

Meeting of the

# OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

---

Tuesday, 13 March 2018 at 6.30 p.m.

---

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA PACK A

---

	PAGE NUMBER
3 .1 24th January, 2018	56 - 81

"If the fire alarm sounds please leave the building immediately by the nearest available fire exit, to which a Fire Warden will direct you. Please do not use the lifts. Please do not deviate to collect personal belongings or vehicles parked in the complex. If you are unable to use the stairs, a member of staff will direct you to a safe area. On leaving the building, please proceed directly to the Fire Assembly Point situated by the lake on Saffron Avenue. No person must re-enter the building until instructed that it is safe to do so by the Senior Fire Marshall. The meeting will reconvene if it is safe to do so, otherwise it will stand adjourned."

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:

David Knight, Democratic Services **Page 54**

Tel: 020 7364 4878 E-mail: [david.knight@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:david.knight@towerhamlets.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 3.1

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE,  
24/01/2018

SECTION ONE (UNRESTRICTED)

## LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

### MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 24 JANUARY 2018

ROOM C1, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE  
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG

#### Members Present:

Councillor Dave Chesterton (Chair)	
Councillor Clare Harrisson (Vice-Chair)	
Councillor Danny Hassell	Scrutiny Lead for Children's Services
Councillor Muhammad Ansar Mustaquim	
Councillor Ayas Miah	Scrutiny Lead for Governance
Councillor Helal Uddin	Scrutiny Lead for Place
Councillor Andrew Wood	Scrutiny Lead for Resources
Councillor Shah Alam	Councillor Mohammed Mufti Miah

#### Co-opted Members Present:

Shabbir Chowdhury	Parent Governors
Joanna Hannan	Representative of Diocese of Westminster
Fatiha Kassouri	Parent Governors
Dr Phillip Rice	Church of England Representative
Christine Trumper	Parent Governors

#### Other Councillors Present:

Mayor John Biggs  
Councillor David Edgar  
Councillor Rachel Blake  
Councillor Joshua Peck

#### Apologies:

Councillor Oliur Rahman	
Councillor Rabina Khan	
Asad M Jaman	Muslim Faith Community

#### Officers Present:

Vicky Clark	(Divisional Director for Economic Growth and Development)
Zena Cooke	(Corporate Director, Resources)
Fiona Heyland	(Head of Waste Strategy Policy and Procurement, Public Realm,

Neville Murton	Communities Localities & Culture) (Divisional Director, Finance, Procurement & Audit)
Robin Payne	(Interim Divisional Director, Public Realm)
Elizabeth Bailey	Senior Strategy, Policy and Performance Officer
Sharon Godman	(Divisional Director, Strategy, Policy and Partnerships)
David Knight	(Senior Democratic Services Officer)

**1. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST**

It was noted that there were no Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest

**2. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES**

**2.1 23rd November, 2017**

**Agreed the minutes subject to the following revisions:**

**Item 9.1 COMPLAINTS ANNUAL REPORT - Actions** delete “How is Governance working with schools and teachers regarding complaints” and insert “How is the Council supporting schools to prepare for the governance issues arising from the introduction of the new data protection legislation”

**Item 10 VERBAL UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS**

**Councillor Clare Harrisson Scrutiny Lead for Health, Adults & Community**

Delete “The Committee noted that the Refugee and Homelessness officer had been appointed” and insert “The Committee noted a verbal update regarding the scrutiny report on access to healthcare for the homeless”

**2.2 13th December, 2017.**

The Minutes were agreed subject to the following amendment:

**Item 12 SUMMARY NOTES FROM BREXIT CHALLENGE SESSION**

It was agreed to add into the minute under the questions and comments from the Scrutiny Challenge Session section the following bullet point:

Details to be provide on those European Union and Non-European Nationals employed by the Council.

**2.3 15th January, 2018**

The minutes were agreed subject to a number of minor changes in regard to format and grammar.

**3. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS 'CALLED IN'**

Nil items

**4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS**

Nil items

**5. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE QUERY AND ACTION LOG  
2017/2018**

Noted

**6. CHAIRS UPDATE**

**6.1 Budget Scrutiny Report**

Councillor Dave Chesterton introduced the Budget Scrutiny Report and the Committee noted the principal recommendations contained within the report which may be summarised as follows:

1. That the Council should publish the draft budget for consultation with the Committee and local residents in early December;
2. That Consultation with businesses and local residents should take place earlier to allow feedback to be considered by the Committee in their deliberation of the budget proposals;
3. That Scrutiny Leads should play a greater role in budget monitoring of their portfolio areas to enable them to effectively review and challenge budget proposals;
4. That scrutiny over the next municipal year is carried out to consider risks of the Council in participating in the Pilot scheme;
5. That the Council develops its work on Brexit to minimise impact locally
6. That the Council should ensure there is greater dialogue and engagement with residents when recovering housing benefit overpayments;
7. That the Council invests in resources to procure and manage contracts in- house to ensure providers are held to account on delivery of their contracts.
8. That the Council lobbies the Government for additional capital reserves to fund fire safety remediation works on privately owned accommodation in the Borough; and
9. That the Council lobbies the Government for additional capital reserves to fund retrofitting sprinklers in high rises above 8 storeys.

