

# OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

---

Monday, 16 December 2019 at 6.30 p.m., Room C1, 1st Floor, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, London, E14 2BG

## SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA A

This meeting is open to the public to attend.

**Contact for further enquiries:**

David Knight, Democratic Services  
1st Floor, Town Hall, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent,  
London, E14 2BG  
Tel: 020 7364 4878  
E-mail: [david.knight@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:david.knight@towerhamlets.gov.uk)  
Web: <http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/committee>

Scan this code for  
the electronic  
agenda:



For further information including the Membership of this body and public information, see the main agenda.

### **3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES**

**72 - 101**

To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 25<sup>th</sup> November, 2019.

#### **8 .1 Budget Scrutiny**

**102 - 131**

The Committee will receive presentations on the following:

- Budget Scrutiny 2019-20;
- Children & Culture Directorate; and
- Health, Adults and Community Savings Update.

# Agenda Item 3

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE,  
25/11/2019

SECTION ONE (UNRESTRICTED)

## LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

### MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD AT 6.30 P.M. ON MONDAY, 25 NOVEMBER 2019

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

#### Members Present:

- |                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Councillor Sufia Alam (In-the-Chair) | – Scrutiny Lead for Children & Education           |
| Councillor Kahar Chowdhury           | – Scrutiny Lead for Health & Adults                |
| Councillor Dipa Das                  | – Scrutiny Lead for Housing & Regeneration         |
| Councillor Marc Francis              |  |
| Councillor Tarik Khan                | – Scrutiny Lead for Resources & Finance            |
| Councillor Eve McQuillan             | – Bethnal Green Ward                               |
| Councillor Bex White                 | – Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment |
| Councillor Andrew Wood               |  |

#### Co-opted Members Present:

- |              |                   |
|--------------|-------------------|
| James Wilson | – Co-opted Member |
|--------------|-------------------|

#### Other Councillors Present:

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Councillor Sabina Akhtar | – Cabinet Member for Culture, Arts and Brexit           |
| Councillor Sirajul Islam | – Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing |

#### Apologies:

- |                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Councillor James King | – Chair Overview and Scrutiny Committee |
| Halima Islam          | – Co-opted Member                       |

#### Officers Present:

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Kevin Bartle    | – Interim Divisional Director of Finance, Procurement and Audit |
| Tim Clee        | – Partnership & Participation Manager                           |
| Thorsten Dreyer | – Head of Intelligence and Performance                          |
| Afazul Hoque    | – Head of Corporate Strategy & Policy                           |
| Daniel Kerr     | – Strategy and Policy Manager                                   |
| Judith St John  | – Divisional Director, Sports, Leisure                          |

Michael Rourke

and Culture  
– Divisional Director Property and  
Major Programmes

## 1. PRE- ELECTION PURDAH

The noted that as there is a General Election on the 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2019 the following Pre-Election Purdah rules are in force.

During this meeting Members of the Committee must refrain from any of the following:

- Endorsing or referencing any candidate standing in the election;
- Endorsing or highlighting any political party standing in the election;  
and
- Endorsing or publicising any campaign or controversial issue which is linked to a candidate or political party at the election.

Members were advised to stick to factual comment when discussing any significant or controversial issues or campaigns.

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest were received at the meeting.

## 3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Chair **Moved** and it was:

### **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 28<sup>th</sup> October, 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and the Chair was authorised to sign them accordingly.

## 4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

Nil items

## 5. RECRUITMENT OF TWO (2) INDEPENDENT CO-OPTED REPRESENTATIVES TO THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Committee noted that an advert, promoting the two (2) positions, had been placed on the Council's website and the positions had also been advertised through social media. The interviews had been undertaken by an interview panel including Councillor James King, the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and officers. As a result of the interviews the following two (2) candidates were selected James Wilson and Halima Islam to

serve as Co-Opted Members on the Committee for the period of the current administration.

It was noted that training would be provided by officers to the co-opted representatives on the Code of Conduct for Members which will include declarations of interest, exempt reports and data protection. An induction session will also be held to explain their role and how this can be developed.

Accordingly, The Chair **Moved** and it was:

**RESOLVED** that:

The Committee agreed the appointment of James Wilson and Halima Islam to serve as Co-Opted Members on the Committee for the period of the current administration.

## **6. FORTHCOMING DECISIONS**

Noted

## **7. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS 'CALLED IN'**

Nil items

## **8. SCRUTINY SPOTLIGHT**

### **8.1 Leisure Facilities**

It was really pleasing to hear about the work which has been delivered to improve the provision of leisure facilities.

The Chair thanked Councillor Sabina Akhtar (Cabinet Member for Culture, Arts and Brexit); Judith St John (Divisional Director Sports Leisure and Culture); Tim Clee (Partnership and Participation Manager) for attending tonight's Overview and Scrutiny meeting to provide an overview of leisure facilities in the Borough. The main points of the discussions on the report may be summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- Had a robust discussion about the shifting landscape of leisure provision in the Borough and raised concerns about the affordability of provision for low income families, the accessibility for women, and customer experience;
- The Committee also questioned how we are measuring improved health outcomes;
- Were encouraged by the range of women only programmes delivered and were particularly pleased to hear that there are plans to open a women's only gym at Poplar Baths;

- Were also pleased to hear that further outdoor gyms will be opening however wanted to see more support and guidance in place to encourage more people to use them to maximise the public health benefit;
- Recommended that there should be a requirement in the new contract to 'staff' outdoor gyms;
- Wanted to see evidence in regard how Public Health and Social Value would reach out to those areas in greatest need;
- Noted that whilst the Astro Turf Pitches that are available to hire across the Borough are run by different providers but they are cheaper than our neighbours or London Wide;
- Noted that the schools estate in Tower Hamlets has a range of educational, recreational and sporting facilities that can be made available for use by members of the wider community when not otherwise required for education purposes;
- Welcomed the development of stronger links between schools and the communities they serve;
- Noted that the leisure centre market has changed with the focuses now on both the higher end and the smaller budget gyms. Therefore, there is a need to look at how LBTH addresses the market; how Council facilities can stand out and encourage people to see them as a place to go;
- Were informed that as to the customer experience of the LBTH centres whilst many have achieved the customer excellence awards it is important to maintain these standards;
- Felt that given the age/quality of existing building stock there is an urgent need to look at how to obtain funding for repairs and maintenance; and
- Asked for bench marking data on users/per centre including a breakdown by post code e.g. (i) the use of the use of Open Air Gyms; (ii) community use of school facilities; and (iii) a breakdown of number of staff who are local residents.

In conclusion, the Chair thanked Councillor Akhtar for the presentation and looked forward to receiving the bench marking data.

