

Item 5.1 - Children's Services Improvement – Progress report quarter 2	Responses
<p>At its October Meeting, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee requested and has since received information on the following queries:</p> <p>1. <b>“Looked after Children”</b>: What information are we collecting on Looked After Children that informs the Council (as their corporate parent):</p> <p><b>a. How many “Looked after Children” there are in the borough?</b></p> <p><b>b. Their School Attainment</b></p>	<p>Children’s Social Care staff use the Frameworki case management system to track all children they are involved with. For Looked After Children, they record information about the legal status and placement of the child e.g. whether they are under a Care Order, and whether they are in a Foster Care. This information is managed by the Child Placement Team and allows CSC managers to track the number of LAC placements at any point in time. As at the end of November 2017 there were 312 Looked After Children in the care of Tower Hamlets.</p> <p>The Virtual School collects and works with a large number of indicators which could be useful to the OSC.</p> <p>These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall attainment of children at different key stages. (This is for children in care and for children in care+ for 1 yr. + in care).</li> <li>• The progress from starting points of children at different key stages. E.g. From KS2 to KS4.</li> <li>• The current attainment and progress of children each term. This is recorded in their Pupil Education Plan by the schools.</li> </ul>

It must be stressed this data can be very inaccurate as it comes from so many different sources.

- Targets for attainment and progress which are tracked each term via the Pupil Education Plan. The Virtual School uses a “flight path” system set aspirational targets and spot declining attainment.
- In addition we also monitor the attendance of all students on a daily, termly and annual basis via Welfare Call.
- Our attendance monitor also records rates of exclusion and absence from school for children in care.
- Each week the Virtual School produces a list of children currently NOR – Not on roll awaiting a school place.

The OSC should also be aware that the following data is required prior to an OFSTED inspection. We produce this regularly to be OFSTED ready.

Data for children in care is collected officially in the new Nexus Database. This went live last year. Currently 2017 data is not yet available and lags behind school data. This is because it needs to be matched to social care data. Pupil level data is expected for January. Nexus will eventually have national and regional comparison data this is expected for March 2018.

Other areas of data which are of use are:

- SEND levels in the year
- % of PEPs completed to standard, we rate these Green, Amber and Red each term.





**Non digital communications:** How are we communicating with the digitally excluded, for example, can regular publications be published and a Mayoral suggestions box be set up?

when the lead petitioner can expect to receive a formal response to it.

For petitions related to a specific Council Directorate – these are sent to the relevant Directorates after which petitioners will get a written response within 28 days from submission of the petition (i.e. from the date the petition closes).

For petitions that are being presented to Council or a Committee meeting – this is dependent on when the meeting is to be held relative to the date the petition was submitted. Following discussion at the meeting the relevant Directorate may be asked to respond in writing covering anything not picked up at the meeting within 28 days of receipt, but this will also depend on the circumstances of the specific petition.

While there has been push over recent years to go digital wherever possible, the Council continues to publish key information and Council business through a quarterly publication – ‘Our East End.’ It is also required to provide access to key services such as planning, benefits and so on via an alternative medium – print materials are available from public Council sites across the borough such as One Stop Shops.

Borough campaigns and events are also publicised through wider mediums such as billboards and print materials in public spaces. The Mayor has also held 10 ‘Ask the Mayor’ events, which are open to the public to raise any issues/questions they may have. In addition, the Mayor’s office takes a number of enquiries on a daily basis via telephone and through writing.

The aim of the Digital Inclusion Strategy was also to upskill residents so that they are better able to engage with online services and materials. A training programme was delivered as part of this to begin to address this.

