

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Monday, 26 April 2021 at 5.30 p.m., Room C1, 1st Floor, Town Hall,
Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, London, E14 2BG

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

This meeting is open to the public to view.

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
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 .2 22nd March, 2021

All Wards

3 - 12

11 .1 Action Log - March, 2021

All Wards

13 - 26

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD AT 6.31 P.M. ON MONDAY, 22 MARCH 2021

ONLINE 'VIRTUAL' MEETING - [HTTPS://TOWERHAMLETS.PUBLIC-I.TV/CORE/PORTAL/HOME](https://towerhamlets.public-i.tv/core/portal/home)

Members Present:

Councillor James King (Chair)	
Councillor Bex White (Vice-Chair)	
Councillor Faroque Ahmed	– Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment
Councillor Marc Francis	–
Councillor Ehtasham Haque	– Scrutiny Lead for Housing and Regeneration
Councillor Denise Jones	–
Councillor Gabriela Salva Macallan	– Scrutiny Lead for Health and Adults
Councillor Leema Qureshi	– Scrutiny Lead for Resources and Finance
Councillor Andrew Wood	–
	–

Co-opted Members Present:

Halima Islam	– Co-Optee
James Wilson	– Co-Optee

Other Councillors Present:

Mayor John Biggs
Councillor Sirajul Islam

Officers Present:

Menara Ahmed	– (Hate Crime Policy & Partnership Manager)
Onyekachi Ajisafe	– (Strategy & Policy Officer, Strategy, Policy & Performance)
Dr Somen Banerjee	– (Director of Public Health)
Adam Boey	– (Senior Strategy & Policy Manager - Corporate)
Ann Corbett	– (Divisional Director, Community Safety)
Afazul Hoque	– (Head of Corporate Strategy & Policy)
Sophia Hussain	– (HESTIA)
Filuck Miah	– (Strategy and Policy Officer, Corporate Strategy and Policy)

Denise Radley	Team)
Ann Sutcliffe	– (Corporate Director, Health, Adults & Community)
James Thomas	– (Corporate Director, Place)
	– (Corporate Director, Children and Culture)
David Knight	– (Democratic Services Officer, Committees, Governance)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received at this meeting.

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST AND OTHER INTERESTS

The following Members for transparency declared a potential interest in relation to Item 10 Pre-Decision Scrutiny Questions:

- I. Councillor Marc Francis due to his wife Councillor Rachel Blake being the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing; and
- II. Councillor Ehtasham Haque due to wife Councillor Sabina Akhtar being the Cabinet Member for Culture, Arts and Brexit.

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 1st March 2021 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

Subject to the inclusion of Halima Islam and James Wilson in the list of those present.

4. ACTION LOG

Received the Action Log, as a result of discussions on the timelines in relations to those matters outlined in the document the Committee noted the following response as to: (i) why the Resources directorate had an overspend of by £4.6m (indicated in the Cabinet Budget Monitoring report for period 9) for temporary accommodation; and (ii) why this overspend had gone unnoticed for so long.

- ❖ In previous years it was not uncommon practice to only report gross overspends in Directorates and thus this specific overspend was being offset by underspends elsewhere. The Council's Finance Improvement

Plan is looking to improve budget management and such reporting protocols have now been updated with the need to report all significant under and overspends, which is now taking place and has resulted in this particular overspend being brought to members' attention. The £4.6m overspend relates to the Housing Subsidy loss from placing Homeless clients into temporary accommodation (T.A.). Rents for T.A. are charged at current Local Housing Allowance (LHA) rates + £40, in line with other London Boroughs. This cost is met through the client's Housing Benefit claim. LBTH claim back the Housing Benefit payment through its subsidy claim at 90% of 2011 LHA rates and the £4.6m represents the difference between the Housing Benefit paid out for T.A. and the amount it can claim back from central government. The rates being paid for TA are higher than the grant received from government and thus if the Council were able to procure more cost-effective accommodation, the level of spend would reduce.

In conclusion, it was **agreed** to have more detailed breakdowns of such overspends.

5. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

No requests were received at this meeting.

