target range but has marginally improved against last year's year end performance. New initiatives have been agreed as part of the Workforce to Reflect the Community programme, which will be brought into play in order to have a greater medium term impact on this indicator.</p>	Simon Kilbey Resources	51	50	46.34	50	49.8	50	46.41	RED	-7.2% AMBER	↔	
	<p>Percentage of earners that are LP07 or above of Local Authority staff that are from an ethnic minority.</p> <p>Measured in: % (This indicator was a former BVPI and is monitored as part of the Council's Workforce to Reflect the Community Strategy)</p> <p>Good Performance: Higher</p> <p>Quarter 1: Performance is within the target range but has marginally dipped after several months of steady increase, but can change with very small movements in numbers. New initiatives have been agreed as part of the Workforce to Reflect the Community programme, which will be brought into play in order to have a greater medium term impact on this indicator.</p>	Simon Kilbey Resources	17	27	22.23	22	22.23	30	22.37	GREEN	-25.4% RED	↕	
	<p>Percentage of earners that are LP07 or above of Local Authority staff who have a disability (excluding those in maintained schools.)</p> <p>Measured in: % (This indicator was a former BVPI and is monitored as part of the Council's Workforce to Reflect the Community Strategy. Staff who have a disability are those that identify themselves as such in the staff survey, against the definition provided in the Disability Discrimination Act 1995).</p> <p>Good Performance: Higher</p> <p>Quarter 1: Performance has remained constant in the last 2 months of this quarter. Of overall staff at LP07 and above, 3 have currently declared a disability. To reach our target, we would require a total of 8 disabled staff at LP07 and above. Further improvement will rely in part on the rigour of the vacancy management / assurance processes. Additionally, we are due to undertake a staff equality audit which will improve data quality - this may result in more disabled staff identifying themselves to the Council for monitoring purposes. Currently, only 75% of staff overall have informed the Council whether or not they have a disability.</p>	Simon Kilbey Resources	2	5.4	2	2	2	5.5	2	GREEN	-63.6% RED	↕	

PI Ref No	PI Description	Responsible Officer & Directorate	Previous years' performance				2011/12 Performance				Analysis of performance		
			Actual 2009/10	Target 2010/11	Actual 2010/11	Q1 Actual (June 10/11)	Target 2011/12	Lower Bandwidth Target	Target	Q1 Actual (June 11/12)	Within Target Range (RED / GREEN)	Variance (performance against Q1 target)	Direction of Travel (comparing 11/12 and 10/11 Q1 actual)
	<p> </p> <p>Number of working days/shifts lost to sickness absence per employee.</p> <p>Measured in: % (the aggregate of working days lost due to sickness absence irrespective of whether this is self certified, certified by a GP or long term divided by the average number of FTE staff)</p> <p>Good Performance: Lower</p>	Simon Kibbey Resources	8.54	6.5	7.31	8.3	6.5	7.25	6.5	7.17	GREEN	-10.3% RED	↑
<p>A decrease of 0.8 day in the average has been achieved for the month ending June 2011.</p>													
	<p> </p> <p>Customer Access Overall Satisfaction</p> <p>Measured in: %</p> <p>Good Performance: Higher</p>	Claire Symonds Resources	N/A	90	86.8	89.3	92	89	92	91	GREEN	-1.10% AMBER	↑
<p>Performance is within range, and at 91% just slightly below the target of 92%.</p>													
	<p> </p> <p>Variation of projected outturn from budget (+/-)</p> <p>Measured in: £m</p> <p>Good Performance: Lower</p>	Chris Naylor Resources	90	91	90	1,239	0	0	0	1,422	RED	RED	↔
<p>The performance to May 2011 is included as June data is not yet available.</p> <p>All Directorates were forecasting spend to budget except Childrens, Schools and Families - the reason for the variance is that savings targets to achieve £1.7million of savings during 2011/12 are yet to be formalised.</p> <p>Reporting on this goes to Cabinet separately.</p>													

