

Item 6.1 Spitalfields and Banglatown Community Governance Review Update	
Question	Response
<p>1. What (if any) non-parish forms of community governance have been tried in this area over the last 15 years?</p>	<p>Under section 93(5) of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 the Council is required to take into account any other arrangements (apart from those relating to parishes and their institutions) that have already been made, or that could be made, for the purposes of community representation or community engagement in respect of the area under review.</p> <p>Government guidance on community governance reviews asks councils to consider other types of viable community representation which may be more appropriate to some areas than parish councils, or may provide stages building towards the creation of a parish council. This can include local tenants and residents' associations, neighbourhood planning forums, other community forums such as safer neighbourhood ward panels. All of these arrangements are currently in place within the area of the community governance review. Arrangements that have been tried but that are no longer in place include full neighbourhood decentralisation in the late 1980s, and more recently, Local Area Partnerships and Neighbourhood Community Budget areas.</p>

<p>2. Why does the Council believe there would be a negative impact on community cohesion given the experience elsewhere in the UK?</p>	<p>Government guidance is clear that principal councils should consider the impact on community cohesion of community governance arrangements. It requires principal councils to consider whether a recommendation made by the petitioners will undermine community cohesion in any part of its area.</p> <p>The government identifies the potential benefits of parishes for community cohesion but it is also clear that a council should decline to set up such community governance arrangements where they judge that doing so would not be in the interests of either the local community or surrounding communities, or where the effect would be likely to damage community cohesion. In our review of the experience from elsewhere we have identified no specific evidence that parish councils have had a negative impact on community cohesion. (Conversely there is also no robust evidence that they have a positive impact.) Guidance recognises, however, that challenges to community cohesion are very local and that local authorities because of their knowledge of local communities are in a good position to assess these challenges.</p> <p>During both phases of consultation, concerns were expressed by people that the creation of a parish would divide local communities and have a negative impact on community cohesion. More than one in four of those opposing the creation of</p>
---	--

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 26 JUNE 2019

	<p>a parish council who provided comments gave this as a principal reason for their opposition to the proposal.</p>
<p>3. What is the total cost of the Spitalfields and Banglatown Community Governance review?</p>	<p>The Council is not able to provide a final cost of the Community Governance Review at this stage as some costs are still being processed. A final estimated cost will be provided in the report to Council on 17 July 2019.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Council will be applying to the Government's CGR New Burdens Fund to offset as much of the costs as possible.</p> <p>In addition to specific financial costs, there is also a significant cost in officer time which it is not possible to quantify.</p>
<p>6.4 Mudchute Farm, Park and allotments, Pier Road E14, Grant of long lease</p>	
<p>Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>1. The Council currently contribute £31k p.a. to the running of Mudchute Farm. How much does it cost to run Victoria Park and Mile End Park as a comparison?</p>	<p>The council has a service level agreement of £31k annually with the Mudchute Farm Association through which the organisation maintains the public open space of Mudchute Park. The costs of running the Mudchute Farm are not included under this arrangement and the Council does not fund the running of the farm.</p> <p>The annual budget for Mile End Park is £924,000 and for Victoria Park it is £1,137,000.</p>

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 26 JUNE 2019

<p>2. What capital funds does it provide to Mudchute Farm (or S106, CIL etc)?</p>	<p>The s106 programme officer has advised we contribute no capital funds from s106/CIL.</p>
<p>3. Why is the rent at peppercorn, when we are charging other venues as much market rents or up to 80 percent, with the new premises charge strategy?</p>	<p>The proposal in the report is to grant a long lease of 99 years to the Mudchute Association. This new lease will replace an existing 30 year lease. The rationale for the long lease is set out in paragraph 3.5 in the report. In essence this includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some current and future funding is contingent on having long term security of tenure. The Council recognises the issues arising from the relatively short term remaining of the existing lease, in terms of raising further and more significant capital funding, and the proposal in the report will provide the certainty that the MA has requested. Many capital funding providers require a minimum lease terms of 25 years as a condition of funding. Supporting the MA in fundraising will generate improved services to Borough residents at no cost to the Council.• Long term planning. The MA employs approximately 55 people, and has a broad range of activities. As a mature and substantial organisation, it would like appropriate security of tenure to be able to plan for the long term.• Track record as custodian of the site. The