6. FORTHCOMING DECISIONS

Noted

7. COVID-19 UPDATE

The Committee received an update from Covid-19 from Somen Banerjee – Director of Public Health, the main points of the questioning maybe summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- ❖ Noted that the numbers vaccinated are lower than in other local authorities because Tower Hamlets has a disproportionately young population with the lowest proportion of over 65s in the country at 6 percent. However, when one looks at Borough in comparison to the rest of North-East London the numbers vaccinated in relation to the average being 2 percentage points lower. In addition, it was noted that there is work being undertaken in the Borough with GP practices and community pharmacies.
- ❖ Indicated that careful consideration was required going forward on about how the Committee continues to scrutinise the impact and response of Covid-19 as new challenges and situations emerge and that this will need to be reflected in the Committees Work Programme.

In conclusion, the Chair thanked Somen Banerjee for his presentation and to all members and guests for their contributions in the discussions on this topic.

8. SCRUTINY SPOTLIGHT

8.1 Town Hall - Impact on Assets/LBTH Estate; Financing, Capacity

The Committee considered a presentation that reviewed the progress on the plans for the New Town Hall and how this is being delivered. The presentation covered (i) financing of the project; (ii) changing “the way we work”; and (iii) “Resident Hub” and the “Local Presence” The Chair welcomed Mayor Biggs; Ann Sutcliffe (Corporate Director for Place); Yasmin Ali Project Director and Sarah Steer Project Manager (Town Hall Project) to tonight’s meeting. The key themes arising from the questioning on the presentation may be summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- ❖ Was advised that the funding for the project comes primarily from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) which operates under a policy framework set by HM Treasury and ensures that lending to local government complies with statute. Also borrowing from the PWLB is very straightforward and at a very low rate of interest.
- ❖ Observed that the new civic centre will make full use of its location in the most accessible part of Tower Hamlets. It will be served by four different train and tube lines including Crossrail, along with well-used bus and cycle routes. The building has been designed to be more than just an office for council staff.
- ❖ Was reminded that the business case for this project it had been demonstrated that it was better value for money than renting a building elsewhere or extending tenancy agreement for Mulberry Place and that in spite of being subject to a further review in the light of the different financing options becoming available it still is the most viable method of financing the project.
- ❖ Noted that it is being constructed on the site of the former Royal London Hospital building, the new civic centre will provide 26,700m² of civic space, with the ground floor designed for public use. In addition, LBTH will be welcoming partner organisations to co-locate in the building, which will enable residents to be served by a diverse range of services from one site.
- ❖ Noted that the entire ground floor of the new civic centre will be dedicated to public use. A new Idea Store that will include supported access to a full range of council services alongside books, a café, drop in space and new public square.
- ❖ Expressed concern that as the new civic centre has been designed to be more than just an office for council staff how will this impact on the future of the libraries and arts provision in Whitechapel for example given its close proximity to the London Hospital site on the Mile End Idea Store. Especially as this was a trusted space where residents are able to explore and share reading, information, and knowledge. In response it was noted that the Mile End Store was to be re-developed

into part of a learning campus with a stronger focus on learning, skills and supporting residents into work.

- ❖ Noted in response that the intention of the Council regarding cultural and creative enrichment in the Borough was to promote venues such as the Brady Centre as welcoming places where local people can immerse themselves in every form of art; learn from local artists; create their own art; watch theatre, music, and dance performances; and learn about art and culture through books and reading.
- ❖ Noted that it is estimated that the cost of this project is in the region of £114.5 million. The Council will be saving public money because as well as securing ongoing annual savings of at least £5m from rental of Mulberry Place, there will be additional savings from more efficient working. Also capital receipts: £78.2m to £91.2m from potential disposals from the sale of old council buildings that will no longer be needed once staff have moved to the new civic centre, which will go towards the £114.5m estimated total cost of the new civic centre.
- ❖ Wanted a breakdown of the capital receipts from the above-mentioned disposals as outlined in the updated Business Case.
- ❖ Noted that the design of the new civic centre will celebrate the rich history of the building – with a new building ‘wrapping’ around the old to create dynamic and flexible spaces for the workforce. Also, by moving from Mulberry Place to Whitechapel will relocate the Councils ‘Front Door’ presence to the centre of the Borough.
- ❖ Noted that the new civic centre would be heated by an air source heat pump system that does not create heat. It simply moves it from one place to another through the vapour compression cycle thereby raising its temperature.
- ❖ Noted that engagement is currently underway with staff on facilities within LBTH buildings in a post Covid environment and that elements of the Covid layout will be considered alongside the revised plans i.e. one-way systems around the floor layouts.
- ❖ Noted that staff are to continue working as they have been and are not being instructed to return to work in the office, this is purely preparing to be ready when the guidance allows LBTH to commence a phased return.
- ❖ Was advised that as part of the wider vision on changing the way LBTH works an engagement programme is underway with staff to review the desk to staff ratio from 6:10 to 4:10, with more flexible working furniture within the building for different work styles.
- ❖ Was informed that Staff will be relocated from John Onslow House and Albert Jacob House to Mulberry Place. Also, that all desks at Mulberry Place have been allocated at divisional level, rather than individual teams, allowing greater flexibility and enabling LBTH to test how the 4:10 principle works ahead of the move to the new civic centre. Whilst also creating additional flexible working spaces within Mulberry Place.