PI Ref No	PI Description	Previous years' performance				2011/12 Performance				Analysis of performance			
		Actual		Actual	Q1 Actual	Lower Bandwidth Target		Target	Q1 Actual	Within Target Range	Variance	Direction of Travel	
		2009/10	2010/11	2010/11	(June 10/11)	2011/12	2011/12	(June 11/12)	(RED / GREEN)	(performance against Q1 target)	(comparing 11/12 and 10/11 Q1 actual)		
	<p>Theme 2: A Great Place to Live</p> <p>Month Actual: 2009/10 Outturn</p> <p>Target - Aspirational</p> <p>Target - Lowest Performance</p>	Responsible Officer & Directorate	Actual 2009/10	Target 2010/11	Actual 2010/11	Q1 Actual (June 10/11)	Target 2011/12	Lower Bandwidth Target	Target	Q1 Actual (June 11/12)	Within Target Range (RED / GREEN)	Variance (performance against Q1 target)	Direction of Travel (comparing 11/12 and 10/11 Q1 actual)
	<p>Net additional homes provided</p> <p>Measured in: Number (the sum of new build completions, minus demolitions, plus any gains or losses through change of use and conversions)</p> <p>Good Performance: Higher</p>	Jackie Odumoye Development & Renewal	2398	2999	1163	92	1605	390	401	34	RED	-91.5% RED	↔
	<p>34 units have been cleared and counted on the London Development Database. This is a provisional outturn only; a large number of net additional units have been completed; however they are currently non reportable via the LDD, due to missing plot level breakdowns. If this information is collected from developers an additional 413 units would be reportable.</p> <p>Although developers are under no legal obligation to provide the Council with detailed completions information, processes are still being strengthened to collect outstanding information from them to maximise the numbers reported. It also worth noting that housing completions are spread out across the year with the majority of completions expected in Q4.</p>												
	<p>Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)</p> <p>Measured in: Number (the sum of social rent housing and intermediate housing - low cost home ownership and intermediate rent)</p> <p>Good Performance: Higher</p>	Jackie Odumoye Development & Renewal	1931	1287	733	116	1231	297	308	326	GREEN	5.8% GREEN	↗
	<p>Quarterly target = 297. 11/12 target range = 1187 - 1231. Performance is above target for Quarter 1, as 326 units of new affordable housing were produced. It is rare for one quarter's figure to match the target exactly as this indicator does not measure a process which provides an even performance across the year. Completed housing units come in batches, as individual building projects complete, and the completion dates are never evenly distributed throughout the year.</p> <p>The forecast is that our annual performance will be comfortably over the higher target figure of 1231. The total predicted output is 2034 units, but as a quantity of these units are scheduled to complete in March 2012, it is likely that some of these will slip into 2012/13. There are 38 different schemes currently on site which are due to deliver units this year and our RSL partners, encouraged by the HCA, will be doing everything they can to ensure completion before 31.3.12.</p>												
	<p>Number of social rented housing completions for family housing (gross figures only)</p> <p>Measured in: Number (a count of the number of affordable housing - local authority, housing associations, and co-operative tenants. Family housing is 3 bedrooms or more)</p> <p>Good Performance: Higher</p>	Jackie Odumoye Development & Renewal	619	405	214	25	390	90	98	100	GREEN	2.04% GREEN	↗
	<p>Quarter 1 target = 90. Projected outturn for 2011/12 is considerably higher than was previously forecast due to a number of schemes which failed to complete by 31.3.11 and therefore unexpectedly fell into the statistics for the 11/12 financial year.</p> <p>Similarly, the target for family housing for affordable rent has achieved the higher of our two possible target figures (90-98), with 100 units of social rented units of 3 bed and larger sizes.</p>												