## 7. FORTHCOMING DECISIONS

Nil items

## 8. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF UNRESTRICTED CABINET PAPERS

The Committee received and noted the agenda for the Cabinet meeting to be held on 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2018 with particular reference to the Council's 2018-19 Budget Report and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018-21. The questions arising from the discussions on this report may be summarised as follows:

The Committee noted that:

- The Capital Programme sets out the relevant expenditure including the time horizon for capital projects and that over the next six to nine months work will be undertaken to ensure that all the relevant documents are kept in proper alignment as this process evolves;
- Commented that there was a need to look at a proper budget cycle process e.g. the cycle infrastructure programme is reference across a number of areas and it appears to lack focus. It is important that there is an ongoing commitment to investment in such an infrastructure and the Council and its partners are working together to get it right;
- Noted that there needs to be a plan of action informed by all the various strategies and going forward the Council will have a process that has an overview of what is to be done and be available earlier to allow for there to be a considered scrutiny of the process;
- Noted that the development of Budget Report and Medium Term Financial Strategy provides a linkage to the strategic policies that the Council wishes to invest in and then look at the funding streams to deliver those priorities;
- Welcomed the proposal to DH Welcomes investment in the purchasing over the next two years of new vehicles for the Underground Recycling System;
- Noted that there is £90m from available from Section 106 although the Council will need to consider its strategic priorities and then look at the funding sources to deliver those priorities;
- Indicated that it wished there to be discussions throughout the year in the development of the process; and
- Noted that the Quarterly Budget Monitoring report would allow there to be a regular scrutiny of the process.

In conclusion, the Chair asked the Committee to submit any pre decision scrutiny of the remaining unrestricted Cabinet papers to the officers by 12:00 noon on the 26<sup>th</sup> January, 2018.

(The responses to the pre-decision scrutiny questions of the unrestricted Cabinet papers for the 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2018 meeting is attached at **Appendix 1**).

## 9. SCRUTINY SPOTLIGHT

### 9.1 Cabinet Member Spotlight - Work and Economic Development

The Committee received a presentation from Councillor Joshua Peck (Cabinet Member for Work & Economic Growth) that highlighted a number of key points in relation to Work & Economic Growth including “Work Path” and employment support; skills improvement and work related training; enterprise and business support programmes; high streets and town centres. It was noted that there had been a review of Skillsmatch delivery which had resulted in the design and launch of a new model. This included the communications campaign; the single telephone contact number and website information. The Committee were advised that the programme has already delivered over 700 people into work this year, which has exceeded the previous comparable period by 23%. Whilst there has been increase in job entry over comparable period to last year seen in all major groups including Black and Minority Ethnic Groups, Women, Black and Minority Ethnic Women and persons with disabilities.

The Committee noted that regarding skills improvement and work related training there had been training programmes delivered in Construction; Teaching Assistants; Childcare; Pre-Employment and Interview Coaching; ESOL Co-Ordination and Sector based ESOL (Including ESOL for Health and ESOL for Construction). In respect of the key achievements for economic growth it was noted that there was a “Ready” suite of business support - Start-up, Growth, Retail Marketing, Supply Chain; the Whitechapel Enterprise Hub and the High Street pilot work including shopfronts and regeneration projects. The questions and comments from Members on the report may be summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- Noted that work was being undertaken to broker greater access to quality of jobs and in terms of sustainability **e.g.** work needs to be sustained over many years’ not just large injections of capital and then leave it at that.
- Noted that with regards to Wood Wharf work is being undertaken to develop sustainable employment programmes;
- Was advised that the Council is supporting small and medium-sized enterprises and businesses to create apprentice positions and to help such businesses maintain their viability against larger competitors;
- Noted the work currently being undertaken in Tower Hamlets to keep local shops viable and resist the trend of conversions of shops to residential;
- Noted that the scheme has benefitted a larger percentage black and minority ethnic groups residents than earlier programmes and is therefore a significant improve over such schemes;

- Noted that the regeneration of areas such as Brick Lane aims to reflect the needs of the customers; environmental health; address ASB issues and ensure that the area reflects the multiple layers of heritage;
- Commented on the importance of addressing the skills shortages in London through local colleges and businesses to address skills gaps in a range of industries;
- Noted that with regards to helping families work is being undertaken to address any barriers to work to ensure that parents can access child care when they seek employment e.g. getting planning agreed for pre-school provision and providing more skilled staff to increase provision of pre-school places; and
- Noted that the £360,000 investment in the Watney Market site will provide a bespoke service for young people and it is a very tangible investment in the future of the children of Tower Hamlets.