## **9. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **9.1 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and Budget Planning**

The Chair thanked Councillor Candida Ronald (Cabinet Member for Resources and the Voluntary Sector) and Kevin Bartle (Interim Divisional Director of Finance, Procurement and Audit) for attending tonight's Overview and Scrutiny meeting to provide an update on the Council's finances as Members reviewed the Medium Term Financial Strategy report. The main points of the discussions on the report may be summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- Expressed concern by the sizable savings that the Council now needs to achieve and indicated that it would want to see (i) a more robust approach to developing saving proposals; and (ii) regular updates on the delivery of savings
- Noted that some savings have not been as robustly developed as they should have been;
- Felt that where the Council has committed to delivering savings that more work needs to be undertaken on (i) validation and (ii) time frames;
- Considered ways in which the Council can achieve the saving targets (**e.g.** recovery plans; an agency staffing panel and a review of all non-essential expenditure;
- Noted that it has an important role to play to ensure that targets are met by (i) continuing to question officers about the savings members have agreed; and (ii) maintaining an oversight of the Councils recovery plans;
- Expressed concerns regarding the timing of the budget consultation process and indicated that it would like this to start earlier to allow for better engagement with residents and the scrutiny process;
- Was pleased to hear that this is something which is currently being considered;
- Noted that some savings cannot now be delivered as they are factually inaccurate and new savings are now required;
- Noted that there is a consistent review of demographic growth to ensure that it reflects the actual situation (**e.g.** Impact on the increases in receipts from Council Tax);
- Felt it was important to have properly defined longer term savings than before.

The Chair **Moved** and it was:

### **RESOLVED**

- Placed on record its concerns regarding the timing of the budget consultation process and indicated that it would like this to start earlier to allow for better engagement with residents and the scrutiny process.

## **9.2 Quarterly Budget Monitoring**

Committee received and noted a presentation from Councillor Candida Ronald (Cabinet Member for Resources and the Voluntary Sector) and Kevin Bartle (Interim Divisional Director of Finance, Procurement and Audit) on Quarterly Budget Monitoring. The main points of the discussions on the report may be summarised as follows:

### The Committee

- Agreed that there is a need to be more robust monitoring process;
- Noted that budgetary pressures had been identified and that plans are in place to address them;
- Noted that the Council's Internal Audit is undertaking a review of the process;
- Confirmed its view that savings must be both robust and feasible if they are to be delivered;
- Expressed the view that consideration could be given to introducing a "bottom-up" budget process with individual directorates assigning total budgets to each service area. Which would boost accuracy and accountability as this process would involve all the individuals in each department; and
- Agreed that all the individuals in each department need to examine (i) how budgets can best serve each service area; and (ii) how to adjust budgets.

### 9.3 Strategic Performance Monitoring: Quarterly Performance Report

The Chair thanked Councillor Sirajul Islam (Statutory Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing) and Thorsten Dreyer (Head of Intelligence & Performance) for attending tonight's Overview and Scrutiny meeting to present an update on the pace, delivery, performance of the Council's Strategic Plan. The main points of the discussions on the report may be summarised as follows:

#### The Committee:

- Noted that Council's Performance and Accountability Framework outlined the process for monitoring the Strategic Plan to improve outcomes for residents;
- Noted that regular monitoring is being undertaken to enable Members and Directorates to keep process under review e.g. which indicators to keep and which to replace;
- Noted that (i) at the end of quarter 2 2019/20 all 73 strategic plan activities are expected to be delivered by the end of the year; (ii) 17 performance indicators have been met or are exceeding their target; (iii) 9 are between the target and the minimum expectation; (iv) 8 are falling short; and (v) 24 indicators are data only measures or do not have an expected data return in quarter 2 2019/20;
- Was keen to get detailed feedback on (i) those "delayed discharges" from hospital attributable to the Councils social care service; and (ii) the inequality measures in regards to WorkPath and Homelessness;
- Was informed that the NEETS indicator is being revised to bring it into line with national indicators which look at the specific age range of 16-17;
- Noted that work is undertaken with the directorates on the format/content of the documentation;

- Agreed that the pace, delivery, performance of the Council would continue to be an item for consideration at the regular spotlight sessions with Lead Members and the Corporate Directors; and
- Agreed to continue with the regular monitoring of the Strategic Plan.

## 10. VERBAL UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS

### **Councillor Sufia Alam Scrutiny Lead for Children and Education**

The Scrutiny lead informed the Committee that:

- Going forward the Sub-Committee would be looking at (i) Youth Provision – “The young experience”; and (ii) Children Social Care;
- The she had, had meetings with the relevant Divisional Directors;
- She had heard from Parents of the SEND Ambassadors group who relayed their experience of the services; and
- There was to be a review in regard to Secondary School exclusions.

### **Councillor Kahar Chowdhury - Scrutiny Lead for Health and Adults**

- Noted that at its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> November the Sub-Committee had considered (i) Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2018-19; (ii) Review of Homelessness Action Plan; (iii) Consolidating Dementia and Challenging Behaviour Inpatient Wards; and (iv) had a discussion relating to proposed changes to welfare meals.

### **Councillor Tarik Khan - Scrutiny Lead for Resources & Finance**

- Noted the Lead Member was in regular discussions with Neville Murton - Corporate Director of Resources and Kevin Bartle – Interim Divisional Director of Finance, Procurement and Audit.

### **Councillor Bex White - Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment**

Noted:

#### **Community Safety**

- The Scrutiny Lead (i) Had received the draft of Spotlight report today (25<sup>th</sup> November, 2019) and will review that later this week; (ii) Had, had review meetings with the Cabinet Member for Community Safety, and also with the Divisional Director to be apprised of developments in this area, specifically the two restructures that have taken place; (iii) Was planning for the new Borough Commander’s attendance at next month’s Overview and Scrutiny meeting; and (iv) Had had a meeting with the Corporate Director to review progress against this year’s budget and the development of the budget for next year.

## Environment

- The Scrutiny Lead (i) Had, had a meeting with Corporate Director for Place to review this year's financial performance, and to look at next year's budget; (ii) Awaiting a full list of what parking income can be spent on, given that this continues to come in higher than budgeted; and (iii) Had a meeting with the Portfolio Lead Member for Environment on fees and charges for the upcoming financial year.

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

The Committee received and noted those questions to be presented at Cabinet by the Chair in relation to unrestricted business on the agenda attached as appendices to these minutes. The main points of the discussion may be summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- Expressed its concern over the changes to the provision of 'meals on wheels'. This item had originally been presented at the Health Scrutiny meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> November, 2019 and the Committee raised a number of concerns. Principally, that that this is a key decision which should be taken by the Mayor in Cabinet before progressing any further;
- Indicated that it would like to ask the Mayor to agree to take this as a key decision so that it can be made in an open and transparent way
- Was disappointed that it had been unable properly scrutinise this decision as they had not been provided with sufficient information;
- Was concerned that (i) furthermore communication with affected service users has not been as clear; (ii) as this was an emotionally sensitive issue consultation with service users should have occurred before, not after, the decision was made;
- Was extremely concerned about the impact of these changes and the risks which may follow;
- Noted that the Cabinet report states that 101 reviews have been carried out and to date only 12 people have alternative arrangements in place;
- Wish to know if it is feasible to find alternative services which can be delivered by March 2020;
- Noted that they may require the Executive to submit a report to Council within such reasonable time as the Committee specifies should they believe that a key decision has been taken which was not (a) Published in advance in accordance with the Council's constitution; (b) The subject of the urgency procedure; or (c) The subject of an agreement with the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, or the Speaker;
- Noted that the power to require a report rests with them, but is also delegated to the Chief Executive, who shall require such a report on behalf of the Committee when so requested in writing by (a) The Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; (b) three Members of the