Accordingly, it was agreed:

1. **Thanked** Mayor Biggs; Ann Sutcliffe; Yasmin Ali Project and Sarah Steer for their presentation and to all members for their contributions in the discussions on this topic; and
2. **Indicated** that the following should be added to the Committees Action Log.
 - A. **(i)** the evolution of the new civic centre business case; **(ii)** the capital receipts from the potential disposals from the sale of old council buildings as outlined in the new civic centre business case; and **(iii)** the assessment of the relocation of the Councils 'Front Door' presence to the centre of the Borough.

8.2 Domestic Abuse

The Committee received a presentation that outlined the extent of Covid-19 impact on Domestic Abuse and effectiveness of partners response. Including (i) national and local policy landscape; (ii) culturally sensitive provision; (iii) funding; (iv) impact of pandemic; (v) the Independent domestic violence advisory (IDVA) provision; (vi) adult and children social care; (vii) housing for victims; and (viii) the next steps. The Chair welcomed Denise Radley(Corporate Director, Health, Adults & Community); Ann Corbett (Divisional Director, Community Safety); Menara Ahmed (Hate Crime Policy & Partnership Manager) and Sophia Hussain (HESTIA) to tonight's meeting. The key themes arising from the questioning on the presentation may be summarised as follows:

The Committee

- ❖ Observed that whilst domestic abuse affects women from all ethnic groups, and there is no evidence to suggest that women from some ethnic or cultural communities are any more at risk than others. The form the abuse takes may vary; in some communities, for example, domestic abuse may be perpetrated by extended family members. Whatever their experiences, women from Black, Asian or minority ethnic communities are likely to face additional barriers to receiving the help that they need **e.g.** unwilling to seek help from statutory agencies or afraid of rejection from their own community if they ask for outside help.
- ❖ Noted that it may be particularly hard for these women to admit to having problems with their marriage, and they may experience additional pressure from their extended family to stay with their partner **e.g.** If their marriage fails, it may be seen as their fault, and they may be blamed for damaging the family honour; and treated as an outcast within their community.
- ❖ Commented that if they have recently arrived in the country, or if their first language is not English, it may be much harder for them to understand the systems of support available or to access appropriate sources of help or be unaware of support services and not know where they should go to get help.

- ❖ Noted the assistance available from Hestia that supports women and children experiencing domestic abuse to find safe, secure, and suitable refuge spaces across London. Observed that Hestia's refuges are a place of safety for any mother and child made homeless by domestic abuse. They also offer emotional and practical support and ensure that every service user has an up-to-date risk assessment; support plans tailored to their needs and to start a conversation around healthy relationships.
- ❖ Commented on the rising number of allegations of abuse in the home were an indication of the "emotional burden" weighing on many couples as a result of the coronavirus lockdowns.
- ❖ Noted agencies within the Borough have been upping their training and that undertaking an audit of safeguarding interventions to look at practice quality around domestic abuse
- ❖ Noted in response to their concerns that the restrictions on face to face visits during the lockdowns have affected earlier identification of abuse. Agencies have provided training to raise awareness amongst their staff on how to safeguard individuals remotely.
- ❖ Noted that the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) had secured additional funding to assist to charities supporting vulnerable people including victims of sexual violence and domestic abuse. The Committee welcomed this funding as it will provide a stronger safety net for anyone facing the threat of abuse in their own home.
- ❖ Agreed that domestic abuse is a complex problem that requires a coordinated, multi-faceted approach. The needs of different members of a household (including adults perpetrating and experiencing abuse and children) are multi-dimensional and inter-linked, and meeting these requires integrated and joined-up services. Which involves collaboration between, for example, police, child protection and specialist support services for people who have experienced abuse.
- ❖ Committee in response to the events surrounding the death of Sarah Everard, recognised the wider problem of gender-specific violence. Members agreed on the need for advocacy and support for women's rights to live in a safe space, without having to change their behaviour to maintain their safety. Also, to encourage public education about unacceptable behaviour that is either threatening or misogynistic e.g. putting in good programmes within schools educate students and staff around male violence towards women and how 'socially accepted behaviours', including 'locker room banter' contribute to this.