## **10. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **10.1 Recycling Scrutiny Challenge Session Action Plan**

The Committee received a report that followed up from the scrutiny challenge session on promoting a shared responsibility and removing barriers to improved recycling in the Borough. The report and recommendations were agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in April, 2016. Subsequent to that an action plan had been developed to address the recommendations. The report and accompanying action plan was accordingly endorsed by Cabinet in September, 2016. It was noted that this report reviews the progress against the original recommendations. The questions and comments from Members on the report may be summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- Noted that the challenge session had taken place on 19th January 2016 and been chaired by Cllr Denise Jones, Scrutiny Lead for Communities, Localities and Culture. The aim of the challenge session had been to explore ways in which the Council and its partners could influence residents to increase the amount of recycling and to 'recycle right'; and how social housing landlords and landowners can work together to facilitate this. The session was underpinned by three core questions (a) what actions can the council and its partners take to inform residents of the importance of recycling, encouraging and to encourage residents to increase the amount of recycling they do and reduce the amount that is contaminated (b) how can landlords, landowners, managing agents, and developers improve recycling facilities on their estates facilitating and how can they facilitate residents to recycle more, and recycle right, and (c) what financial opportunities can the Council access to support recycling activities and what the options are available to use S106 planning obligations or the Community Infrastructure Levy are;



- Expressed concern that not enough done to provide information on where to get the recycling sacks. In response it was noted that there had been increased publicity on provision of the recycling sacks available in different locations and that disabled and elderly residents who live in a block of flats and would like recycling sacks but cannot collect them can contact Streetline to discuss their options through email [Streetline@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Streetline@towerhamlets.gov.uk) or by phone on 020 7364 5004;
- Agreed on the need to be flexible in the way the Council supports people to recycle and need to encourage the Registered Social Landlords to support their resident's to recycle;
- Indicated that it was important to ensure that the Council work with those that want to recycle both communities and individuals;
- Noted that the Council is looking at the structures in public realm to reinstate the outreach work to reinforce the importance of recycling;
- Noted that the Council is working to get the management of the blocks and residents of the blocks to work together e.g. There is a programme on food recycling in blocks and getting the right elements in place to make it happen; and
- Noted that the Council is building up the capacity of the management of contract monitoring but current contract is unwieldy but if the contractor fails to meet the contract conditions the Council can and does enforce the default payments but whilst there are challenges overall it is working well.

In conclusion, the Chair Moved and it was **RESOLVED** that the Committee would welcome the report and looked forward to receiving a presentation at a future meeting on the Council's Communications Strategy in relation to recycling.

## 10.2 Quarter Two Corporate Performance Report

The Committee received and noted a report that summarised the Council's performance during quarter two of 2017/18 (July-September 2017) in delivering year two of its three year strategic plan. The year two plan, which was agreed by Cabinet in April 2017, built upon the Council's achievements in year one of the plan (2016/17) and set out ambitious plans to achieve the outcomes detailed in the Strategic Plan.

The questions and comments from Members on the report may be summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- Noted the current number of working days/shifts lost to sickness absence per employee and that it has been recognised that the measures in place currently are not sufficiently achieving the outcomes expected i.e. sustained reduction in sickness absence, and that a different approach may yield better results.

- Was advised that the Council's sickness management processes are now subject to a review in line with the outcomes based accountability framework. Corporate Leadership Team has recently agreed a new Employee Wellbeing Plan, which will be underpinned by a range of measures to improve health in the workplace being launched from November onwards. The Council has started a review of all formal sickness management cases with a view of putting in place wellbeing plans for affected members of staff;
- Noted that a review of the occupational health service has been undertaken and the Council has commissioned a new ergonomic and physiotherapy services. Alongside this, the Council are introducing a new offer to support staff going through career transition;
- Was informed that following a review of industrial relationships in partnership with the trade unions, the first phase of the revision of employment policies and practices has now begun. The review will cover conduct, performance and improvement, staff wellbeing, collective consultation, employee grievances, managing discipline and whistleblowing;
- With regarding to delivering a range of activities to reduce staff sickness and improve wellbeing, the following activities are now taking;
- Place (i) Staff wellbeing plan has been developed; Occupational Health service will be reviewed to ensure it meets need (ii) Review of the absence management procedure is taking place; and (iii) A review of the way the Council reports sickness absence levels to focus on outcomes instead of compliance with procedures;
- Commented that the Council has only one indicator on "ASB" and "Adult Healthy Lives". Therefore, it was felt that the Council is refreshing the Strategic Plan, it would seem sensible that these indicators being reviewed; and
- Asked for clarification on paragraphs 4.8.4 to 4.8.6 as they refer to "White British Children" and (in 4.8.6) "White British Working Class Pupils" interchangeably and would like to know how is "working class" measured.