Overview and Scrutiny Committee; or (c) by a resolution passed at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee;

- Noted that the Executive would then prepare a report setting out the date of the decision, particulars of the decision, the individual or body making the decision, and if the Mayor is of the opinion that it was not a key decision, the reasons for that opinion;
- Noted there should also be details of any alternative decisions that were considered and why they were rejected, and the names of any member who has declared a conflict of interest in relation to the decision (if any); and
- Noted that the report will be submitted to the next ordinary meeting of Council. However, if the next meeting of Council is within ten days of receipt of the written notice, or the resolution of the Committee, then the report may be submitted to the Council meeting after that.

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

Nil items

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

As 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.

**14. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

Nil items

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

Nil items

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

Nil items

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

Nil items

**The meeting ended at 9.30 p.m.**

**Chair,  
Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Item 6.1 Refresh of Tower Hamlets Substance Misuse Strategy 2020-2025</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p><b>Question:</b> £1.5m on drug prevention. How much of this will be on street enforcement?</p>	<p>The £1.5m highlighted for drug prevention includes spend of approximately £925k on the Drug Interventions Programme (DIP). The DIP targets those engaged in crime and/or drug &amp; alcohol related anti-social behaviour with the aim of supporting them into treatment. A further £82k partly funds our commissioned Reset outreach/referral service. This service engages with hard to reach communities including those who are street homeless, to engage them in treatment.</p>
<b>Item 6.2 Award of Contracts for the Support Service in Three Hostels for the Single Homeless</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p><b>Question:</b> What consideration has been made to the expansion of hostel spaces in Tower Hamlets in the face of the homelessness crisis we are facing?</p>	<p>The directorate currently spends £4.872 million per annum on accommodation based and floating support services for residents who are experiencing homelessness or rough sleeping. There are 452 hostel beds in the borough commissioned by the Council. This compares with 200 beds in Hackney, 163 in Newham, 430 in Westminster and 652 in Camden. We work in partnership with our hostel providers to continually look for improvements to hostel provision and to ensure that residents progress through the pathway into more stable independent living.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b> Will anti ASB/drug dealing covenants be drawn up with Providence Row for each hostel as part of the Service Level Agreement</p>	<p>There is a good working arrangement between hostels and all agencies working with ASB. Multi-agency meetings have been established including hostel providers, the police, ASB team, DAAT, rough sleeping team and hostels usually have</p>

	good relationships with local residents associations. We will monitor how well these arrangements deal with the local issues
<b>Question:</b> How have local GP services been engaged in the contracting process? Practices receive funding for patients that live in their catchment for 2 consecutive quarters- which often isn't the case for the homeless/hostel population they treat.	GP services work closely with our hostel providers and do provide support for residents within hostels, however long they are resident for. In addition, the CCG commission a specialist primary care service – Health E1 – which supports hostels and rough sleepers.
<b>Item 6.3 Adoption of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing the Benefits</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p><b>Appendix 3</b> for Adoption of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing the Benefits Millennium Quarter Public Realm Guidance Manual is to be revoked and removed from the website</p> <p><b>Question:</b> Given that these documents are much more detailed than anything in the Local Plan and have never been fully implemented, why are they obsolete?</p>	<p>Appendix 3 of the Cabinet report sets out the reasons supplementary planning guidance has been revoked, and this will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Guidance being superseded by more up-to-date policy</li> <li>- Guidance has informed more recent policy being adopted</li> <li>- Guidance has already been implemented on sites which have been developed out</li> </ul> <p>With regard to the Draft Millennium Quarter Public Realm (MQPR) Guidance Manual, this was prepared to inform The Millennium Quarter Masterplan which was revoked upon the adoption of the South Quay Masterplan.</p> <p>Background The Draft Millennium Quarter Public Realm (MQPR) Guidance Manual (2008) was prepared prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy (2010) and as such, was subsequently adopted as interim planning guidance.</p>

	<p>When the Millennium Quarter Masterplan (2000) was revoked on 6/10/2015 following the adoption of the South Quay Masterplan as a supplementary planning document (SPD) (2015), the draft MQPR guidance manual (2008) was retained so as to continue being used to inform development across the South Quay area.</p> <p>The main purpose of the draft MQPR Guidance Manual was to provide attractive, uncluttered and accessible for all whilst seamlessly integrating public and privately owned land and new public open space. The main principles set out in the manual provide the framework for delivering the vision for MQ streetscene such as: tree lined boulevard, enhance and preserve dockside promenade and enhancing paving surfaces.</p> <p>The following headings below outlines the aims/principles of the draft MQPR Guidance Manual and how it has informed or been reflected in the new Local Plan and the adopted IoD SP OAPF.</p> <p>Two site allocations in the new Local Plan, Marsh Wall West and Millharbour South, cover the same boundary as the area covered by the draft MQPR guidance.</p> <p><b><u>Strategic Design approach</u></b> <b><u>Principles/aims</u></b></p>
--	---

	<p>Identifies movement strategy with clear defined routes for pedestrians/cyclist and vehicles.</p> <p>The two site allocations, Marsh Wall West and Millharbour South, set out and define a new movement strategy with greater priority for pedestrians and cyclists. This movement strategy is more up to date with identified development parcels and sites which have been developed since the draft MQPR was produced.</p> <p><b><u>Design &amp; layout guidance</u></b> <b><u>Principles/aims</u></b></p> <p>This section provides guidance for the detailed design and layout of public realm. Prescriptive guidance on how the Streets and paths (highways – adopted or private) should be laid out and how they relate to adjacent private developments. The two site allocations specify design principles and delivery considerations which developments are expected to respond to and address.</p> <p>The detailed guidance within the MQPR guidance is prescriptive and the Council would have to rely on s106 contributions secured through the now revoked Millennium Quarter Masterplan for the highway design principles to be delivered. Also given that CIL has now replaced s106 since the production of the Guidance, design principles and aims within the Guidance would be much harder to</p>
--	--

	<p>achieve.</p> <p>Much of the prescriptive design guidance is outside the development sites and applied to the Council’s own adopted highways. This is considered to be too prescriptive for the Council and has no direct funding mechanism to deliver it now.</p> <p>It should be further noted that the Local Plan states that ‘Development should accord with the design principles set out in the latest supplementary guidance for South Quay’.</p> <p>The relevant SPG for South Quay in this instance would be Isle of Dogs OAPF (IoD OAPF) adopted in October 2019 by the GLA. There are design criteria that developments would need to have regard to in light of this up-to-date guidance.</p> <p><b><u>Materials and specification</u></b> <b><u>Principles/aims</u></b></p> <p>Sets out prescriptive street furniture specifications such Seating, bollards, bins, cycle stands, bus shelters, wayfinding, lighting, surface treatment, types of trees.</p> <p>The Local Plan or the IoD OAPF does not detail prescriptive specification of street further etc. within the two site allocations as it is not considered appropriate. In addition, product and design as specified have moved on and evolved</p>
--	--