Accordingly, the Chair:

3. **Thanked** The Chair welcomed Denise Radley (Corporate Director, Health, Adults & Community); Ann Corbett (Divisional Director, Community Safety); Menara Ahmed (Hate Crime Policy & Partnership Manager) and Sophia Hussain Sophia Hussain (HESTIA) for their presentation and to all members for their contributions in the discussions on this topic; and
4. **Indicated** that the impact of Covid-19 on Domestic Abuse should be included in the Action Log

9. VERBAL UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS

The Committee **noted** the updates that had been submitted from Councillor Bex White the Scrutiny Lead for Children & Education.

The Committee noted that:

- ❖ The April 2021 meeting of the Sub-Committee will focus on Children's Social Care, both during the pandemic and looking into the future.
- ❖ The Sub-Committee will also be looking at the performance of the Regional Adoption Agency one year on from its creation, particularly focusing on how the Council retains oversight and follows the journey of the Boroughs children now that this is being managed at a regional level.
- ❖ The Scrutiny Lead at her last regular catch-up with the Corporate Director and Cabinet Member had focused discussions on the agenda for the upcoming Sub-Committee, and on updates to the expected Ofsted timelines.

10. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF UNRESTRICTED CABINET PAPERS

Following comments by the Committee the Pre-Decision Scrutiny Questions (PDSQ) were agreed for submission to the Cabinet on the 24th of March 2021 (See attached appendix).

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

The Committee noted the following:

1. The virtual scrutiny feedback survey will be available to all members of scrutiny until the 9th of April 2021 the survey will help to inform the work programming for 2021/22.
2. The Scrutiny Annual Report will be ready by the by the beginning of May 2021; and A briefing session was planned on the Strategic Plan at 6:00 p.m. on 25th March 2021.

12. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

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

Nil items

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

Nil items

**The meeting ended at 8.43 p.m.
Chair, Councillor James King
Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Reference	Action	Assigned to	Scrutiny Lead	Due Date	Response
26/10 meeting	<p><u>1. Budget Monitor as at P5 for 2020/21</u> The Committee would require as part of the budget process in the next quarter a detailed breakdown of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covid costs; • Recovery plans versus population vulnerability; and • What costs will not be reimbursed by Central Government. <p><u>2. Waste Service performance update</u> Next time, OSC wanted to see details of service improvement with particular reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements in waste heading for reuse; street cleansing and bulk waste collections; • How it is now easier for people to report mis-collections through IT systems • How agency staff are used; and • Action plans for the West of the Borough e.g. Weavers; Spitalfields and Whitechapel. 	Kevin Bartle	OSC Chair		
		Dan Jones	OSC Chair & Scrutiny Lead for Env & Comm Safety	Next time this item returns to OSC	
23/11 meeting	<p><u>1. Strategic Performance Monitoring</u> Details on mitigation of poor performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of adults supported into employment by the WorkPath • Young people entering the youth justice system for the first time • Level of household recycling (quarterly audited) <p>In addition, that more detail should be provided within any future report</p> <p><u>2. COVID-19 update</u> OSC to review the Mayor's response to the Committee's COVID Review</p> <p><u>3. Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) Guide</u> Sought clarification on what OSC is able to do/act on as a part of the CCfA process</p>	Thorsten Dreyer			<p>1. PDSQs' responses provided before Cabinet on 25 Nov.</p> <p>2. OSC to provide comments to Chair</p> <p>3. Adam to work with Matthew Mannion to develop a communications approach for</p>
		OSC members	OSC chair	Before next meeting	
		Adam Boey			

