

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE GRANTS SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON MONDAY, 3 JULY 2017**

**MP702, 7TH FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT,  
LONDON E14 2BG.**

**Members Present:**

Councillor Andrew Wood (Chair)  
Councillor Ayas Miah (Member)  
Councillor Clare Harrisson (Member)  
Councillor Candida Ronald (Member)  
Margherita De Cristofano (Co-Optee)

**Others Present:**

Gemma Cossins TH CVS

**Officers Present:**

Mohammed Ahad	Community Programmes Officer, Third Sector Team
Mahbulul Anam	Interim Strategic Project Manager - Whitechapel Vision, Place
Zena Cooke	Corporate Director, Resources
Emily Fieran-Reed	Service Manager, Community Cohesion, Engagement and Commissioning, Strategy, Policy and Equality
Paul Greeno	Senior Corporate and Governance Lawyer, Legal Services
Muhibul Hoque	Strategy, Policy and Performance Officer
Beth Haley Jepson	Whitechapel Delivery Project Support Officer
Abdul J. Khan	Sustainable Development Manager, Strategy Innovation & Sustainability, Development and Renewal
Carrie Kilpatrick	Deputy Director for Mental Health and Joint Commissioning
Christine McInnes	Divisional Director, Education and Partnership, Children's

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Shafi Ahmed.

### **1.1 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR THIS MEETING**

Councillor Andrew Wood put himself forward as the Chair of this meeting and Councillor Candida Ronald and Councillor Clare Harrisson seconded the appointment.

The Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee **AGREED** to appoint Councillor Andrew Wood as Chair for the meeting.

### **2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR**

Councillor Clare Harrisson put herself forward to be vice-chair of the sub-committee. Her nomination was seconded by Councillors Andrew Wood, Candida Ronald and Ayas Miah.

The Sub-Committee **AGREED** to appoint Councillor Clare Harrisson as vice-chair of the sub-committee.

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Clare Harrisson declared non-pecuniary interest in item 8.1 stating that Oxford House was situated in her ward and she was familiar with the organisation.

### **4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes from the 23<sup>rd</sup> March and 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2017 were approved to be an accurate record of the meeting.

### **5. GRANTS SCRUTINY SUB COMMITTEE REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **5.1 Terms Of Reference, Quorum, Membership And Dates Of Meetings**

Councillor Wood referred members of the Sub-Committee to the Terms of Reference, Quorum, Membership and dates of meetings report. He stated the report was for noting and said it was useful for Members to be reminded of the purpose and responsibilities of the Sub-Committee.

Members confirmed they were happy for future meetings to commence at 6:30 p.m.

The Grants Overview and Scrutiny Sub-Committee **NOTED** the report.

## 6. CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

The Sub-Committee noted that no public submissions had been submitted to the Clerk by the deadline. (5pm the day before the meeting).

## 7. GRANTS DETERMINATION SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION

### 7.1 Exercise of Discretions / Individual Mayoral Decision

There were no Exercise of Discretions/Individual Mayoral Decisions to report back to the Sub-Committee.

### 7.2 Royal London Hospital Meanwhile Use Community Garden

Beth Harley-Jepson, Project Support Officer for Whitechapel Vision Delivery team presented her report relating to the release of £40,222 of section 106 resources to Core Landscapes to relocate and establish their community garden project in Whitechapel.

The project will bring an innovative community garden at Royal London Hospital where everything is container grown to withstand moves to new locations, an innovative showcase of meanwhile space for community benefit.

Members of the Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee asked the following questions:

- Where is the charity presently located?
- Is the cost mentioned just the cost of moving?
- What is the duration of the lease at the new location?
- What types of communities will the charity target and reach out to?
- A map showing the size and scale of the garden would have been useful.
- Were other locations considered?
- Is Bart's Trust contributing financially to the project?
- Will the site be accessible for deliveries, given it sits on an intersection?
- Is there a caveat in the contract that says the project stays in Tower Hamlets?
- What links can be made with Queen Mary University's life-sciences project in terms of benefits to the university, research and patients?
- How is the project being evaluated?

The Sub-Committee **AGREED** to endorse the recommendation contained within the report and asked their comments be reported to the Grants Determination Sub-Committee.

### 7.3 **Mental Health User Led Grants Programme - review of allocations for 2017-2018**

Carrie Kilpatrick, Commissioning Manager, Health, Adults and Community Directorate informed members the 2016/17 Tower Hamlets User led Grants (ULG) programme was approved to fund 31 user led groups to provide social and therapeutic activities that promote social inclusion, well-being, and independence for people with mental health problems aged over 18. User led groups are at the heart of the Council's strategy to develop services that give more choice and control to service users.

She referred members to page 35 and the recommendation to provide an additional £16,672 for year 2017/18 to the groups listed in the table.

Members of the Grant's Scrutiny Sub-Committee asked the following questions:

- Referring to page 36, of the 31 groups 24 met the required conditions. What is being done to build capacity because the number of groups has reduced?
- Of the 7 groups which did not meet the criteria, was money paid to them? If so was any money returned?
- Is mentoring provided to the user led groups?
- In reference to Appendix A, page 53 more information about the groups is needed.
- Are the projects evaluated and if so are the outcomes based on health outcomes?

Members of the Sub-Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** the recommendation contained within the report. Members asked their comments be reported to the Grants Determination Sub-Committee.

### 7.4 **Schools Energy Retrofit Programme**

Abdul Khan, Service Manager for Energy and Sustainability informed Members his team was seeking a budget of £240,000 in order to pilot a project to support schools across the Borough to reduce energy consumption and resulting carbon dioxide emissions. The funds would be section 106 fund from the Carbon Offset Fund.