	<p>since the guidance was produced over 10 years ago. For instance implementing TfL’s standardised Legible London signs/wayfinding which are consistent across the whole of London that would be more appropriate rather than that identified in the MQPR Guidance.</p> <p><b><u>Maintenance guidance manual</u></b> <b><u>Principles/aims</u></b></p> <p>Provides strategy for maintenance and management of public realm spaces, such as how often bins needs to be collected and how often pavements needs to be cleaned/swept.</p> <p>The Local Plan and IoD OAPF do not specify any prescriptive management strategy; however, the highway authority would have a strategic management strategy for their own assets, and an estate management strategy is usually secured through a development management process via s.106 and/or planning condition. This would ensure that the quality of the public realm is retained and maintained.</p>
<p><b>Item 6.4 Adoption of the Tower Hamlets Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>1. <b>Question:</b> What consideration has been put into tightening up the local plan to make it harder for HMOs (accommodation described as co-living) to receive planning permission?</p>	<p>HMO: The new Local Plan introduces a new policy on housing with shared facilities (HMOs) - policy D.H7. This policy covers both smaller traditional HMOs (use class C4) as well as larger HMOs often described as co-living (sui generis use</p>

	<p>class).</p> <p>The policy has been introduced to address two trends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Conversion of existing housing into smaller HMOs (due to permitted development rights enabling this); and</li><li>• A context of increasing market interest in the provision of this form of housing designed to meet the large growth of multi-adult households both locally and in London, which has been broadly supported in the GLA's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (2016) and emerging London Plan.</li></ul> <p>The policy seeks to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The scheme meets an identified need with regards to both the specific scheme and its location. This is to prevent the oversupply of this form of housing.</li><li>• The scheme doesn't result in the loss of existing larger housing suitable for family accommodation.</li><li>• The scheme is of a high residential quality and well managed, so it is built as, and remains, a high quality living environment and does not have amenity impacts on neighbours.</li></ul> <p>In addition, a key policy objective is for the development to deliver the borough's priority need for affordable housing. The policy acknowledges that some traditional HMOs do provide a form of affordable housing, in particular for people in</p>
--	---

	<p>receipt of the shared-room rate housing benefit. However the majority of the new style of larger HMOs do not meet this need and must therefore contribute towards the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>In recognition that this type of housing could come forward on a large site which could accommodate a range of housing types, the Local Plan policy requires all large-scale HMO / co-living schemes to deliver affordable housing according to the same hierarchy as all housing developments: Priority to deliver on-site self-contained (i.e. conventional flats and houses) affordable housing, if this is demonstrably not possible the scheme should deliver off-site self-contained affordable housing and only if this is also not demonstrably possible can the scheme provide a payment in lieu.</p> <p>The emerging London Plan only requires all large-scale HMO/ co-living schemes to provide a payment in lieu for the delivery of conventional affordable housing.</p> <p>To support the implementation of this HMO policy, the Council is in the process of adopting an 'article 4 direction' which will prevent the use of permitted development rights for the change of use from dwelling houses (class C3) to small houses in multiple occupation (class C4).</p> <p>The process to implement an article 4 direction is</p>
--	---

	<p>lengthy, but was agreed by the Mayor in Cabinet on July 24th 2019, with consultation held during August and September 2019. The article 4 direction will be presented to Cabinet on January 29th 2020 for confirmation and the direction will come into force one year on from that confirmation. Once the article 4 is in place, any change of use from dwelling houses (class C3) to small houses in multiple occupation (class C4) will be subject to the new Local Plan Policy described above.</p>
<p>2. <b>Question:</b> Is the Local Plan not amended too much that it now needs another round of Public Consultation?</p>	<p>The process of consultation on the Local Plan has been thorough, and undertaken in line with the statutory requirements. The key stages in the development of the plan, and the relevant consultation processes that accompanied each stage are set out in the Table 1 (after paragraph 3.3) of the Cabinet report.</p> <p>The most recent stage of consultation was the ‘main modifications’ consultation which took place between 25 March and 9 May 2019. This consulted on the proposed main modifications that emerged as part of the Local Plan examination process. The final decision on which modifications should be implemented belonged to the inspector of the plan, and these modifications are set out and explained in full in her final report. A number of minor modifications were proposed at the same time, but these did not need to be consulted on, being typographical and grammar corrections, and other minor changes for clarity. The final decision</p>

	<p>as to what represented a ‘main’ or ‘minor’ modification rested with the inspector. The majority of the proposed main modifications were accepted in the inspector’s final report, with only minor changes to some of the proposed modifications. These changes are set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• MM6 – for the Canary Wharf Tall Building Zone Principles, the following sentence was removed: “The silhouette of One Canada Square should be clearly visible in all relevant strategic views and borough designated views, as defined in policy D.DH4”</li><li>• MM31 – in the monitoring indicators related to A5 hot food takeaway uses, the inspector has added “and/or a local authority owned leisure centre” as a facility that an A5 use should not be placed within 200 metres of (in addition to schools)</li><li>• MM33 – new modification added by the inspector, to amend the boundary of the Reuters site allocation to omit the data centre</li><li>• MM34 – new modification added by the inspector, to amend the boundary of the Skyline of Strategic Importance designation so that it accords with the boundary of the Canary Wharf Tall Building Zone designation</li></ul> <p>With regards to the CIL examination, the revised draft charging schedule was submitted for examination on 25 May 2019 – after the end of the Local Plan main modifications consultation. The inspector in the CIL examination was aware of what had taken place at the Local Plan</p>
--	--

	<p>examination, and would have had access to the proposed main modifications that had been consulted on. Indeed, reference to the modified version of the Local Plan is made in the CIL inspector’s final report. While the CIL inspector could not have access to the Local Plan inspector’s final report, which was released after the conclusion of the CIL examination, it is clear that they had a knowledge and understanding of what modifications were proposed to the Local Plan at this time, and examined the CIL charging schedule on this basis.</p> <p>Given the minor nature of the changes between the main modifications proposed in the consultation and those eventually implemented by the Local Plan inspector, and given the fact that these changes do not appear to impinge on development viability in any way, it is not considered necessary to re-consult on the CIL charging schedule. There is no reference in the CIL inspector’s final report to modifications MM6 or MM31, to tall building zones, to A5 uses, or to the Reuters site allocation – and these are the only issues where changes have been made after the close of the CIL examination.</p>
<p>3. The London Borough of Tower Hamlets will retain 5% of CIL charges for monitoring and administrative purposes in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).</p> <p>(A) <b>Question:</b> Will LBTH always retain 5% of CIL even if that exceeds the direct monitoring and administrative costs incurred?</p>	<p>No, The Council is not required to use the whole 5% and the actual percentage used may vary</p>