<p><b>Item 5.3 – Establishment of Group Training Association for Construction Training</b></p>	
<p><b>Construction Training:</b> 5.22 Have any potential pop-up training sites within Tower Hamlets been identified?</p>	<p>‘Pop up’ sites in general are by their very nature reliant on demand, the nature of the site; and will be time limited. Discussions by Officers with developers and contractors in the borough to establish construction “pop-ups” are on-going, but the use of a particular site is very much dependant on the stage of build, the nature of the training required and the length of time before the space is required to enable construction to take place. WorkPlace have recently utilised a “pop-up” site on the Ballymore London City Island Development to deliver a successful pre-apprenticeship programme for electricians and plumbers; a more formal “pop-up” has been established by Keepmoat in Old Ford Road, which is currently delivering an entry into construction course for women funded by WorkPath. At present, talks are underway with Hills and their sub-contractor Corbyn at Fish Island to support delivery of general operative training, which will hopefully commence delivery in the new year when the highlighted space becomes available. Pop up sites are beneficial to deliver elements of training locally and alongside on site work and will form part of the delivery structure.</p>
<p><b>Item 5.6 – Removal of Nuisance and Illegally Parked Vehicles</b></p>	
<p><b>Nuisance/Illegally Parked Vehicles</b>  This issue has been raised twice in recent weeks at OSC, which remains concerned that the current arrangements are not satisfactory. What action is being taken about abandoned vehicles, particularly on private land (including housing providers’ land), which become a magnet for criminal activity / ASB?</p>	<p>Officers have responded to this issue at O&amp;S but are happy to come back to a future meeting.</p>

Item 5.7 – IDF Approval of allocation of CIL and s106 funding and approval for the adoption of capital budget for certain projects	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this project also looking at other bridges required, including the Millwall Cut Bridge and a 3rd bridge across South Quay, which will be required in a few years' time</li>   <li>• Is this bridge to be fixed or movable like the current bridge to allow ships/boats through?</li>   <li>• Why is CIL being used given the large amounts of S106 collected locally for this bridge?</li>   <li>• Can we have a list of S106 monies collected (either already in the bank or planned) by project i.e. PA/13/01606 for a South Dock bridge.</li> </ul>	<p>The current project focuses on the delivery of the South Dock Bridge only and is based on the IoD – South Dock Bridges Feasibility Study (May 2016). This identifies a strong business case for a new walking and cycling link across South Dock, to support the large amount of development coming forward in the South Quay area and to relieve pressure on the existing Wilkinson Eyre Bridge.</p> <p>Upon completion of the construction of South Dock Bridge, the Infrastructure Planning Team will undertake a benefits review of the outcomes of the project. This will help inform the next phase of improving walking and cycling links across South Dock, including possibly the future replacement of the Wilkinson Eyre Bridge (as recommended in the feasibility study) as a potential second phase. It is considered unlikely however building a third bridge will offer value for money.</p> <p>A potential Millwall Cut Bridge is not part of the scope of the South Dock Bridges project to date.</p> <p>The IOD - South Dock Bridges Feasibility Study (May 2016) identified that the bridge is required to be movable and will open to allow ships/boats through.</p> <p>The triggers for payment of the S106 associated with the South Dock Bridge have not been reached so the Council has not yet received the contributions.</p> <p>The South Dock Bridge Project is aligned with the agreed Heads of Terms (HoT) for the Deed creating Planning Obligations and undertakings for the development at South Quay Plaza</p>

(PA/14/00944).

The agreement for development at South Quay Plaza dated 30th March 2015 obliged the developer to pay the Council £480,965 to be spent 'towards the provision of a Pedestrian Footbridge within the Site'. In accordance with the S106 agreement, the contribution will be paid on the earlier of:

- Transfer of the first Residential Property
- Agreement of the Pedestrian Footbridge Zone by the Council, Berkeley Homes Ltd, and the Canal & River Trust (CRT)
- The expiry of five years from the date of Planning Permission, i.e. 30/03/2020

None of these triggers have yet been reached so the Council has not yet received this contribution. Nonetheless, it is highly likely the Council will receive the contribution by 30/03/2020 at latest, given the third provision regarding a five year trigger date outlined above.

The South Dock Bridge Project is also aligned with the agreed HOT for the Deed creating Planning Obligations and undertakings for the development at 1 Bank Street (PA/14/02617).

This agreement has secured £250,000 as a 'Sustainable Transport Contribution' which can be spent on this project. The agreement specifies that 'The Owner shall pay the Sustainable Transport Contribution to the Council on the earlier of the Occupation Date or the second anniversary of the implementation of the At Grade Work whichever comes sooner'.