## 11. VERBAL UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS

The Committee received briefings from each of the following Scrutiny Leads:

1. **Councillor Clare Harrisson - Scrutiny Lead for Health, Adults & Community** – Noted the report regarding the progress on maternity services at the Royal London and the journey that this department has been on and how mothers felt new service is functioning. It was noted that the Trust had thanked Sub-Committee for the report and how it has it helped the Trust move forward. Also noted that there would be an issue-specific 'deep dive' scrutiny regarding access to Health Care to Refugee's and the Homeless and that all scrutiny members were invited;
2. **Councillor Danny Hassell - Scrutiny Lead for Children's Services** - Noted that there would be two sessions of the Gangs Issue when there

will be interviews and workshops as part of this review. Received and noted the Ofsted Monitoring Report including the key points of improvement (i) details around the thresholds; (ii) performance management process (iii) Improved standards in social work practice (iv) Improved Management Overview; and that these improvements at this stage seemed sustainable;

3. **Councillor Helal Uddin - Scrutiny Lead for Place** – Noted with concern at the poor level of attendance at the last scrutiny challenge session and the need going forward to ensure a proper scrutiny of the Local Plan; and
4. **Councillor Andrew Wood - Scrutiny Lead for Resources** – Noted that there would be specific scrutiny sessions with a focus on the services that Young People want; identifying any gaps in such provision on the and access to facilities for younger children.

**12. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF RESTRICTED CABINET PAPERS**

Nil items

**13. ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT**

Nil items

**14. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

The agenda circulated contained no exempt/ confidential business and there was therefore no requirement to exclude the press and public to allow for its consideration.

**15. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

Nil items

**16. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS 'CALLED IN'**

Nil items

**17. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL) CABINET PAPERS**

Nil items

**18. ANY OTHER EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

Nil items

**The meeting ended at 9.15 p.m.  
Chair, Councillor Dave Chesterton  
Overview & Scrutiny Committee**



# Appendix 1

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 5.1 - The Council's 2018-19 Budget Report and Medium Term Financial Strategy 2018-21	Responses
<p>Further to the comment's made at O&amp;S on the 24<sup>th</sup> on the reduction in government grant funding: in the Strategic School Improvement Fund as against the Education Services Grant. Para 3.4.30 &amp; Para 3.4.31 of the Cabinet 30<sup>th</sup> January Document Pack. The reduction in government grant funding: in the Strategic School Improvement Fund as against the Education Services Grant. Para 3.4.30 &amp; Para 3.4.31 of the Cabinet 30 January pack is £2.7million Core Grant of 17/18 is being replaced by £0.2million in 2018/19:</p> <p>I. Request that this reduction be examined and verified as correct; and</p> <p>II. Request clarification on what level of expenditure is proposed to meet the reduction</p>	<p>I. The reduction in government grant set out in the report is correct. £200k will be received directly by the council, whilst there has been no change to the Council's statutory duties in this area. A school improvement fund has been announced by the government which will need to be bid for by local teaching school alliances working within the Tower Hamlets Education Partnership if this funding is to be made available for school improvement in the borough.</p> <p>II. The funding available through the new fund is not equal to that which has been removed by the government and the bid being submitted for one school is circa £70k. Schools are expected to make a financial contribution to their</p>

<p>in Government Grant Funding for the Strategic School Improvement Fund.</p>	<p>own improvement. The current expenditure is being supported through the Council's budget as Education Services Grant has been treated as a core grant. The level of expenditure will be maintained whilst the plans for school improvement are developed during the next financial year.</p>
<p><b>Item 5.2 - Community Engagement Strategy</b></p>	<p><b>Responses</b></p>
<p>How do we ensure that the strategy is delivered and executed effectively?</p> <p>For example the recent Isle of Dogs speed hump consultation</p> <p>Leaflets not delivered to every affected address - the larger and more difficult to access buildings did not get it Not advertised on the Council website anywhere including on the consultation page Not advertised on the Councils Facebook page. Tweeted twice but once with the wrong end date (5th Jan rather than 21st) Brief mention in the East London Advertiser</p> <p>So what was a promising consultation exercise did not deliver fully due to poor execution of that consultation. How do we avoid that?</p>	<p>We acknowledge that there is much that we could do better when we engage with local people. The strategy sets out our plans to make the council more transparent and accountable and to encourage more local people to get involved in shaping their neighbourhoods, council services and the future of the Borough. We have made a commitment in the strategy to simplify, improve and coordinate our engagement activities.</p> <p>The delivery plan contains a number of improvements which we will introduce over the next three years. These include setting out minimum standards and guidance for all of our public engagement activities and introducing an involvement calendar and tracker (p.5-6 of delivery plan). We also want to improve our use of social media and the internet. To support these changes we will provide training and tools for council staff to raise the quality of involvement activity (p.8 of delivery plan).</p>