<p>(B) <b>Question:</b> If yes to question 1 what will the excess 'profit' be spent on?</p> <p>(C) <b>Question:</b> If yes to the question 1 how will the funding deficit be filled if only 95% of CIL will be spent on infrastructure?</p>	<p>between years, depending on the amount received. Any of the 5% unused for administration is required to be returned to the 'main CIL pot' for use on the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>CIL is paid to the Council in either one or two phases within six months of the commencement of development. Individual payments for large developments can exceed £5m. This means that income from CIL is not regular, but is subject to peaks and troughs, resulting in annual income that varies significantly and therefore so does the annual value of the administrative 5%. Further, Government CIL Regulations state that income received as the administrative 5% must be spent only in the year it is received. The result is that the cost of the administering CIL as a percentage of income varies from year to year.</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Additional funding for infrastructure includes national and regional funding e.g. Government Grants such as for schools, Housing Infrastructure Fund administered by Central Government, Strategic Infrastructure Pot administered by City of London on behalf of London Councils, a range of GLA and TfL funding sources and additional S106 obligations.</p>
---	--

<p><b>Item 6. 5 Update Report on recommendations for the future delivery of Contract Services</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p><b>Question:</b> Do we have a list of providers who currently provide or could</p>	<p>The resource pack circulated to Health Scrutiny</p>

<p>provide a meals on wheels type service to residents, for example Husseys the butchers in Wapping support a number of local residents</p>	<p>Committee members describes the main alternative provision to the Welfare Meals service. There is a huge range of alternatives, so the resource pack does not include everything. In addition to the resource pack, we expect social care practitioners working in our locality teams to have knowledge of specific local alternatives.</p>
<p><b>Question: 4.2.15 ii Electric vehicle van hire:</b> Can we not use this electric van elsewhere, as far as I know it is one of only a handful or perhaps the only one used by LBTH despite having declared a climate emergency</p>	<p>We will explore options across the Council for the alternative use of the electric van.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b> How many new service users have been referred to the Meals on Wheels service in each of the past five years?</p>	<p>Written response to follow</p>
<p><b>Question:</b> Why the full Equalities Impact Assessment mentioned in para 6.1 has not been published alongside the report, and if that will now be done?</p>	<p>The Equalities Impact Assessment is a working document that is reviewed regularly to identify and mitigate any impacts identified. The document has been circulated to Health Scrutiny Committee members and can be made available as necessary. As the report to Cabinet is an update report, related documents have been referenced but have not been published alongside.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b> Why have existing service users been told this service is ending before any decision on its future has been taken by the Mayor in Cabinet?</p>	<p>The Mayor in Cabinet discussed the future of the service following a February 2019 Cabinet report entitled ‘Recommendations for the Future Delivery of Contract Services’. Following this, Recommendation 8 in the report was carried out: “Undertake further work collectively to assess alternative delivery options and the future operation/function of the CPU”. Engagement with current service users was carried out as part of this. The work resulted in an agreed approach of individual reviews to support people to receive meals from an alternative source. We do not view this to be a separate key decision to be made by</p>

	<p>the Mayor in Cabinet. The explanation for this view is articulated in the answer to the below question 'Why is the decision to end the meals on wheels service not considered a key decision. Existing service users were sent a letter to inform them of the planned change.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b> Why the effective closure of the Meals on Wheels service was not subject to public consultation?</p>	<p>The Council is not ceasing providing support around meals but changing how support is provided to make it better aligned with the requirements of the Care Act to promote independence, choice and control. This approach helps build resilience and find personalised solutions for people.</p> <p>A range of approaches to engagement and consultation were considered and an individual and personal approach was agreed, focused on the 160 people directly affected by the change. The changes being made will continue to meet individual needs. Measures have been put in place to ensure the impact of these changes is not detrimental. Concentrating our efforts on the individuals and talking through alternative options is a proportionate approach and more likely to result in the best outcome for them.</p>
<p><b>Question:</b> Why is the decision to end the meals on wheels service not considered a key decision?</p>	<p>We do not view this decision to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards or electoral divisions. This is because the decision does not mean that service users stop receiving meals, but rather it changes the way that meals</p>

	<p>are provided. The resource pack outlines some of the large range of alternatives available to people. We do not consider these alternatives to result in a significant material impact, impact on wellbeing or impact on the quality of service received. The Equality Analysis identifies the barriers people might experience in accessing these alternatives, and concludes that mitigating actions are in place to overcome them.</p> <p>The February 2019 Cabinet report ('Recommendations for the Future Delivery of Contract Services') includes the following recommendation, which was subsequently agreed: "Recommendation 8: In partnership with Adult Services undertake further work collectively to assess alternative delivery options and the future operation/function of the CPU. The findings of this work will be the subject of a future report to Cabinet".</p>
<p><b>Question:</b> 101 reviews have been undertaken and only 12 solutions have been identified. Are there alternatives realistically available and deliverable by March, 2020?</p>	<p>We are making good progress and most of the alternative arrangements will be in place by January. It is important people are given a bit of time to adjust where required and that new arrangements are implemented at the correct pace. There are processes to identify complex cases and the type of support they require. All cases will have new arrangements by February 2020.</p>
<p><b>Item 6.6 Scrutiny Report - Improving health, environmental quality, economic and social outcomes through Housing Open Spaces</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>

**Question:** Given the scrutiny report will LBTH now commit to not building on any housing open space that it owns?

No. The objective of the joint scrutiny review was to improve health, environmental quality, economic and social outcomes through Housing Open Spaces. In delivering the joint scrutiny review, members of the joint scrutiny panel agreed to review good practices and policies in housing open space management.

Key issues of importance arising during the review were:

- Improving the quality of open spaces
- Enhancing bio diversity
- Improving connectivity to open spaces
- Place making

The joint panel agreed that in a borough with a growing population, where the lack of affordable housing is one of 3 top resident concerns, c.19, 000+ people are on the housing register, there is a Mayoral priority to deliver 2,000 Council homes, where existing open space deficiencies exist and underutilised open spaces is an issue, delivering a balance between competing priorities to achieve quality open spaces is crucial (Recommendation 2b).