	<p>MA has operated the Mudchute Park and Farm for almost 40 years, and is primarily responsible for its creation. The MA has grown and improved its activities over this period in partnership with the Council. It has demonstrated good governance and a sound financial track record with a sustainable business model during this period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The MA and Council are both committed to any long lease containing protections to ensure the continuation of the Mudchute as open space for the people of the Borough and visitors, for the duration of the lease term. <p>Leases of five years or more are excluded from the Council's rent reduction scheme. The grant of the lease at a peppercorn rent is on the basis that it will "help it to secure the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of its area". The various ways in which the MA supports these objectives are set out in paragraph 3.13 in the report.</p>
--	---

6.5 Tower Hamlets CCTV Approach	
Questions	Response
<p>1. Can Cabinet clarify the extent and means of resident engagement in the deployment of CCTV going forward? I understand that an assessment framework is to be developed. Will this be transparent to residents? Will there be a mechanism for them to suggest locations?</p>	<p>Resident engagement is a key priority in our approach. Decisions to introduce new cameras will be informed by resident consultation and involvement of the relevant Safer Neighbourhood Panel and Ward councillors. The report recommends the development of an assessment tool which will use evidence such as crime data and the likely detection and investigation value of cameras to help determine the location of new CCTV infrastructure. The tool will also take into account the viability of installing CCTV in areas where there are infrastructure limitations or disproportionate costs involved. Residents will also need to be consulted on privacy and civil liberty issues, and the process will be transparent so that residents are clear about the rationale for installations</p>
<p>2. We know that ASB is under-reported, and that many residents have given up, therefore we cannot solely rely on data from formal reporting. How will ward councillors and Safer Neighbourhood Panels be able to feed into locations in a meaningful way?</p>	<p>It is important that we continue to encourage residents to report ASB to the police, who have improved their 101 and on-line reporting tools in response to complaints. The council has aligned its own ASB Investigation team on a geographical basis to facilitate better access for residents and councillors to report ASB. The Investigation Team Officers will develop effective relationships with their Ward Panels. At present we task operational resources based on data from formal reporting and also take account of complaints to the council, Member and Mayor Enquiries, and intelligence</p>

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 26 JUNE 2019

	<p>and information from our own services. We intend to use the learning from this approach to inform the evidence base for locating CCTV cameras.</p>
<p>3. Will there be scope to use this capital investment to upgrade street lighting where it would otherwise make the CCTV less effective?</p>	<p>The capital investment is for the upgrade of CCTV. The technical specification for the CCTV upgrade will take into account existing and future upgrades to street lighting, of which there is a significant capital investment with upgrades to white LED lighting being well advanced.</p>
<p>4. What's the likely timescale for the delivery of the £3m capital spend? How confident are we of delivering this on time?</p>	<p>The original capital investment bid has suggested a three year programme. However the detailed work on the Business Case will test out reasonable timescales for implementation and delivery and may propose a shorter time scale. We are confident with delivering this upgrade on time as replacing infrastructure is part of business as usual.</p>
<p>5. Why do none of the recommendations talk about road safety or management?</p>	<p>Speed cameras and red light cameras are operated by TfL (Transport for London). The Council is not responsible for them and doesn't hold any information on them. When using CCTV for traffic enforcement we have to be cognisant of the Surveillance Camera Codes of Practice. These state that where local authorities have civil enforcement powers for parking and bus lane enforcement, we should use cameras sparingly as motorists may regard enforcement by cameras as over-zealous. Such systems should therefore only be deployed where other means of enforcement are not practical and their effectiveness in achieving this purpose is subject to regular review.</p>

	<p>The council also supports local policing operations to tackle speeding motorists using hand held speed guns. The council is currently developing a Transport Strategy which outlines what the council plans to do around implementing liveable streets and using traffic management measures to remove traffic from residential streets to create more people friendly environments for walking and cycling. Further, recommendation 13 of the CCTV paper is to develop an evidence base around CCTV's value for public realm services and this could include the use of CCTV in road safety/management.</p>
<p>6.7 Contracts Forward Plan 2019/20 - Quarter One</p>	
<p>Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>1. Regarding: P5481 - Modular Building at Blackwall Depot: Who is this modular building for</p>	<p>The current refuse and waste collection services operate from a series of porta cabins on the existing Blackwall Depot site. The Council is seeking to consolidate the site operations and this requires providing a fit for purpose modular building on short term basis whilst the long term redevelopment proposals are designed. In October 2018, the Cabinet made the decision to create an In-House Waste Management Service, to commence from April 2020, when the current contract with Veolia expires in March 2020.</p>