Item 5.3 - Consultation on an Additional Licensing Scheme for Houses in Multiple Occupation	Responses
<p>I. When a planning application is submitted that could mean a property could then become useable an HMO, is it not possible for the Council to take a view that it will not accept any future application for the property to become an HMO; and</p>	<p>I. When a planning application is submitted that could mean a property could then become useable an HMO, is it not possible for the Council to take a view that it will not accept any future application for the property to become an HMO; and</p> <p>The Coalition Government in October 2010 modified the current planning regulations surrounding HMO's. Planning permission is now automatically granted by the General Development Order where an existing single family dwelling (C3) is used as a small HMO (within class C4) or vice versa. Any house or flat rented out in the private rented sector which is not occupied by a family, where the number of occupants is between 3 and 6 the planning permission is automatically granted.</p> <p>For these purposes "family" is defined in the same way as under the Housing Act 2004 for housing/environmental health purposes. Thus the 2004 Act definition of a HMO now applies for planning purposes as well. What this means therefore is that shared houses/flats lived in by unrelated persons were taken out of C3 and together with small bedsits (where there are between 3 and 6 occupants) now have their own use class (C4). Those properties which were already used in this way as at 6th April 2010 were automatically transferred into this new use class C4. Single family homes/flats remain in the modified class C3.</p> <p>Therefore planning permission is required for HMO's with 7 or more occupants – this is a use on its own, termed "sui generis"..</p> <p>Where planning permission is required, the Council cannot refuse to accept a planning application as it has a statutory duty to receive and determine planning</p>

<p>II. What additional capacity is being introduced to increase the Councils ability to undertake enforcement measures against unlicensed HMO</p>	<p>applications. The Council cannot be pre-determined on whether a HMO use is acceptable or not and has to determine each case on its own merit taking into account the Councils planning policies and the specific circumstances surrounding the case. Generally, we tend to resist HMO's that involve the loss of family housing. Where they are acceptable, they should be located in or around a town Centre with good access to public transport and services</p> <p>II. What additional capacity is being introduced to increase the Councils ability to undertake enforcement measures against unlicensed HMO</p> <p>The Council will shortly be consulting on introducing an additional licensing scheme, which if adopted, will require all HMO's within the Borough that have three or more renters to be licenced. The licensing fee will be used to increase the staffing within the Environmental Health and Trading Standards – these staffing resources will be used to carry out enforcement and compliance inspections on HMO's. In addition, under the Tenants Charter commitment, the Mayor has agreed to employ a further Environmental Health Officer and Trading Standards Officer during 18/19 – which will support general enforcement against landlords and managing agents the operate HMO's.</p> <p>Should the HMO also constitute an unlawful change of use under planning law then the Planning Compliance Team will be able to take any planning enforcement action necessary to remedy any identified harm. We will do this in partnership with our Environment Health Teams sharing information as we go on.</p>
---	--

Item 5.4 – Requesting approval of the allocation of S106 funding and approval for the adoption of a capital budget in respect of the following projects: Oval Public Space PID; and Leisure Facility Improvement PID	Responses
<p>Question relates only to the Oval.</p> <p>I. Why is approval being sought after the opening of the Oval by Mayor John Biggs to spend money when the money has already been spent;</p> <p>II. The £105,000 increase in costs - what is the breakdown of that cost</p>	<p>In response to the queries raised below please note</p> <p>I. The original design of the landscaping works for the Oval were based on estimated works. Works began in January 2018, with the process of clearing the site from abandoned and parked vehicles, only then could contractors undertake ground surveys. The findings of these surveys led to a redesign for which we only received the more accurate estimated costs in August 2018. It was decided to continue with the works whilst we apply for the additional funds, as stopping all works and securing the site would only have led to the site once again being used for unauthorised parking and other ASB activities. A PID for the additional funds was drafted and presented to IDSG on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2017, however, at the meeting further information was requested, and therefore approval was deferred until this information was provided. Had IDSG approved the PID then the matter would have been decided at the IDB taking place 14<sup>th</sup> November 2017 prior to the completion of the works. Instead the matter was deferred to the IDSG taking place on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2017. A delay in the works would have encountered significant additional costs. It should be noted that project closure and final payment is only due in March 2018.</p> <p>II. In relation to the additional costs incurred please find below a breakdown :</p>

increase from £230,000 to £335,820 (**Page 202 1.2 (b) refers**);