Through resident engagement the Council housebuilding programme empowers residents to be active in the design of schemes. This includes enhancing open space / green space sites through intelligent design and planting, and working with the ASB preventions officer to design out ASB. The joint panel acknowledged the Council's

	<p>approach to design and stakeholder engagement and requested that the Council prioritise and encourage underutilised spaces to be co-designed and transformed to deliver a balance between competing priorities.</p> <p>Additional outcomes that the Council is progressing since the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exploring the conditioning of environmental improvements as part of Council schemes</li> <li>• Organising a workshop bringing together everyone who delivers open space projects</li> </ul> <p>Another issue of importance is the question - how housing open space improvements will be funded if not through new development?</p>
<p><b>Item 6.8 Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q2 2019-20</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p><b>6.8a App1 for Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q2 2019-20</b> Capital Receipts Table 5.2 Less: Poolable amount paid to DCLG 0.8M</p> <p><b>Question:</b> I thought we had an agreement with the Mayor of London that we would not lose Right to Buy receipts not spent within the timescales. Is this money really lost?</p>	<p>Any right to buy receipts that are paid back to MHCLG are passported to the GLA and held by them for three years for use by LBTH. After three years, any receipt not used will be lost; therefore the Council will prioritise use of receipts held by GLA.</p> <p>Background: The Mayor of London launched the Building Council Homes for Londoners funding prospectus in May 2018. The prospectus contained details of a Right to Buy Ring-fence Offer for councils under which the GLA will ring-fence any Right to Buy receipts that a participating council collects and returns to the GLA (via central Government) for use by that council. This decision approves the receipt from central Government of funds collected</p>

	<p>by councils in London from Right to Buy receipts and, where the funds received derive from a participating council's area, the award of such funding by the GLA as affordable housing grant to be spent on delivering new social housing for rent by that council. It also approves applying such receipts to the Mayor's Homes for Londoners: Affordable Homes Programme 2016-21 budgets retrospectively at the end of each year, once amounts received are finalised.</p> <p>The Mayor of London approved on 5 November 2018 that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The receipt from central Government of grant on a quarterly basis for amounts up to that collected by councils in London from sales receipts (plus any interest) of dwellings under the Right to Buy scheme;</li> <li>2. Where councils opt in to the GLA's Right to Buy Ring-fence Offer, as described in the Mayor's Building Council Homes for Londoners funding prospectus, making allocations of affordable housing grant to spend on delivering new social housing for rent up to the amount received (or expected to be received) from central Government in respect of the decision above; and</li> <li>3. Applying the grant received from central Government under this Mayoral Decision to the Mayor's Homes for Londoners: Affordable Homes Programme 2016 21 budgets at the year end.</li> </ol> <p>Link:  <a href="https://www.london.gov.uk/decisions/md2369-right-buy-ringfence-offer">https://www.london.gov.uk/decisions/md2369-right-buy-ringfence-offer</a></p>
<p><b>6.8g App7 for Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q2 2019-</b></p>	<p>Whilst receiving only one bid is not commonplace,</p>

**20, item 6.8** Barnsley Street - This scheme exception records that following extensive market testing and a 9 week tender period, only one submission was received from Mulalley. The proposed contract sum for the scheme is £18,826,413.00 which is over the PTE of £16,752,300.00.

**Question:** Receiving only one tender is unusual, how common is this?

**Question:** Why only one tender?

it does happen and tends to occur more now than it used to. Precise reasons for non-response have not been received from the other Framework members yet but the following factors are known to have an influence:

1. Market costs have gone up but the cost driver from local authorities is downward as the impact of the austerity measures still pertain, meaning that potential bidders are more selective in the opportunities they respond to.
2. Mulalley is an established provider for LBTH and so knows it well as a client. On this basis Mulalley can bid more confidently as opportunities arise.
3. The tender was undertaken via a Framework. This, by definition, limits the market able to bid, which means:
  - a. Providers can be more selective in the opportunities they pursue as they will always be one of a select number of tenderers for any opportunity they choose to bid for
  - b. If providers on the Framework choose not to tender, there is not an 'open market' of bidders who might step in and make up the numbers. Whilst Frameworks are a very useful tendering medium for both clients and contractors, these factors combine to illustrate the limited benefits of this route to the market.

A single response is always disappointing but not unknown. Brownfield infill sites present logistical problems that might render the opportunity less

	attractive to the market, and so more readily bring the factors above into play.
--	--

# **Budget Scrutiny 2019-20**

## **Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

### **16 December 2019**

**Kevin Bartle**

**Interim Divisional Director Finance,  
Procurement & Audit**

# Delivery of MTFS Savings - Process

- High level savings target issued prior to the start of the year
- Directorates consider options
- Finance staff support production of a savings pro-forma
- Corporate finance staff collate proformas and feed in to MTFS
- Proposals reviewed by CLT and agree those to submit to members
- Proposals reviewed by Cabinet before final agreement
- Questions raised by members before approving
- Final savings included in MTFS for approval by Council

# Challenges with the process

- MTFs is normally finally balanced with little room for manoeuvre
- ‘Low hanging fruit’ already taken
- ‘Real’ or genuine service reductions avoided
- Tendency to accept ‘flaky’ proposals given pressure to balance the budget
- Tendency to push ‘difficult’ proposals into the future

# Impact of non delivery/slippage

- Each saving not delivered produces an overspend
- If this cannot be mitigated from elsewhere it will require a draw down from reserves
- Delayed savings have a compounding impact on use of reserves
- New, more robust, challenge process planned for next year to be led by the Cabinet Member for Resources

# Savings Performance Q2 Summary

Savings target £'000	Slippage from previous year £'000	Revised Savings target £'000	Delivered/ cashed £'000	Forecast savings £'000	Variance - Slippage £'000	Variance - Under / (over) delivery £'000
-------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------	--

Savings Achievement Status
Savings Delivered / On Target
Savings Slipping but Achievable
Not Deliverable / Not Achievable
<b>Total</b>

2019-20							
6,067	319	6,386	<b>2,539</b>	6,206	100	80	
6,959	8,359	15,318	<b>351</b>	7,791	7,527	-	
1,819	1,579	3,398	-	50	-	3,348	
<b>14,845</b>	<b>10,257</b>	<b>25,102</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>14,047</b>	<b>7,627</b>	<b>3,428</b>	

Savings Achievement Status
Savings Delivered / On Target
Savings Slipping but Achievable
Not Deliverable / Not Achievable
<b>Total</b>

2020-21							
14,590	100	14,690		<b>12,490</b>	300	1,900	
-	7,527	7,527		<b>7,001</b>	250	276	
-	-	-		-	-	-	
<b>14,590</b>	<b>7,627</b>	<b>22,217</b>		<b>19,491</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>2,176</b>	

Savings Achievement Status
Savings Delivered / On Target
Savings Slipping but Achievable
Not Deliverable / Not Achievable
<b>Total</b>

2021-22							
8,159	300	8,459		<b>8,159</b>	-	300	
-	250	250		<b>250</b>	-	-	
-	-	-		-	-	-	
<b>8,159</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>8,709</b>		<b>8,409</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300</b>	

# Directorate Savings 2019-20

2019-20						
Savings target	Slippage from previous year	Revised Savings target	Delivered / cashed	Forecast savings	Variance - Slippage	Variance - Under / (over) delivery
£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000

Directorate
Health, Adults & Community
Children and Culture
Place
Governance
Resources
Cross-Directorate

2,752	679	3,431	<b>781</b>	2,594	837	-
3,443	1,550	4,993	<b>450</b>	645	1,000	3,348
2,456	530	2,986	<b>1,351</b>	2,506	400	80
50	-	50	<b>50</b>	50	-	-
525	2,250	2,775	-	2,075	700	-
5,619	5,248	10,867	<b>258</b>	6,177	4,690	-