This development remains to be commenced and so the contribution is not yet available.



- Planning Permission requirement: Planning permission for South Quay Plaza was granted on the basis that they must provide a bridge landing point. Why do we need a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) or is it Canal and River Trust and Canary Wharf Group who are targets of CPO?
- Ownership of land in the area is pretty simple with few landowners why do we need land ownership assessment - can we buy land registry for £6 per site?

Initial CPO advice is being sought in case lease agreements for land/water space cannot be secured with any of the multiple landowners. If this were to be the case, then a Compulsory Purchase Process would need to be undertaken for the necessary land and water space, not just the bridge landing point on South Quay Plaza.

The Land Ownership Assessment will help officers to identify all the landowners in and around the site. The Council's Asset Management team are currently undertaking the Landownership Assessment and to date around 224 relevant titles in the area; 24 free hold, and 200 lease hold have been identified. Undertaking this work in-house has assured a lower cost (around £1,350). However, an external company may need to be procured to identify unregistered titles.

All the landowners in the area will be notified of the project during the proposed public consultation for the bridge.

Millennium Quarter Master Plan or the Pan Peninsula S106 has some detailed engineering diagrams for a bridge; does the project team have copies of all of the files from previous attempts to build a bridge as may

Officers are locating and utilising all information available to inform the detailed design work for the bridge currently underway.

<p>save time and money?</p> <p>Can we have a copy of this report: M:\INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING\IP INFRA PROJECTS\IoD - South Dock Bridges\SD Feasibility &amp; Design Study\Phase 1 Feasibility\Outputs &amp; Reports\Phase 1 Report - Final Version</p>	<p>The feasibility study cannot be distributed via email due to its large size; however hard copies can be made available for Members.</p>
<p><b>Item 5.8 - Consultations on a new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule and submission for examination</b></p>	
<p>Question - Appendix B makes reference to a number of appendices but they are not attached. Are they available? 5.8b Appendix B - Viability Study (no appendices)</p>	<p>The appendices referred to are so large as to be impractical to form part of the Cabinet Agenda Pack. The papers included in the Cabinet Agenda Pack summarise the evidence included in the appendices in question and include all the conclusions derived from the appendices.</p> <p>The full documentation will be available on the Council's website from the commencement of the public consultation.</p>
<p>Question - Although Project Stone is now dead why is northern and eastern Cubitt Town in Zone 2 and not Zone 1. Project Stone price per square meter assumptions were comparable to other Zone 1 properties based on leaked documents</p>	<p>The rates applied and the location of zone boundaries are required to be based on economic viability assessment. The rates and zones applied are a direct result of the assessment and advice from the Council's independent economic viability consultant, BNP Paribas Real Estate.</p> <p>CIL will apply to new build property and therefore it is sales value evidence that is most relevant.</p> <p>The CIL rates set can be influenced by the availability of new build sales rate information in an area. If further evidence of sales values is available, Officers would welcome the submission of evidence relating to this question and would certainly consider it as part of the consultation process.</p>

<b>Item 5.9 - Neighbourhood Planning: Isle of Dogs</b>	
<p>The Committee is seeking confirmation that the decision the Cabinet is taking with regard to this Neighbourhood Plan is procedural and that agreement to its submission does not imply support by the Council for the contents of the Plan?</p>	<p>Yes, the legislation and regulations are clear that at the submission stage, the Council must progress to consultation and examination any Neighbourhood Plan which meets the procedural submission requirements. These requirements are laid out in legislation (paragraph 6 of Schedule 4B of the TCPA 1990). Further information is provided in paragraph 5.7 of the report.</p> <p>The Council will also be responding to the consultation to outline its views on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<b>Item 5.13 - Corporate Directors' Decisions</b>	
<p>The Committee has queries whether the projects listed under the £190,000 Adoption of capital estimates to continue the delivery of the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) at Ann Sutcliffe Place is correct as some have been previously reported to the Strategic Development Committee as being complete several years ago?</p>	<p>Written response to be provided.</p>