

<b>Agenda Item – 6.3a App1 - Adults Safeguarding Annual Report 2018</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Page 13 Safeguarding Adults Review –</p> <p>Q.1 How many people died while under the care of LBTH in the last year from other than natural causes or where a Coroner's Inquest was required? We have number of child deaths in Children's report but not similar data for Adult Social Care.</p> <p>Q.2 How many Reports to Prevent Future Deaths" aka Regulation 28 reports issued for people in LBTH care in last year. Where can we find reports?</p>	<p>Q.1 LBTH and the Safeguarding Adults Board is not informed of all adult deaths in the same way as we are informed of all child deaths in the borough. However, each agency represented on the Safeguarding Adult Board would typically be informed of a death if involved in providing services to that individual.</p> <p>Each agency is expected to refer cases that might require a Safeguarding Adult Review to the Safeguarding Adults Board, and part of the role of the Board is to encourage these referrals. In order to progress to a Safeguarding Adult Review, certain criteria must be met in terms of whether the adult was deemed to have been at risk, if abuse or neglect is known or suspected and if there may have been multi-agency failings. The death can be of natural or other than natural causes and some Safeguarding Adult Reviews are carried out in cases which do not involve a death. Safeguarding Adult Reviews are primarily about learning across the multi-agency safeguarding partnership.</p> <p>In 2017-18, three of the six cases referred met the threshold for a Safeguarding Adult Review and three cases did not. For cases that do not meet the threshold, it is for each responsible agency to carry out their own review of lessons learned.</p> <p>In addition to Safeguarding Adult Reviews, it may be useful to note that there is now a requirement for the</p>

death of every person with a learning disability to be subject to a health-led Learning Disability Mortality Review so that lessons can be learned to make service improvements. 14 of these took place in 2017-18.

These reviews may or may not result in a referral for a Safeguarding Adult Review. The process is led by the Tower Hamlets NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) jointly with the Council and findings are reviewed by the Safeguarding Adult Board. Both Safeguarding Adult Reviews and Learning Disability Mortality Reviews can look at deaths that were of natural or other than natural causes.

Safeguarding Adults Reviews have executive summaries which are published on our website and most review documents are available on request. In future reviews will be published as part of a national repository of Safeguarding Adult Reviews. Details of each review completed are included in the annual safeguarding report which is widely circulated and presented to the Council's Cabinet each year.

Q2. No adult Prevention of Future Deaths reports were sent to LBTH in 2017-18. One has been published since then in June 2018 and can be found [here](#) or by visiting [www.judicary.uk](http://www.judicary.uk). The case it refers to is subject to a themed review on isolation. This will be described in the 2018-19 Safeguarding Annual Report next year.

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 31 OCTOBER 2018

	In addition, we are interested in learning from all local Prevention of Future Deaths reports and we are looking into how best to do this through the Safeguarding Adult Board Executive.
<b>Agenda Item – 6.4a - App1 - Children's Safeguarding Board Annual Report</b>	
Questions	Response
<p>Page 17 21 “potential victims of trafficking” were referred to the National Crime Agency</p> <p>Q Is there any follow up information on the outcome?</p>	<p>All of these 21 cases continue to receive a level of support from either children’s services or adults services. The care and intensity of support varies depending on the level of continuing need.</p>
<p>Page 17 28 child deaths were reported in the year of which 10 were unexpected deaths</p> <p>Q 1. Where any children who died under the supervision of LBTH?</p> <p>Q 2. Where any subject to any kind of Reports to Prevent Future Deaths” aka Regulation 28 report?</p>	<p>By the term ‘under the supervision of LBTH’ I am assuming this means in receipt of services from children’s services as a child in need, subject to child protection or a child looked after.</p> <p>Q1 – a number of children whose death were expected would have been in receipt of support from children with disabilities services, including schools</p> <p>Q2 – no Regulation 28 reports was issued by the Coroner in 2017-18 period</p>
<p>Page 32 Appendix 3 – LSCB Operational Board – Agency Representative Attendances for 2017-18</p> <p>Q why did so many LBTH departments not attend the quarterly meetings?</p>	<p>The Tower Hamlets Safeguarding Children Board is extremely important and when Board members cannot attend, a substitute attends in their place and reports back on key actions to be taken forward.</p>

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 31 OCTOBER 2018

<b>Agenda Item – 6.6      High Streets &amp; Town Centre Strategy 2017-2022</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>The strategy covers existing high streets/town centres. What consideration has been given to the lack of high streets/town centres in other areas of Tower Hamlets?</p>	<p>The approach and priorities set out in the High Streets &amp; Town Centres (HS&amp;TC) Strategy (2017-2022) links to priorities set out in a number of corporate strategies and policy documents, including the Draft Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031, within which Policy S.TC1 Supporting the Network of Hierarchy of Centres, sets out the new hierarchy of centres within Tower Hamlets..</p> <p>In order to deliver meaningful improvements to the competitiveness and performance of our key local high streets, the HS&amp;TC Strategy has prioritised and focused on our main centres and destination high streets where street markets are located including: the Major Centre of Canary Wharf, the borough's nine designated District Town Centres and the two destination high streets of Columbia Road and Middlesex Street.</p> <p>The Council's regular reviews of the commercial offer on high street areas across the borough, along with there-classification and/or re-drawing of the boundary of these centres, will be reflected in the regular review of the HS&amp;TC Strategy and in-turn the prioritising of programmes of work.</p>
<p>Q.1. Most of that growth is not near the key high streets mentioned in paragraph. Most of the growth is in the city fringe in Aldgate, Poplar River Zone and the Isle of Dogs. How does this strategy provide support for high growth areas like Marsh Wall &amp; Millharbour &amp; Leamouth where large volumes of new</p>	<p>As described above, the HS&amp;TC Strategy derives its focus from the Draft Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 and focuses on our main town centres and destination high streets where our street markets are located.</p>

## PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 31 OCTOBER 2018

commercial space is being delivered but with no mention in report? What about grocery store provision? How do we encourage retailers like Aldi & Lidl to enter market here?