<b>Total</b>
--------------

<b>14,845</b>	<b>10,257</b>	<b>25,102</b>	<b>2,890</b>	<b>14,047</b>	<b>7,627</b>	<b>3,428</b>
---------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	--------------

# Directorate Savings 2020-21

2020-21					
Savings target	Slippage from previous year	Revised Savings target	Forecast savings	Variance - Slippage	Variance - Under / (over) delivery
£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000

Health, Adults & Community	1,190	837	2,027	<b>1,751</b>	-	276
Children and Culture	1,800	1,000	2,800	<b>1,950</b>	250	600
Place	3,080	400	3,480	<b>2,780</b>	-	700
Governance	-	-	-	-	-	-
Resources	2,770	700	3,470	<b>2,570</b>	300	600
Cross-Directorate	5,750	4,690	10,440	<b>10,440</b>	-	-

Directorate
Health, Adults & Community
Children and Culture
Place
Governance
Resources
Cross-Directorate

<b>Total</b>
--------------

<b>14,590</b>	<b>7,627</b>	<b>22,217</b>	<b>19,491</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>2,176</b>
---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	------------	--------------

# Directorate Savings 2021-22

2021-22					
Savings target	Slippage from previous year	Revised Savings target	Forecast savings	Variance - Slippage	Variance - Under / (over) delivery
£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000

1,700	-	1,700	<b>1,700</b>	-	-
300	250	550	<b>550</b>	-	-
329	-	329	<b>329</b>	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-
200	300	500	<b>200</b>	-	300
5,630	-	5,630	<b>5,630</b>	-	-

Directorate
Health, Adults & Community
Children and Culture
Place
Governance
Resources
Cross-Directorate

<b>Total</b>
--------------

<b>8,159</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>8,709</b>	<b>8,409</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>300</b>
--------------	------------	--------------	--------------	----------	------------

# Savings Not Deliverable

## - Children & Culture

Directorate	Savings Title	Year Approved	£'000
Children and Culture	Better targeting of services for children with special educational need and disabilities (SEND)	2017-18	940
Children and Culture	Increasing the involvement of partners in Early Years services	2017-18	2,408
			<b>3,348</b>

Page 10

### **Better targeting of services for children with special educational need and disabilities (SEND) - £0.940m**

- £200k saving was achieved in Educational Psychology Service.
- Remaining £940k is unachievable on general fund as it relates to DSG funding.

### **➤ Increasing the involvement of partners in Early Years services - £2.408m**

- Local Authority day nurseries have closed, which reduces pressure in DSG. Savings does not impact general fund.

# Savings Slipping but Achievable

Directorate	Title	Year Approved	Savings target 2019-20 £'000	Slippage from previous year £'000	Revised Savings target 2019-20 £'000	Slippage £'000
Health, Adults & Community	Day Opportunities Provision	2017-18	140	100	240	-
Health, Adults & Community	Helping People with Learning Disability live Independently	2017-18	619	550	1,169	837
Health, Adults & Community	Improving Employment Support for Adults with Disabilities	2017-18	100	29	129	-
Children & Culture	Better support for families through early help, and reduction in social care demand	2017-18	1,000	-	1,000	1,000
Place	Generating more income from council assets	2016-17	-	50	50	-
Place	Maximising use of technology in Housing Options Service	2017-18	300	-	300	300
Place	Review of Enforcement Function- More Generic Working	2016-17	-	351	351	-
Place	School Crossing Patrols to be delivered by Schools	2016-17	-	89	89	-
Cross-Directorate	Consolidation of Business Support and Administration Functions	2017-18	-	1,000	1,000	1,000
Cross-Directorate	Debt Management & Income Optimisation	2017-18	1,500	1,500	3,000	1,500
Resources	Human Resources (1)	2017-18	-	1,250	1,250	700
Cross-Directorate	Human Resources (2) Council wide agency costs / Training & development / Employment T&C	2017-18	2,000	-	2,000	-
Cross-Directorate	Local Presence / Contact Centre Review	2017-18	800	1,250	2,050	1,200
Cross-Directorate	Review of Printing/ Scanning/ Use of Multi-Functional Devices (MFD's)	2017-18	500	990	1,490	990
			<b>6,959</b>	<b>7,159</b>	<b>14,118</b>	<b>7,527</b>

# Savings Slipping but Achievable

## Health, Adults & Community

### ➤ Day Opportunities Provision - £0.240m

- Savings delivery being reviewed through Adult Social Care Programme Board

Page 112

### ➤ Helping People with Learning Disability live Independently - £1.169m (slippage forecast £0.837m)

- Savings delivery being reviewed through Adult Social Care Programme Board and Supporting Independence working group.
- A mitigation plan is in the final stage of development.

### ➤ Improving Employment Support for Adults with Disabilities - £0.129m

- Some savings will potentially slip due to procurement timelines, however mitigations will be put in place.

# **Savings Slipping but Achievable**

## **Children & Culture**

- **Better support for families through early help, and reduction in social care demand (Youth Services and Commissioning) - £1m**
  - This will not be achieved in 2019-20.
  - Savings are due to come from multiple workstreams and a phase 2 restructure of the team, which will achieve part year savings in 2020-21 and full year in 2021-22.

# Questions and discussion

This page is intentionally left blank



EVERY  
CHANCE  
for EVERY  
CHILD

Page 116

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee – Budget Scrutiny - Children & Culture Directorate

December 2019

Cllr Danny Hassell

Cabinet Member for Children, Schools and Young People

# Overall Position



The current pressures on the General Fund amount to £12.2m.

## **‘Overspending’**

- This consists of Children’s Social Care (£2.9m), Special Educational Needs (£1.7m), Youth Services and Commissioning (£1.5m), Children’s Resources (£1.3m) & Sport, Leisure and Culture (£0.6m).

Page 1

## **Unachievable savings**

- This also includes unachievable savings amounting to £3.3m (Early Years £2.4m and SEND £0.9m) and slipped savings of £1.0m (Youth Services and Commissioning).

## **Recovery plan**

- There is a recovery action plan in place that currently suggests a reduction in the forecast overspend to £10.2m before drawdown from reserves of £0.6m.



TOWER HAMLETS

# Children's Social Care

EVERY  
CHANCE  
for EVERY  
CHILD

- Following conclusion of the “intervention and monitoring” phase of strengthening services, following the Ofsted ‘Good’ rating in June, we are now looking to “right-size” the budget for Children’s Social Care.
- **Staffing** - In order to continue this standard of service delivery, CSC require an additional investment of £1.6m to increase their frontline social work establishment by 25 posts. These 25 posts were funded via the Ofsted Improvement budget, therefore the request is to maintain the current staffing levels which have delivered the significant improvements seen over the past two years and endorsed by the recent Ofsted judgement of “Good”.