Page 13

Agenda Item 11.1

					Members, including examples showing how and when to use CCfA.
<p>Page 4/12 Meeting 4</p>	<p>1. <u>COVID-19 Update</u> The committee requested clarification as to why E1 Health Centre and White Chapel Health Centre were exempt or not participating in the Vaccination 1st Wave Site for Tower Hamlets</p> <p>2. <u>WorkPath</u> To bring back and review WorkPath Services in next year's scrutiny WP</p> <p>3. <u>MTFS 2021 -24 (Budget Update)</u> The Committee requested more information on how and why temporary accommodation costs have arisen and the extent to which this is COVID and non COVID related?</p> <p>The Committee requested more information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Rates • Covid Gap • What support is available from Government • Council Tax Support <p>The Committee agreed to hold a session (prior to the budget scrutiny meeting) on understanding business rates reset</p> <p>4. <u>AOB</u> The Committee welcomed the Executives response to the Call in - Change the Band 3 policy but didn't change the PRS policy. OSC to delegate responsibility to Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Sub-Committee to review the PRS policy and implications for waiting list in 6 months' time</p>	<p>Dr Somen Banerjee</p> <p>Vicky Clark</p> <p>Karen Swift</p> <p>Kevin Bartle</p> <p>Kevin Bartle</p> <p>Karen Swift</p>	<p>OSC Chair</p> <p>OSC Chair</p> <p>OSC Chair</p> <p>Scrutiny Lead for Housing and Regeneration on Scrutiny Sub-Committee</p>	<p>Before next meeting</p> <p>OSCs next year WP date TBC</p> <p>Before next meeting</p> <p>Before 11 Jan 2021 Budget Scrutiny Meeting</p> <p>June 2021</p>	<p>The increase in costs was Covid related because the service accommodated 200 single homeless people into accommodation (mainly commercial hotels). For those who came in not all costs were recoverable from housing benefit. For example, provision of three meals a day and floating support in the commercial hotels to assist hotel management with supporting residents. Some residents were not entitled to benefits, so the cost of their accommodation was not recoverable. Furthermore, the nightly rate in the commercial hotels was above the eligible housing benefit amounts, so even for those who were entitled for housing benefit, the full cost was not recoverable.</p> <p>The Committee was provided (on 07.01.2021 the information via a briefing session which covered business rate reset. Business rates and council tax and Covid funding. Slides were circulated to O&S members and awaiting on the update slides for Covid funding.</p>

<p>07/01 Meeting Page 15</p>	<p><u>Business Rate Reset/ Council Tax Reset and Covid Funding briefing</u></p> <p>1. On the Council Tax Reduction Scheme, the Committee sort for clarification on how much of the increase in the cost of the scheme was as a result of the decision to suspend the income floor for self-employed claimants as part of bringing in line with suspension of universal credit</p>	<p>Roger Jones</p>	<p>O&S Committee</p>	<p>By next Meeting.</p>	<p>The CTR caseload has increased from 29,268 in March 2020 to currently 31,626, it was as high as 32,482 in May 2020. Overall, the cost of awarding CTR over the same period has increased from £27.9m to £31.4m. Some of this increase will be down to new claims and some will be down to changes in circumstances on existing claims such as and changes in income (an example of this would be the SEISS payments which will impact on self-employed claims) or changes to the number of people in the household.</p> <p>The DWP suspended the Minimum Income Floor (MIF) used in the assessment of Universal Credit (UC) in April 2020. Since March 2020 the number of CTR claims with Self Employed income has dropped from 857 to 838, but of these the number that are UC claims has increased from 443 to 573. All of these are no longer affected by the MIF.</p> <p>As a result of this the number of cases affected by the Council's MIF has decreased from 297 to 261 during the same period. Where we are advised that the MIF is causing hardship, we are looking at each case to assess whether S13a could be used to mitigate the effect of the MIF. To date this year, we have awarded £133,137.67 under Section 13a provisions to address the impact of the MIF being applied.</p> <p>We have had 358 applications so far and awarded in 213 cases and have a further 29 applications still being considered.</p> <p>We have also awarded £1.7m under the Hardship Fund to those who were assessed as still having something to pay.</p>
<p>11/01 meeting</p>					