Q.2 Who is the Crossharbour Neighbourhood Forum? I have never heard of them before?

The Council is aware of the growth in other areas such as Aldgate and the South Quay area and recognises that there is a growing customer base in these areas which established centres, including Canary Wharf, Chrissp Street, Whitechapel and Brick Lane and the destination high street of Middlesex Street, can benefit from.

The HS&TC Strategy aims to maximise the competitiveness of the current centres and diversity of the overall offer in the borough's designated town centres and destination high streets.

The Council's regular reviews of the commercial offer on local high streets in the borough may result in a reclassification of these areas and/or a re-drawing of the boundaries of centres over the period of the Strategy. Any changes in the hierarchy of centres will be taken on board in the annual review of the HS&TC Strategy. With regards to grocery store provision, as noted within the HS&TC Strategy, over 90% of our high street businesses are independent retailers and the size of many of the retail units on the high street are too small to be of interest to national multiples. The Council will work with developers in growth areas to encourage inward investment from national chains where this is feasible and would add to the existing offer.

The Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Forum's area of focus includes Crossharbour Town Centre – the title of the Neighbourhood Forum in the strategy will be changed before it is published.

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 31 OCTOBER 2018

Agenda Item 6.8 Waste Management Delivery Options	
Questions	Response
<p>The Risk Log identifies that there will be an impact on Corporate Services for bring the waste service in-house. What is the year-on-year cost of this to Corporate Services?</p> <p>3.5 Recently a number of Local Authorities have taken the decision to bring their waste service and/or street cleansing provision back in house. This includes Slough Borough Council 2018 etc.</p> <p>Q 1. Have we undertaken any due diligence on how the transfer process worked in the other Boroughs which have already made the change?</p> <p>Q 2. Any evidence from these other Boroughs on the success of the transfer in terms of quality of service?</p> <p>Q 3. Any evidence from these other Boroughs on the success of the transfer in terms of cost?</p>	<p>A year on year cost calculation for the impact on Corporate Services because we believe the risk/amount to be minimal. The service has built in costs for dedicated HR support to manage employee issues.</p> <p>The other impacts e.g. where adding 300 people to payroll, finance to manage an additional budget, maybe elements of project support etc. will add to what is managed corporately but not expected to incur additional cost. This risk is on the log but not a significant risk.</p> <p>1) Officers whilst producing this report have been working with LB Hackney who brought their service back in house in 2003, and had some contact with other councils who have been through the process or are at a similar stage. The intention is to work with these councils to ensure all lessons learnt are incorporated into our pre mobilisation planning.</p> <p>2) The work with LB Hackney has shown it is possible to improve the quality of services by bringing the service in house whilst reducing costs. The transfer of services in house does not determine success or quality, but other boroughs are finding that managing In-house is allowing them to make the improvements that they want to make.</p> <p>Officers undertook performance analysis for Street Cleansing, Recycling and Waste Minimisation for</p>

	<p>Tower Hamlets, LB Newham, LB Islington and LB Hackney, all of which have In-house service. The results are attached and shows mixed performance for Tower Hamlets against the other boroughs compared.</p> <p>3) Hackney decided to bring their refuse and street cleansing services back in house and saved £3 million per annum in the process. In 2011 Hackney brought its recycling service back in house from the private sector, saving £1 million a year. They have since integrated their estate and street cleansing services, saving a further £1 million. The savings were made through improving the efficiency of services by setting sensible but challenging productivity levels. The performance of staff and the service generally was made a priority</p>
<b>Agenda Item – 6.9 Additional Licensing Scheme for Houses of Multiple Occupation</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
Without enforcement, what evidence is there to support the effectiveness of such licensing schemes?	<p>The private rented sector, of which HMOs form part, has undergone significant growth. It is now the second largest tenure in the UK and houses around 4.3 million households in England. It is suggested that licensing larger HMOs has led ‘rogue’ landlords to focus their operations on smaller HMOs.</p> <p>Although there are varying views on the effectiveness of licensing, the Government believes that it has helped “tackle overcrowding and poor property management.”</p>

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 31 OCTOBER 2018

	Licensing schemes set the basic standards that landlords need to achieve and renters can expect. As within any commercial activity there are those that abide by the rules and those that do not. The effectiveness of the scheme would be weakened without appropriate enforcement of the standards.
<b>Agenda Item – 6.14 - Approval to consult on a new Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
Will an increase in CIL levels have an impact on the affordable housing viability assessments?	Response provided following the Cabinet meeting.
6.14c – Appendix C - Supporting Evidence and Funding Gap	Response provided following the Cabinet meeting.
6.13 Residual Funding Gap £596 million	
Q. this gap does not include the 68 un-costed projects mentioned in para 6.4 so the real gap is circa £750 million to £900 million?	