# Children's Social Care



- **Placements** - The sufficiency strategy has had an impact on the numbers of older young people reducing within the high cost placements. However this has been offset to some degree by an increase in more expensive placements such as those for mother and baby assessments. There is a growth bid of £1.8m to realign the placement budget.
- **Cost Reductions** - £1m of savings against the Social Work Academy and associated recruitment activity. These savings will come from converting current agency staff into permanent positions, through the recruitment, support and retention of newly qualified SW's (ASYE's) and recruitment of experienced SW's over a three year period.

# Contract Services



- Options for the future delivery of Contract Services were presented to and agreed by Cabinet in February 2019. The options included recommendations intended to reduce pressures on the budget for this service, including withdrawal of Secondary school catering, withdrawal from schools contract cleaning, a review of adults' welfare meals.
- Some changes have been made and are reducing the budget pressure this year.
- The action plan will have a phased impact during 2019/20 with fully delivery from 2020-21.

# Other areas of pressure



- **Leaving Care Service (Through-care)** - Cumulative funding pressure as a result of responsibilities for increasing number of Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children and change in legislation for LA responsibilities for young people up to age 25. In addition to the commitments made to provide accommodation for Dubs Children.
- **Early Years** – A growth bid has been prepared to reverse the 2017-18 pre agreed savings for Early Years. The proposal was flawed as the Early Years budget was funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) not the revenue base budget. Therefore no savings could be achieved.
- **Sport, Leisure and Culture** - Recovery action plan proposes reducing spend against income by £0.6m to offset pressures within this service.

# Special Educational Needs



- There is a proposed growth bid to reverse the 2017-18 pre agreed savings for SEND. The business proposal was flawed as the SEND budget for Educational placements and associated support for children who have an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) (a statutory requirement under C&F Act 2014) is funded by the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG), not the council's general fund.
- The Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) has a £7.7m overspend. This is principally in relation to the High Needs Funding Block.
- The council has been required to submit a recovery plan to DfE which outlines how the overspend will be addressed.
- The recovery plan includes reducing the amount of funding retained by LBTH to deliver support services, reducing demand for Alternative Provision and a reduction in all school top-up payments.
- The indicative High Needs Block funding for 2020/21 shows an increase of £7.3m which will decrease the overspend pressure.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Health, Adults and Community Savings Update

Page 124

## Overview and Scrutiny

**16 December 2019**

# Overall Position

Directorate – Projected 4.1m Overspend at end of Quarter 2

Adult Social Care – the main driver of the above position with a projected overspend of 4.4m at Quarter 2 (against net budget of c100m).

## Pressure

- Pressures in both residential/nursing and home care packages
- Pressures around increased demand for care and pressures on the cost of care services (similar to national picture)
- Increased forecast costs in Direct Payments without corresponding reduction in home care and with only a small rise in numbers – further investigation
- Significant difficulties arising from changes to home care payment systems impacting on data quality and forecasting.

Page 125

## Savings

- 3.4m savings target in 2019/20 – on track to deliver 2.6m (76%) at end of Q2.

## Recovery Plan

- In place and currently mitigation in place or planned for 2.6m with further actions being continually explored.

Service Area	Title	Lead Officer	19-20 Savings		Slippage	
			Target £000	Forecast £000	£000	RAG
Adults Social Care	Helping People with Learning Disability live Independently	Claudia Brown	1,169	332	837	Red
Adults Social Care	Improving Employment Support for Adults with Disabilities	Warwick Tomsett	129	129	0	Amber
Adult Social Care	Day Opportunities Provision	Claudia Brown / Warwick Tomsett	240	240	0	Amber
			<b>1,538</b>	<b>701</b>	<b>837</b>	

## Helping People with Learning Disability live Independently – Forecast slippage £837k

Progress with work streams has not been as successful as originally planned. The delay is mainly due to identifying clients and moving them back in to the Borough.

A mitigation plan is in the final stage of development to provide clarity on what the profile of savings delivery can be whilst also increasing confidence and maximising independence of service users. The plan broadly explores options to:

- Increase local accommodation to support moves back into the borough via partnership schemes with Housing
- Successfully move clients from residential into Supported Accommodation
- Re-procure care services.

## Improving Employment Support for Adults with Disabilities

Block contracts have been re-procured resulting in a delivered saving of £20k. The remaining saving is planned to be delivered through the procurement of the Learning Disabilities day opportunities framework. This is on track to deliver £72k in 19/20, with the remainder in 20/21. The slippage in this is the time necessary to implement changes in individuals care packages.

## Day Opportunities Provision

This work stream has previously delivered savings of £260k; remaining savings in this area cover commissioned and in house provision for older people and for adults with learning disabilities. Further work in this area has slipped and we are reviewing any opportunities to mitigate the savings in this financial year.

The MTFs includes further significant savings as we continue to:

- Seek efficiencies across all services/contracts
- Transform adult social care through a strengths and assets based approach
- Promote prevention, early intervention/early help and reablement
- Try to reduce the cost of adult social care in the borough – benchmarking indicates we have comparatively high costs even when our levels of deprivation/need and other specific factors are taken into account.

Page 128

Service Area	Title	Lead Officer	Savings Target £000	
			20-21	21-22
Adult Social Care	Adult Social Care Transformation	Claudia Brown	1,000	
Integrated Commissioning	Integrated Commissioning Efficiencies	Warwick Tomsett	190	
Adult Social Care	Promoting Independence and in Borough Care for Adults with Disabilities	Claudia Brown		700
Integrated Commissioning	Efficiencies in Commissioned Services for Adult Social Care	Warwick Tomsett		1,000
			<b>1,190</b>	<b>1,700</b>

All agreed savings currently considered 'green' i.e. at a relevant stage of planning/implementation

## Adult Social Care Transformation (2020-21) - £1m

### Welfare Meals

- Work is already underway on reviewing service users in receipt of meals
- Expectation is the work will be completed by end Feb 2020 for delivery of £305k estimated savings in 2020-21.

### Mental Health Wellbeing and Recovery Redesign

New contracts already in place, full year savings for 2020-21 of £174k

- Work underway to ensure full utilisation of the new service provision and a reduction in spot purchased provision.

### Practice and Quality Forum

- Encourages innovative options for meeting eligible care needs
- Work underway to understand the financial benefits in the shift in practice – linked to existing Recovery Plan.

### **Integrated Commissioning Efficiencies (2020-21) - £0.19m**

Work to deliver the saving has already been completed and has fully delivered.

### **Promoting Independence and in Borough Care for Adults with Disabilities (2021-22) - £0.7m**

The Promoting Independence programme is all about improving support for people with a learning disability. It aims to enable more people to live in the community, with the right support and close to home. Working collaboratively with people with learning disabilities and their families, we can provide opportunities for people to move from residential care to supported living or their own accommodation with the right level of support. By taking a strengths based approach we can also often reduce the level of support needed to enable people to maximise their independence.

### **Efficiencies in Commissioned Services for Adult Social Care – 21-22 - £1m**

Opportunities for efficiencies through the re-commissioning of services have been identified on a number of contracts. These are in the process of being planned for implementation during 2020 for delivery in 2020/2021.

This page is intentionally left blank