					<p>Centre, Children with Disabilities Team and the GP Care Group Social Prescribers who offer advice, support and interventions specifically to families where there is a child/child with SEND.</p> <p>Strategic discussions will take place between the LA and health providers to ensure clear professional boundaries mean education and health services are appropriate and complementary. The following developments will also contribute to capacity which builds a more sustainable system over time, enabling schools to better meet their statutory duties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New guidance issued by LBTH in January 2021 (SEND threshold document) to support mainstream schools to meet the requirements of the SEN code of practice for children with different forms of SEND, inclusion specific requirements in the code for support for children with sensory impairments. This will be supported by THEP leadership consultants in their school improvement role with headteachers • Professional development for SENCOs now integrated into the Tower Hamlets Education Partnership middle leadership programme • Professional development offer for SEND inclusion for school staff and for governing bodies to be rolled out from the summer term 2021 to support schools to improve statutory compliance, meet Ofsted inspection requirements and best practice by implementing the guidance above • Creation of a new SEND Inclusion Adviser post tasked with support and oversight for inclusion in the borough's schools, ensuring implementation of the new guidance (above) and managing the SLS/LAS • Development of on-line SEND advice and guidance to improve awareness • Recruitment of a Rehabilitation Officer to support children and YP with visual impairment
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with other services (including Early Help and the Children with Disabilities team) to ensure needs not requiring specialist teaching support are met for children with sensory impairments and their families. • Professional development/training for council officers working with families of SI and PD, including Early Help, Area Inclusion Co-ordinators to improve support and sign-posting • Work with the local college provider to further develop support for SI pupils with sensory needs to enable pupils with SI needs do not need to leave the borough for post-16 education • Use of the Local Offer and SENCo training to signpost schools and parents to support for SPLD in assessing needs, support strategies and guidance • <i>Following a review of integrated therapies by health colleagues, commissioning of therapies will be increased, particularly Speech and Language Therapy, for those in nursery and primary school for the academic year beginning September 2021.</i> • Review the allocation of support within nationally recognised frameworks, informed by evidence of the educational effectiveness of the use of a range of approaches to support educational development such as group work which capitalises on the inclusion of children with SEND working with peers and using 1:1 interventions only when there is a clear educational benefit <p><i>Following the public consultation on the change of use of the High Needs Funding Block, 4 more posts (2 in HI, 2 in VI) were added back in to the structure to expand the level of statutory service provision. An increase in SI posts by 4 from the original staffing proposal</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

	<p>3. The Committee asked if the Children’s Long-Term Recovery Plan (went to DfE) can be shared because it provided context of the savings for Children</p> <p>4. The Committee requested to understand more detail of the capital borrowing fund and if the treasury management strategy could be shared</p>	<p>James Thomas</p> <p>Kevin Bartle</p>			<p>The document was shared with the OSC Members via Democratic Services on 22.01.2021</p> <p>The papers for this can be sourced from the Audit Committee 28.01.2021 here</p>
<p>Page 19</p> <p>25/01 meeting</p>	<p><u>ASB</u></p> <p>1. Service to report back to scrutiny in March regarding consultation results on a pragmatic approach to ASB linked to nitrous oxide.</p>	<p>Ann Corbett</p>	<p>OSC Chair</p>	<p>01.03.2021</p>	<p>This is the summary of the result of the public consultation on the proposal to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order to prohibit the possession or use of psychoactive substances (including nitrous oxide) and which is causing or likely to cause harassment, alarm, distress, nuisance or annoyance to members of the public.</p> <p>The consultation ran from 4th January 2021 and closed on the 15th of February 2021. It was widely publicised on the council’s website, social media feeds, community platforms such as Online Watch Link (OWL), Tower Hamlets Housing Forum (THHF), Safer Neighbourhood Board, (SNB) and Safer Neighbourhood Ward Panels.</p> <p>The consultation received 2584 visitors and 948 formal responses to the consultation, one of the highest responses for any consultation the council has undertaken.</p> <p>Of those 948 responses, 97.5% (924) were residents and overall, 93.7% (886) were in favour of introducing</p>