Abdul stated the project would be looking to install energy efficient measures into schools that will reduce their energy consumption, carbon emission and costs. He said there would be an open application process for schools to apply for funding for retrofit projects.

Members of the Sub-Committee asked the following questions:

- This is a worthwhile initiative and will assist schools. Energy efficiency needs to part of the building process especially for those schools which have been newly built
- Can PFI built schools also apply for funding?
- Is support to be provided to schools after the initial process of applying for funding?
- How many schools are you looking to support in the first phase?
- Would £30,000 be sufficient for schools in older Victorian buildings? Is this amount enough to cover the cost of lighting upgrades, for example?
- How does this project link with the Mayor of London's Air Quality Initiative?
- Would some schools need encouragement to apply?
- How are you to achieve economies of scale if schools can use their own contractors to deliver the energy efficiencies?

The Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** to endorse the recommendations contained within the report and asked their comments be reported to the Grants Determination Sub-Committee.

#### **7.5 MSG Quarterly Performance Monitoring Report (Jan- Mar 2017)**

Zena Cooke, Corporate Director for Resources, presented the quarterly performance report relating to the Main Stream Grant (MSG) Project for September 2015 through to August 2018.

The programme is made up of 5 broad themes covering a range of activities and services:

Project performance for this period (January to March 2017) shows there are 5 Red rated projects and 1 Amber rated project.

Zena informed members the Council was in the process of procuring and testing a 'web based' software which would enable users to interactively engage and find out how much was awarded to each project and how organisations were performing.

Members of the Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee asked the following questions:

- **Children's Education Group** – this organisation has been on its last warning for some time. What are the issues and when is the final cut-off date for warnings?  
*The Council has corresponded with the organisation and is waiting for them to sign the 'Head of Terms' before they can move from the Red rating. In the meantime no monies have been made available to the organisation.*

- **Cubitt Town Bangladeshi Cultural Association** - Can you explain what the significant variations are?  
*It is in relation to reducing targets. We have consulted Community Languages as to if they will be providing value for money, for the amount paid.*
- In reference to page 77, could you explain why the Grant Amount and Amount Paid vary?
- In reference to page 71, point 3.20 and 3.21 it states “Trustees are not permitted to share the building.” What is the reason for this?
- With respect to page 77, first line it appears a large amount of money has been expended for 5 learners to enter exams. More context and information is required, in order to analyse the progress made by the organisations.

The Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** for the report to be discussed further by the Grant’s Determination Sub-Committee at its meeting of 10<sup>th</sup> July 2017.

## 7.6 Community Benefit Rent Reduction Policy Review

Emily Fieran-Reed, Service Manager for Community Cohesion, Engagement and Commissioning informed Members the Council was seeking to undertake further work to identify its community buildings portfolio. The scope is to extend the review to also include building occupied by VCS organisations exclusively either on a tenancy basis or on peppercorn rent agreements.

Emily referred Members to point 3.1 of the report which set out the main points arising and point 3.4 which stated the initial review had included 74 buildings.

Members of the Sub-Committee made the following comments and questions:

- This is a positive piece of work. There also needs to be a review of commercial buildings to ensure agreements are audited and the right relationships are in place.
- Lessons need to be learnt from the initial tranche to ensure community groups on the premises are involved and our approach is adjusted accordingly.
- TRA’s would need to be engaged especially as some TRA may believe their rent for their community space is being paid by the service charge paid by renters.

The Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** to endorse the recommendations contained within the report and asked their comments be reported to the Grants Determination Sub-Committee.

## **7.7 Grants Determination Sub-Committee Forward Plan**

Cllr Wood asked Members to **NOTE** the forward plan for the Grant's Determination (Cabinet) Sub-Committee.

## **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT**

### **8.1 Grant Support to Oxford House (Bethnal Green)**

Zena Cooke, Corporate Director for Resources explained the Heritage Lottery Fund had approved funding for the Oxford House project and the Council was to match fund £250K of Section 106 monies for the project. She referred Members to point 4.1 of the report which gave a breakdown of the total cost of the project.

Members of the Sub-Committee made the following comments and asked:

- Will the section 106 monies be in addition to the cost outlined at 4.1?
- What contingency plans were in place if the project was not delivered to budget and time?
- Which section 106 pot is the money coming from? Would be helpful to see the IDB report.

The Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** to endorse the recommendations contained within the report and asked their comments be reported to the Grants Determination Sub-Committee.

### **8.2 School Clothing Grants: 2017/18 Academic Year**

Christine McInnes, Service Head for Education and Partnerships apologised for the lateness of the report. She explained the report was seeking a budget of 201K for the School Clothing Grant 2017/18. The grant would assist those families in need, in order to pay for school clothing.

Members of the Sub-Committee asked the following questions:

- Can the criteria, for who is entitled to the grant be made clear? Some constituents who receive 'working tax credit' have been refused the grant.
- How are you making families aware of the clothing Grant and have you informed parents this is available to them?

- What is the take up for the grant? Can analysis be provided showing the number of beneficiaries to families in receipt of Benefits?
- How has the sum of £110 (point 3.1) been reached? Is this arbitrary. Would be useful to know when this was last reviewed.

The Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** to endorse the recommendations contained within the report and asked their comments be reported to the Grants Determination Sub-Committee.

The meeting ended at 8.00 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Andrew Wood  
Grants Scrutiny Sub-Committee