14	Supply and planting of trees	£14,850	November 17
15	Installation of furniture	£21,000	November 17
16	Supply and installation of bins	£2,888.34	December 17
17	Works completed	£40,962.66	January 18
18	Contingency	£5,631.06	January 18
19	Final Payment Planning, Architectural and Project Management Fees	£21,800.85	March 18
20	Launch of new public open space by the Mayor	£0.00	December 17/January 18
21	Project Closure	£0.00	March 18
	<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>107,132.91</b>	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>335,820.00</b>	

III. What is the cost per square meter of the work done and how does that compare with other similar projects; and

IV. S106 contributions (**PA/06/02068**) - were they subject to the 7 year rule and when was that money received by LBTH. (**Page 267; Paragraph 6.3.2 refers**)

III. The cost per square meter for delivering the Oval (incl) fees is £507.58. Actual construction cost is £421.21/sq.m  
We do not have another similar site to which we can compare the cost per square meter, as this required a specific design that would prevent it being used for unauthorised parking

IV. The expiry date of an s106 contribution is determined by the s106 legal agreement, which varies depending on the development. As such there is not standard seven year rule. The Council received full payment of the contribution in question on 13/06/2017, the legal agreement outlines that funds should be expended within five years of full payment. Consequently, the expiry date of this contribution is 13/06/2022.

<b>Item 5.6 – Article 4 Direction - Office (B1a) to Residential (C3)</b>	<b>Responses</b>
<p>I. Why does the Isle of Dogs Article 4 map not match the Central Activities Zone area established in the draft Local Plan? As a result may send mixed messages;</p> <p>II. Why does it not include existing office space at the end of Millharbour i.e. Greenwich View and offices like Northern &amp; Shell near Crossharbour DLR but does include large areas which are wholly residential?</p>	<p>I. The area in the east of the borough currently covered by an exemption has been defined by the Isle of Dogs CIL Charging area</p> <p>II. These areas are covered by the principles of a site allocation (Millharbour South and Crossharbour TC respectively) which include the provision of housing and essential infrastructure, e.g health facility and education.</p>
<b>Item 5.7 – Annual Infrastructure Statement 2018/19</b>	<b>Responses</b>
<p>I. How does this document relate to the following documents Infrastructure Delivery Plan October 2017 - part of the draft Local Plan Current Capital Programme part of the Budget Pack when the structure and layout for all three is so different and the GLA IoD and South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework Development Infrastructure Funding Study - Draft copies of which LBTH has</p>	<p>I. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) identifies the infrastructure needed to support the delivery of the Local Plan over a 15 year plan period and lists currently known projects proposed to meet that need. Similarly the GLA's Isle of Dogs and South Poplar Opportunity Area Planning Framework Development Infrastructure Funding Study (DIFS) will identify infrastructure needs to support development over a 25 year period in that area. These two documents have been developed alongside each other and are broadly consistent. That said, infrastructure needs and planned projects develop over time and therefore information in the current documents and any future versions of the IDP (which is proposed to be updated regularly) will need to present the most up to date information available.</p> <p>The Annual Infrastructure Statement (AIS) sets the course of direction for the</p>

<p>had for 7 months;</p> <p>II. With 4 different infrastructure related documents available which is the master document;</p> <p>III. How do we ensure that they are consistent documents in terms of naming and values (different documents have different £ totals for the same project);</p> <p>IV. Can a breakdown of the CIL by ward be made available (I think this is all Canary Wharf ward anyway);</p> <p>V. What is the latest CIL balance in the bank account? and what is the total value of CIL from approved planning applications and as a</p>	<p>allocation and expenditure of CIL over the next 15 months. The information included is based on the broad outputs of the IDP and DIFS as well as more up to date information where appropriate, such as the latest forecast CIL income for 2018/19.</p> <p>The AIS makes broad indicative allocations of CIL funding to infrastructure themes, to encourage and enable the development of projects using this funding. It also identifies the broad indicative use of Local Infrastructure Fund monies. The Capital Programme is more, specific, identifying those projects that are scheduled for delivery over the period 2017-2031. Projects developed using funding identified in the AIS will feature in the capital programme when it is appropriate to do so.</p> <p>II. The four documents each have a different purpose and therefore none of them will be a 'master' version for all purposes.</p> <p>III. As infrastructure projects/programmes develop and further work is undertaken, cost estimates can be refined; therefore each document will need to reflect the most up to date information available. It is important that the naming of projects is consistent and any mistakes rectified. Documents are cross-checked to ensure consistency.</p> <p>IV. The overall breakdown by Ward can be provided in a written up date to follow.</p> <p>V. As at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2017</p> <p>CIL Balance = £37.49m CIL from approved planning applications, but funding not yet due to Council (i.e.</p>
---	---