	<p><u>Borough Commander Spotlight</u></p> <p>2. Borough Commander to provide demographic data on FPNs issued, and details on where money recovered goes</p>	<p>BC Marcus Barnett</p>		<p>01.03.2021</p>	<p>a PSPO. 89.4% (889) thought the PSPO should be boroughwide and 88.5% (838) said they had witnesses nitrous oxide misuse and that it made them feel unsafe.</p> <p>The proposal is being progressed and is planned to be decided upon by cabinet in April.</p> <p>In relation to the demographic data on FPN's issued we sadly cannot break down the figures to show each individual Borough Command Unit or London Borough. The data is held centrally by the Metropolitan Police Service and the breakdown for London shows us that the large majority of the fines have been issued to young men from 18 to 30 years old: 16% Asian, 12% Black & 70% White. Gender: 77% male, 1% not specified and 22% female.</p> <p>Chief Inspector Pete Shaw has tried to find out what happens in regards to the money from the fines issued, however at this point we are not able to identify this specifically with the response from our central command team being that they believe it goes back to the government for it to then be redistributed however they feel suitable.</p>
<p>01/03 Meeting</p>	<p><u>Covid Update</u></p> <p>1. The Committee wants to understand the protocol or mitigation plans which will be in place for managing risk of Covid spikes (through social mixing) during the campaign period for and after the forthcoming election/referendum</p>	<p>Robert Curtis and Will Tuckley</p>	<p>O&S Committee Chair</p>	<p>22.03.2021</p>	<p>The risk assessments are being driven from the GLA with additional information relating to premises and staffing being added as part of our own project planning and risk assessments compiled for Will and associated Officers (See below).</p> <p>The issue with spikes, as we all know, is we can only prepare for the worst scenario with masks, provision of sanitiser, social distancing, ventilation, bubbles for staff, sneeze screens provided and appropriate training provided which will apply to the main three project areas namely postal vote opening, polling day and the count (GLA).</p> <p>In addition, GPC have and continue to be updated and all of the implications and scenarios are being</p>

					<p>discussed and addressed at the highest level through project boards both internal and external, where we are represented, along with advice from PHE, the Electoral Commission, Government (Cabinet Office) and the GLA.</p> <p>We are also liaising with our own Corporate Health & Safety (Tracey Gorbell) and Shuheda Uddin who is assisting us with the provision of PPE (Senior Commissioning Manager) In addition, I have also held a meeting with Rachel Buttrick and Andy Liggins and this will continue to be the case as we approach the official timetable.</p> <p>This is the responsibility of the Constituency Returning Officer (Althea Loderick - CEO Newham) who is the senior officer from the lead authority for the Constituency (City and East), Will Tuckley as Counting Officer for the Referendum and the Mary Harpley who is the Greater London Returning Officer (GLRO) for the GLA all of whom are working closely together to get the precautions in place where considered necessary.</p>
	<p><u>Strategic Performance Q3 -2020/21</u></p> <p>2. The Committee wants to understand how the recycling rates and street cleaning performance is calculated</p>	<p>Thorsten Dreyer</p>		<p>22.03.2021</p>	<p>See attached Evidence Appendix 1/1b for this response provided 22.03.2021 meeting</p>
	<p><u>Budget Monitoring Report as at 31.12.2020 (period 9)</u></p> <p>3. The Committee wants more detail information on delivery target for Legal Service and modernisation of the registration service (as part of the savings tracker) and what this means</p>	<p>Janet Fasan</p> <p>Kathy Constantinou</p>		<p>26.04.2021</p> <p>26.04.2021</p>	<p>The £40k for Registrars is not a saving as such, but an increase in revenue for when we move to St. George's Town Hall. The move has been delayed several times, but it looks like it will go ahead by the Summer. The building is bigger than BPH which</p>

	<p>4. The Committee requests more detailed information on the HRA approved capital programme for period 9</p> <p>5. The Committee requests an explanation on why the Resources directorate has an overspend of £4.6m (indicated in the Cabinet Budget Monitoring report for period 9) for temporary accommodation, the basis of this overspend and why it has gone unnoticed for so long?</p>	<p>Hitesh Jolapara</p> <p>Karen Swift</p>		<p>22.03.2021</p>	<p>means we can hold more appointments and offer more ceremonies. At the moment, we are restricted to one ceremony room at BPH whereas SGTH has 2 ceremony rooms. We will be introducing wedding packages along with the basic ceremonies which will generate more money. We have also introduced a Genealogist post into our structure which was previously done by a registrar in between appointments and we were very limited as to how many applications we could accept and therefore directed applicants to our Head Office. This is a part time post which generates an average of £1,300 - £1,500 per month which we will look into increasing if the demand remains as high as it has been now that the public are aware we can offer same day applications and are not directing applicants to our Head Office. We will also be able to offer more private Citizenship ceremonies due to the bigger premises and these are offered at a premium fee and are very popular.</p> <p>See attached Appendix 2 for this response on 22.03.2021 meeting</p> <p>In previous years it was not uncommon practice to only report gross overspends in Directorates and thus this specific overspend was being offset by underspends elsewhere. The Council's Finance Improvement Plan is looking to improve budget management and such reporting protocols have now been updated with the need to report all significant under and overspends, which is now taking place and has resulted in this particular overspend being brought to members' attention. The £4.6m overspend relates to the Housing Subsidy loss from placing Homeless clients into temporary accommodation (T.A.). Rents for T.A. are charged at current Local Housing Allowance (LHA) rates + £40, in line with other London Boroughs. This cost is met through the</p>
--	---	---	--	-------------------	---