PI Ref No	PI Description	Previous years' performance				2011/12 Performance				Analysis of performance									
		Actual 2009/10		Actual 2010/11		Target 2011/12		Lower Bandwidth Target		Target		Q1 Actual (June 11/12)		Within Target Range (RED / GREEN)		Variance (performance against Q1 target)		Direction of Travel (comparing 11/12 and 10/11 Q1 actual)	
		2009/10	2010/11	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12	2011/12
Theme 3: A Prosperous Community																			
	<p>16 to 18 year olds who are not in education, employment or training (NEET)</p> <p>Measured in: % Good Performance: Lower</p>	Mary Durkin	6	5.5	5.3	6.4	5	5.3	5	4.6	5	4.6	GREEN	8% GREEN	GREEN	8% GREEN	↑		
	<p>Overall employment rate - working age - Maintain the current gap between the Borough and London average rate (-8.3%) Upper: Reduce the gap to 7.3%</p> <p>(Employment Rate)</p> <p>Measured in: % Good Performance: Employment rate - Higher & Gap - Lower</p>	Nick Smales	(60.4)	(55.7)	(60.3)	(61.7)	(60.7)	(60.4)	(60.7)	(60.7)	7.3	8.3	GREEN	-13.7% RED	GREEN	-13.7% RED	→		
	<p>Lower Hamlets employment rate has been 60.7 since April 2011, compared to the London average of 69.0. The gap has therefore been maintained at 8.3. The Employment Strategy has recently been finalised and is in the process of implementation. This will aim to improve performance on this measure.</p>																		
Theme 4: A Safe and Cohesive Community																			
	<p>Carers receiving needs assessment or review and a specific carer's service, or advice and information</p> <p>Measured in: % (number of carers whose needs were assessed or reviewed by the council in a year who received a specific carer's service, or advice and information in the same year as a percentage of people receiving a community based service in the year) Good Performance: Higher</p>	Deborah Cohen	33.9	30.90	31.3 (Prov)	7.9	35	7.8	7.8	8	7.8	7.8	GREEN	-2.5% AMBER	GREEN	-2.5% AMBER	→		
	<p>Data for this indicator is collated through commissioned service providers. Commission contracts stipulate that monitoring is to be provided one month following the end of the quarter.</p>																		

PI Ref No	PI Description	Responsible Officer & Directorate	Previous years' performance			2011/12 Performance				Analysis of performance			
			Actual 2009/10	Target 2010/11	Actual 2010/11	Q1 Actual (June 10/11)	Target 2011/12	Lower Bandwidth Target	Target	Q1 Actual (June 11/12)	Within Target Range (RED / GREEN)	Variance (performance against Q1 target)	Direction of Travel (comparing 11/12 and 10/11 Q1 actual)
	<p>Month Actual</p> <p>Target - Aspirational</p> <p>2009/10 Outturn</p> <p>Target - Lowest Performance</p>	Andy Bamber Communities, Localities & Culture	2.14	2.0972	1.77	0.52	1.73	0.44	0.43	0.6	RED	-39.5% RED	↗
	<p>Number of most serious violent crimes per 1,000 population</p> <p>Measured in: Number (No. of recorded most serious violent crimes/total population x 1000)</p> <p>Good Performance: Lower</p>	<p>Quarter 1: This measure is off target for the April-June period. However, there are a number of ongoing activities planned to reduce most serious violent crime including the setting up of the Whitechapel Town Centre Team which will include 8 PCs to address cross ward issues with a key focus on violence.</p>											
	<p>Number of serious acquisitive crimes per 1,000 population</p> <p>Measured in: Number (No. of recorded serious acquisitive crimes/total population x 1000)</p> <p>Good Performance: Lower</p>	Andy Bamber Communities, Localities & Culture	20.29	20.09	22.81	5.17	22.58	5.7	5.65	7	RED	-23.9% RED	↗
	<p>Quarter 1: This measure is off target for the April-June period. Resources have been made available during 12011/12 to enable proactive operations to continue to arrest prolific offenders as well as deter opportunistic criminals. Overall target is expected to be met and exceeded at the end of the year.</p>												
Theme 5: A Healthy & Supportive Community													
	<p>Percentage of children becoming the subject of Child Protection Plan for a second or subsequent time</p> <p>Measured in: %</p> <p>Good Performance: Lower</p>	Jenny Boyd Children, Schools & Families	8.03	9-13%	10.16	11.67	7	16	7	0	GREEN	100% GREEN	↗
	<p>Target exceeded</p>												
	<p>Social care clients and carers in receipt of Self Directed Support</p> <p>Measured in: %</p> <p>Good Performance: Higher</p>	Deborah Cohen Adults, Health & Wellbeing	10.7	30	30.7	7.3	90		40.7	39.6	GREEN	-2.7% AMBER	↗

PI Description		Previous years' performance		2011/12 Performance			Analysis of performance	
PI Ref No: PI Description Month Actual Target - Aspirational Target - Lowest Performance		Responsible Officer & Directorate Actual 2009/10 Target 2010/11 Actual 2010/11 Q1 Actual (June 10/11) Target 2011/12		Quarter 1 Target Range Lower Bandwidth Target Target Q1 Actual (June 11/12)			Within Target Range (RED / GREEN) Variance (performance against Q1 target) Direction of Travel (comparing 11/12 and 10/11 Q1 actual)	
Quarter 1 figures are slightly off target, but within the overall target range.								