<p>subset from those planning applications which have started construction;</p> <p>VI. Can a summary of the public consultation carried out from the 27th June to 8th August 2017 be made available including questions asked;</p> <p>VII. Proposed Allocation of CIL% how does that match the other documents listed above where a list of specific projects is provided? Which one takes precedence?</p> <p>VIII. Why no mention of the CIL policies currently under Regulation 16 consultation of the Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Plan - either the policies themselves or their legal implications</p> <p>IX. Why no mention of Reg 59C section b in the "The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013"?</p> <p><i>Application of CIL by Local Councils</i>  <i>59C. A local council must use</i></p>	<p>CIL Liability Notice issued) = £5.76m  CIL from approved planning applications that have commenced construction, but funding not yet due to Council (i.e. CIL Demand Notice issued) = £2.39m</p> <p>VI. Officers are considering the detailed responses on both LIF priorities and projects received as part of the LIF Consultation held from June to August 2017. A consultation summary is being prepared and will be made available in the first half of 2018.</p> <p>VII. The projects listed in the IDP, DIFS and Capital Programme are likely to be funded by a range of sources, some including CIL and some not. The allocation of funding in the AIS to infrastructure themes is indicative and does not require any spend on specific projects. Given this, the documents are linked, but not interdependent and therefore neither document needs to take precedent.</p> <p>VIII. Paragraph 7.17 of the AIS makes reference to the use of LIF funding in LIF Area 4 to support 'local people and construction through non-capital means'. This paragraph recognises the draft proposals in the Isle of Dogs Neighbourhood Plan for the use of CIL for these purposes. Further discussion with the Neighbourhood Forum will need to follow to understand the detail behind the proposals.</p> <p>IX. In London and hence in LB Tower Hamlets, Regulation 59F supersedes Regulation 59C. Regulation 59F is quoted in paragraph 7.3 of the AIS providing the necessary context for the section on LIF.</p>
--	---

<p><i>CIL receipts passed to it in accordance with regulation 59A or 59B to support the development of the local council's area, or any part of that area, by funding—</i></p> <p><i>(a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or</i></p> <p><i>(b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.</i></p>	
<p><b>Item 5.8 Strategic Performance Monitoring 2017/18 Q2</b></p>	<p><b>Responses</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why has staff sickness increased in <b>Quarter 2</b>?</li> </ul>	<p>The overall sickness statistic takes account of the last 12 months of sickness absence. The difference between 2017/18 Q1 (9.72 average FTE days lost per FTE employee) and Q2 (10.27 average FTE days lost per FTE employee) indicates that long-term absence has increased slightly and that short-term has remained the same across the council.</p> <p>The number of incidence of sickness absence has decreased and this indicates that the most likely reason for the overall increase is that some short term absences have become long term.</p> <p>Stress is the main reason for sickness absence, with musculo-skeletal issues being the next highest reason.</p>



Significant work has been undertaken over the last 6 months to ensure an organisation-wide, well-connected and holistic approach to staff wellbeing – with a clear intended outcomes that the Council *has ‘A well workforce, taking responsibility for its own health and with lower levels of sickness absence’*. A number of key interventions have already taken place including:

- Applying an ‘outcomes based accountability’ methodology to the issues
- Undertaking an Employee Wellbeing survey
- Drawing up a Wellbeing Provisions Plan
- Reviewing the Council’s Occupational Health delivery model
- Implementing an Employee Assistance Programme and Career Transitioning Support
- Delivering targeted training for managers to drive up compliance with the sickness management procedure and associated data recording
- Reviewing and agreeing new key performance indicators (KPIs), which include performance measures relating to the introduction of employee wellbeing plans, agency spend arising from sickness absence, and days lost to sickness absence
- Setting up a reporting dashboard to track those KPIs
- Ensure monthly scrutiny of dashboards at all Directorate Management teams and through Performance Improvement Board and Corporate Leadership Team
- Drafting and commencing a trial in the use of ‘Wellbeing Plans’ in the handling of informal and formal sickness cases.