					<p>client's Housing Benefit claim. LBTH claim back the Housing Benefit payment through its subsidy claim at 90% of 2011 LHA rates and the £4.6m represents the difference between the Housing Benefit paid out for T.A. and the amount it can claim back from central government. The rates being paid for TA are higher than the grant received from government and thus if the Council was able to procure more cost-effective accommodation, the level of spend would reduce.</p>
<p>Page 23</p> <p>18/03 Meeting</p>	<p><u>Call In</u></p> <p>1. Monitoring Officer to detail the reasons for decision to Invalidate the call-in requisition regarding Cabinet's decision: Bow Bus Gateway and time closure exemptions consideration taken on 03.03.2021</p>	<p>Janet Fasan</p>		<p>24.03.2021</p>	<p>Further to the meeting of O and S on the of March 18th and your request for a note, please see below my considerations in respect of the above Call in request.</p> <p>Under paragraph 53 of the council's constitution, <i>'decisions will come into force, and may then be implemented at 5pm on the fifth clear working day, after the publication of the decision unless, after receiving a written request to do so, the Monitoring Officer calls the decision in'</i>.</p> <p>Paragraph 55 provides that:</p> <p><i>During that period, the Monitoring Officer shall call-in a decision for scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee if so requested by:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Not fewer than five Members of the Council; or</i></p> <p><i>(b) Two voting church, faith or parent governor representative in respect of any education matters only;</i></p> <p><i>(c) The request for a call-in must give reasons in writing and outline an alternative course of action.</i></p> <p><i>In particular, the request must state whether or not those Members believe that the decision is outside the policy or budget framework.</i></p> <p>To constitute a valid Call in request the above requirements (a) or (b) must be met and C. Also as</p>

					<p>per para 53 above the call in must relate to a prior decision that was made in the stipulated time frame.</p> <p>The Call in request did not give reasons or alternative actions that were referable to the decisions that were made on the 3rd of March and/or gave reasons and alternative options that were referable to an earlier decision on the bus gates that was taken on the 25th of November 2020. Please see table below which sets out the decisions of the 3rd March and the reasons/alternatives that were provided.</p> <p>A request was made to Cllr Wood to address the above by close of play on Monday the 15th March, however, his response did not advance matters. In a subsequent email dated 16th March, the Monitoring officer's concerns were reiterated. The email included her suggestions as to how matters may be taken forward by a different route.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 for more details</p>
<p>22/03 Meeting</p>	<p><u>New Town Hall</u> 1. To provide the Committee with further details on the updated financial business case for the New Town Hall.</p> <p><u>PDSQ</u> 2. What is the ethnic make-up of Tower Hamlets Council staff at a managerial level</p> <p><u>Budget Monitoring as at 31.12.2020 (period 9) follow up:</u> 3. The Committee wants more information on HRA Approve Capital Programme -projected overspend</p>	<p>Ann Sutcliffe and Yasmin Ali</p> <p>Amanda Marcus</p>		<p>26.04.2021</p> <p>26.04.2021</p> <p>26.04.2021</p>	<p>A business case refresh is being carried out by the team and this will be available as a draft for Finance teams' consideration by the end of April. This will then be approved and presented to the Town Hall Project Board ahead of any further discussion, internally or externally subject to commercial sensitivity considerations. An update on the timeline for the business case refresh can be made available at the end of May 2021.</p> <p>This has been shared offline with Members, this information is not for sharing publicly and as part of OSC work Programme for 21-22 it may be useful to organise a challenge session to discuss and understand better how strengthen our workforce diversity'</p>

	<p>- full breakdown of budget against each capital programme projects for consideration</p> <p>4. A copy of the Savills report which was cited in the MTFS.</p>	<p>Jane Abraham</p> <p>Rupert Brandon</p>			<p>Service update: This information has not been to Cabinet once it's been to Cabinet in June 21 will be provided to OSC'.</p>
<p>26/ o4 Meeting</p> <p>Page 25</p>					

This page is intentionally left blank