Agenda Item 10.2

Committee/Meeting: Cabinet	Date: 7 September 2011	Classification: Unrestricted	Report No: CAB 034/112
Report of: Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) Originating officer(s) John S. Williams, Service Head, Democratic Services		Title: Recording/Webcasting Council Meetings Wards Affected: All	

Lead Member	Deputy Mayor, Councillor Ohid Ahmed
Community Plan Theme	One Tower Hamlets
Strategic Priority	Efficient and effective services

1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 On 2nd February 2011 the Council considered a motion concerning recording of future Council meetings and agreed to audio and video record each meeting of the Full Council and to make the recording available online within 48 hours (for the full Council resolution see paragraph 5.1 below)
- 1.2 The Council's resolution relates to an executive matter which has resource implications and it therefore stands in the form of a recommendation to the Executive.
- 1.3 This report identifies the action required to implement the Council's resolution and sets out a number of options for consideration and the resource implications of these.

2. **DECISIONS REQUIRED**

Cabinet is recommended to:-

- 2.1 Consider the four options identified in section 6 of the report in relation to future recording and/or webcasting of Council meetings and decide which of the options should be pursued; and
- 2.2 If option 1 (utilising the existing equipment to implement a basic, low quality service) is the preferred option, to agree that this shall commence immediately subject to the Monitoring Officer agreeing the necessary amendment to the Council's Constitution; or
- 2.3 If option 2 (upgrading of equipment) or option 3 (a full webcasting service) is the preferred option, to agree that the officers report back to the next meeting with a full proposal including the source of funding and tender process for the project.

3. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

- 3.1 The decision above will address the resolution of the Council of 2nd February 2011 and, if option 1, 2 or 3 is agreed, will facilitate implementation of that resolution.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 The report sets out four possible options for consideration at section 6 below.

5. BACKGROUND – THE COUNCIL RESOLUTION

- 5.1 On 2nd February 2011 the Council agreed the following motion:-

“RESOLVED

This Council notes that:

It is able to audibly and visually record council meetings using current technical equipment available in the council chamber.

It is able to record business conducted at Full Council with little or no cost to the taxpayer.

This council believes that:

democracy and accountability are important concepts in order to gain public trust in the decision making in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.

residents should be able to refer to and view council meetings through the use of audio visual equipment.

conduct of Members of the Council will be positively affected by the knowledge that footage is in the public domain.

This Council resolves: -

To audio and video record each meeting of the Full Council to enable reference for members of the public, Council Members and officers and to increase transparency and accountability

To amend the Tower Hamlets Council Constitution, Part 4, Rule 27.1 to read ‘No photography or video or audio recording of any kind by guests and members of the public may take place at any Council Meeting without the express permission of the Chair.’

To introduce to the Tower Hamlets Council Constitution, Part 4, Rule 27.2 to read 'The Council Chamber, whilst the public gallery is open and the Council is conducting its business at the Meeting of the Tower Hamlets Council, will be video and audio recorded by the Council and made available online within 48 hours'.

- 5.2 Because the Council's resolution calls on the authority to take action in relation to an executive matter, it has the status of a recommendation to the Executive (Mayor and Cabinet), for consideration in the light of any resource and other implications.

6. OPTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 6.1 Four options are set out below in respect of the resolution of the Council. In determining which of these, if any, to pursue the Executive will wish to consider the extent to which they will deliver the two main benefits proposed by the Council motion i.e.:-

(a) To enhance transparency of the democratic decision-making process and to enable access to the Council proceedings by residents who would otherwise not attend the meetings; and

(b) To capture a full record of the Council proceedings for future reference in case of any subsequent requirement e.g. to assist in the investigation of a complaint or other enquiry.