We will review these actions on a regular basis as part of our outcomes based accountability approach to ensure they are achieving our objectives and delivering the agreed outcomes that reduce sickness absence and improve wellbeing.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• “<b>Support into Work</b>” shows as amber. How do you intend to make this green?</li></ul>	<p>At the end of Q2, the WorkPath partnership outturn was 416 against a target of 550. Historically around 30-35% of outstanding employment targets is driven through in last quarter; this forecasts to achieve between 1010-1087 job starts. The new WorkPath service launched in April 2017 is completing a number of additional engagement events and jobs events alongside working with new communities and client groups so there is a potential increase in job starts to reach the lower bandwidth target. The service will be driving to increase support and entry to this level with the actions below:</p> <p>Actions to support more people into employment include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The appointment of Training Provider to deliver construction training which began in Q2 and has already delivered training to 93 TH residents</li><li>• Pre-employment training is being delivered to continue previous sector specific and generic training i.e. Teaching Assistant, Mid Meal supervisor training, SIA (security industry) etc.</li><li>• Secured funding to increase the capacity of ESOL training delivered by the IDEA Stores and also a sector specific ESOL tutor has been recruited</li><li>• Delivery of working start programmes, including women into health, women into construction and women childcare alongside. Funding has been secured to extend the Women in Health programme, training packages are being developed and placement opportunities secured.</li><li>• Delivery of working start programmes, placements and apprenticeships including the Mayor’s Apprenticeship Commitment</li><li>• Supporting the roll out of the London Councils’ ESF Community Grants Fund focusing on support for specific target groups including Women, in particular Somali and Bangladeshi women and those who are economically inactive due to parental and/or caring responsibilities. WorkPath will have an integral part to play to support and work in partnership with the successful community organisations.</li><li>• ELBA has been appointed to deliver a project to specifically target Somali</li></ul>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Employment Rates</b> – (The gap between borough and London average employment rate) shows as amber. What is the Council doing to have greater confidence in the data?</li> </ul>	<p>Graduates and support them in finding and securing graduate opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with Renaisi to deliver project RISE (supporting Refugees Into Sustainable Employment) and will be introducing them to the New Resident and Refugee Forum. This project offers a holistic approach to breaking down the barriers that may prevent refugee communities accessing the work place. The service will support the project by engaging organisations and those residents with refugee status who could benefit from the project.</li> <li>• WorkPath Employment adviser assigned to Somali Integration Team to promote pre-employment, access to skills and job entry</li> <li>• The service is also working closely with the council’s Syrian family resettlement programme. The first family arrived at the end of November 2017. WorkPath will engage with those families once they are resettled and provide access relevant services relating to employment and skills</li> <li>• The WorkPath service is attending further engagement and jobs fairs events including East London Jobs Fair in Feb ; working with Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) services from Feb; Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) Jobs event in March.</li> </ul> <p>Data used for this performance measure is sourced from the Office for National Statistics’ Annual Population Survey. Whilst ONS publishes some information about the survey methodology, including the borough’s sample size, the Council does not have access to the raw data and there is little the Council can do to influence the methodology they use.</p> <p>As part of the refresh of the 18/19 Strategic Plan, this performance measure/data source will be retired in favour of a measure which is a directly reflects Council delivery and the numbers of residents supported into employment. An in-depth technical review of this performance measure and its data source has been carried to inform this</p>
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council only has one indicator on “<b>ASB</b>” and “<b>Adult Healthy Lives</b>”. As the Council is refreshing the strategic plan, are these indicators being reviewed?</li> <li>• Paragraphs 4.8.4 to 4.8.6 refer to “<b>White British Children</b>” and (in 4.8.6) “<b>White British Working Class Pupils</b>”. Please clarify which children are referred to in each cohort as they appear to be used interchangeably in the report. How is “working class” measured?</li> </ul>	<p>process. It also looked at other administrative data, such as out-of-work benefits claimants and Universal Credit claimants to establish whether there was a link between the number of claimants and the falling employment rate. Our analysis was inconclusive and showed that there has been no significant rise in the overall number of claimants but this is possibly because the period for reporting spans the roll out of UC and various other changes to the benefit rules. The Service is also proposing to write to ONS statisticians to seek an explanation for the significant decrease in the borough’s sample size and further information about the local response rates.</p> <p>The Council is reviewing all of the indicators in the Strategic Plan to align them with an ‘Outcomes Based Accountability’ approach. A wider set of measures relating to ASB and adult healthy lives are already available via the Anti-Social Behaviour Blueprint and Health &amp; Wellbeing Strategy and some of these will be incorporated into the refreshed Strategic Plan.</p> <p>‘White British’ refers to pupils of White British heritage, while ‘White British working class’ refers to those children of White British heritage also qualifying for the Pupil Premium / Free School Meals.</p>
---	--