Option 1 – use existing equipment

- 6.2 The Council Chamber is already equipped with video cameras, microphones and a processing unit that can capture the proceedings. These have been used in the past to provide audio and video coverage of the proceedings to an overflow area when the public gallery is full, and it would be possible to utilise this equipment at future meetings to produce a video/audio record that could be posted on the Council's website.
- 6.3 However, the system is old and unreliable. The video output is in the form of a split screen of four sections, each fed by a fixed camera which does not follow the debate. The sound quality is poor and is dependent on Members remembering to switch on their microphones – any comments not made into an open microphone will not be recorded. The Council's existing AV contractors have confirmed that 'the better the content gathering package the better the experience for the user ... sound is even less forgiving and if not thought through and designed correctly will give you very poor results and make the experience for the user who is watching on their laptop ... impossible to follow.' In addition, the resulting record provides no indexing or search facility to assist a viewer who may wish to find a particular item or section of the debate rather than view the whole meeting.
- 6.4 There would be some minor resource implications arising from this option – in the main relating to computer consumables to record the meeting and staff

time to oversee this and transfer the file to the website. These could be contained within the existing Democratic Services budget, at least for recording of Council meetings only, subject to other tasks being re-prioritised as necessary.

Option 2 – upgrade existing equipment

- 6.5 A second option would be to upgrade the existing equipment to provide a better quality and more complete record although still using ‘static’ camera(s) and posting a simple video/audio file for viewing on the internet without the addition of an index or search facility.
- 6.6 The Council’s existing contractors have suggested a number of ways in which the Council Chamber installation could be improved. These include the provision of new cameras, microphones and if required direct feed of PC Powerpoint material from the meeting.
- 6.7 These improvements would also have the benefit of improving the quality of sound for persons attending the meeting itself e.g. in the public gallery. However, there would be a one-off financial cost which is estimated at up to £75k for the highest quality option (supply and installation of equipment including ambient microphone pick up to cover the whole room, audio sound processors, three cameras on ‘pan tilt’ and zoom moving heads, a control console and local monitors; but not including any lighting improvements that may be advised). It is likely that a mid-range solution could be identified that would reduce this cost by up to 50% by cutting out features not required.

Option 3 – full webcasting service

- 6.8 The third option would be to contract with a webcasting service provider to record and host webcasts of Council meetings. A number of local authorities including approximately six London boroughs plus the GLA already offer webcasts of their meetings and there are a number of service providers in the market place. Officers have had initial discussion with a number of providers and the Council’s existing AV providers are also able to offer a hosted web application in conjunction with the system improvements at option 2.
- 6.9 Webcasting (‘web broadcasting’) uses streaming technology to distribute video and audio coverage of a meeting/event or other material via the internet. By using webcasting, council meetings can be accessed live (if the Council so decided) or subsequently by anyone with a computer and internet access, anywhere in the world.
- 6.10 A webcasting service would provide additional features to the options set out above. Typically a webcast consists of a video window showing the meeting, with synchronised sound and subtitles to indicate who is speaking. The title of the report or motion under discussion is displayed and the viewer can click on links to the published agenda, presentations, explanatory information and/or speaker biographies. Some services provide for

interactive functions such as viewer comments or surveys – these are particularly relevant where a webcast is used for consultation purposes.

- 6.11 After a live webcast has finished (or following a meeting, if it is not webcast live), the record is loaded into an archive and remains accessible for an agreed period – normally 6 or 12 months. Within this period any viewer can replay all or part of the meeting. When viewing an archived webcast the viewer also has the benefit of pause, rewind and fast-forward functions as well as index points so they can cut straight to a particular discussion item or speaker/speech as required.
- 6.12 Some councils have reported viewing figures of between 1,000 and 2,000 visits per month, with individual meetings attracting anything from 50 to 4-500 viewers. However these are combined figures for live and archived viewings – normally of a range of committee/cabinet meetings as well as the full Council - and the technical limitations of the monitoring process mean that it is not always possible to tell accurately the number of different individuals viewing or what proportion are from within the borough or even internal to the council.
- 6.13 Typically the webcasting service provider would install fixed cameras in the Chamber and would lease to the Council a specialist PC and associated hardware. Three or four cameras would be installed to enable good coverage of the whole meeting including close up shots of the member speaking and wide angle shots as required. Contract fees would be payable from approximately £25k per annum and there would also be some staffing costs.

Option 4 – take no action

- 6.14 A further option would be to take no action in relation to the recording and publication of the Council proceedings.

7. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS AND ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

- 7.1 A brief assessment of the four options is set out below. Cabinet is asked to consider which of these it wishes to pursue. If options 2 or 3 are chosen, the officers will report back to the next meeting with a full proposal on the technical aspects, source of funding and tender process for the project:-

Assessment of option 1: It would be possible, within existing budgets, simply to utilise the existing equipment to record the meeting and then post the resulting files on the website but the resultant record is likely to be of poor quality, possibly incomplete and not user-friendly. Therefore although this option would be an economic way of implementing the Council's resolution, particularly in relation to capturing a record for future reference; in terms of public accessibility and ease of use it is not recommended.

Assessment of option 2: Upgrading the existing equipment would enable a higher quality record of the proceedings to be made for reference purposes

which would also be suitable for publication. It would also improve the experience for those actually attending the meeting. However, there would be a one-off cost estimated at between £35k and £75k; and the published record would still have limited functionality in terms of indexing, search and links to other records etc.

Assessment of option 3: Of the three options, a webcasting service would provide the most flexible and user-friendly means of viewing Council meetings. Depending on the solution chosen (which would need to be subject to tender under the Council's procedure rules), initial set up costs could be low as the equipment could be leased from the service provider rather than purchased. However, there would be ongoing revenue implications in the form of a contract, hosting and lease fee estimated at approximately £25k p.a. or more if additional meetings were webcast in future, and staffing costs as a webcast operator would be required at each meeting in addition to the committee clerk (estimated at approximately £2k p.a. initially).

Assessment of option 4: This option would have the effect of continuing current practice of not recording the Council meetings. This option would be lawful and would give rise to no budgetary implications.

8. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

- 8.1 There is currently no budget provision for recording/webcasting the Council meetings. The report sets out three possible options for taking forward the resolution of the Council on 2nd February 2011 on this matter together with a fourth option, to take no action.
- 8.2 The first option, using existing equipment, would give rise to minimal costs which can be contained within existing budget provision for Democratic Services although there would be some knock-on effect to delivery of other function by that team.
- 8.3 The second option, upgrading the existing equipment would incur one-off set up costs estimated at between £35k and £75k but minimal ongoing costs. In relation to the third option – a full webcasting service which would provide significantly better functionality – initial set up costs would be lower if a leasing option was chosen, but there would be ongoing annual costs of providing the service estimated at a minimum of approximately £27k per year.
- 8.4 If the Cabinet wishes to pursue either option 2 or option 3 therefore, funding will need to be identified of the sums mentioned in the current and/or future years as applicable. The Cabinet will wish to consider whether the benefits are commensurate with these costs and if webcasting is the most effective way of using this resource to open up the democratic process and enhance community engagement with local democracy.

9. CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL SERVICES)

9.1 As noted in the Council's resolution, an amendment to the Council's Constitution will be required to qualify the current prohibition on photography and recording of Council meetings to enable webcasting of those meetings within the agreed webcasting programme.

9.2 Webcasting raises a number of issues in relation to the Human Rights Act and Data Protection Act. Images of members of the public that may be captured by the webcasting are potentially 'personal information' under the DPA. It will be necessary to agree a protocol to ensure that the Council meets its statutory obligations, for example by ensuring that members of the public are made aware that a particular meeting is being webcast and that by remaining in the room they are deemed to have given their consent for any images of themselves that may be taken to be used for broadcast or training purposes within the Council.

9.3 The proposed protocol will also provide for the Democratic Services officer to confirm that webcasting has ceased, once any Camera Resolution for Part 2 of the Agenda has been passed. In addition, Members will be aware that absolute privilege does not apply to council meetings. The protocol will provide for the Chair or Monitoring Officer to cease the webcast if there is a possibility of inappropriate material being transmitted.

10. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

10.1 Webcasting is one way of opening up access to the democratic decision-making process for residents who for whatever reason are unable or unwilling to attend meetings in the Town Hall and therefore has the potential to reach groups of residents who are currently not engaged in that process.

11. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

11.1 Webcasting will enable residents who wish to do so, to view meetings from home. This may decrease the need for journeys by car or public transport, thereby reducing the impact of such journeys on the environment.

12. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 There are no direct risk management implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

13. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

13.1 There are no direct crime and disorder reduction implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended)
List of “Background Papers” used in the preparation of this report

Brief description of “background papers”	Name and telephone number of holder and address where open to inspection.
E-mails of 3 August and 4 August 2011 from AVM ltd to LBTH.	John S. Williams Tel: 020 7364 4204 Mulberry Place, E14 2BG

Agenda Item 14

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank