

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 6.35 P.M. ON MONDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2020**

**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) (Scrutiny Lead for Children and Education)  
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:**

Councillor Candida Ronald (Cabinet Member for Resources and the Voluntary Sector)  
Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman (Cabinet Member for Work and Economic Growth)

**Officers Present:**

Kevin Bartle – (Interim Corporate Director, Resources)  
Vicky Clark – (Divisional Director for Growth and Economic Development)  
Aelswith Frayne – (Interim Head of Employment and Skills)  
Sharon Godman – (Divisional Director, Strategy, Policy and Performance)  
Afazul Hoque – (Head of Corporate Strategy & Policy)  
Filuck Miah – (Strategy and Policy Officer, Corporate Strategy and Policy Team)

Kayleigh Regan Kibati  
Tony Wilson

– (WorkPath Client)  
– (Director at Institute for Employment  
Studies)

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Denise Jones.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST AND OTHER INTERESTS**

The following Members for transparency declared a potential interest in relation to the Item 8 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;
- II. Councillor Ehtasham Haque due to wife Councillor Sabina Akhtar being the Cabinet Member for Culture, Arts and Brexit;
- III. Councillor Denise Jones due to her being a Business Owner in Tower Hamlets; and
- IV. Co-opted Member Halima Islam due to her being an employee of Tower Hamlets Community Housing Ltd.

### **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 23<sup>rd</sup> November, 2020 be approved as a correct record of the proceedings and the Chair was authorised to sign them accordingly.

### **4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS**

Nil items

### **5. FORTHCOMING DECISIONS**

Noted

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

The Committee noted that a decision from the Mayor on the proposed changes to the Common Housing Register Allocations Scheme was awaited.

### **7. COVID 19 UPDATE**

The Committee received an update from COVID-19 from Somen Banerjee – Director of Public Health, the main points of discussion on the presentation are outlined as follows:

The Committee noted that:

- The New Covid strain had been identified in South East of England.
- In East London there has been a very rapid rise in the 13 to 17 age group.
- New Covid strain identified that may be responsible for 'faster spread' in South East.
- Regarding testing in schools in the Borough it has been necessary to make some very quick decisions in terms of the locations for the testing units.
- Whilst the Borough had seen high levels of Covid-19 in Bishop Challoners and George Green's testing is not limited just to those two schools and they are working with their neighbouring schools to enable testing of staff/pupils with a focus on the teaching staff and the 11 to 13 age group.
- The Borough is (i) promoting testing in schools more generally; and (ii) communicating the changes in advice around who can be tested.
- The message previously was that you only get tested if you have symptoms that has now changed in the context of rising levels of Covid-19 and in the recognition that if you think that you may have been exposed to Covid-19 you can get tested although not presenting with signs or symptoms of infection, illness, or disease (**i.e.** they are asymptomatic) but can pass on the virus on to a vulnerable person and therefore you are part of a chain that may lead to the death of another. Therefore, as the spread of public health misinformation through social media becomes more prevalent, it is important to develop an effective social media strategy to ensure that the people in Tower Hamlets have access to the correct information.
- It is especially important message to get across through social media; texts; sending out letters; and word of mouth utilising the Borough's Team of Covid-19 Champions.
- Regarding the vaccination programme the Tower Hamlets GP Care Group has texted 3,200 residents about the programme and those who have not responded or not contactable via text or mobile phone are being written to.
- East One Health and Whitechapel Health Centre are apparently not yet participating in programme, but officers would contact Tracy Cannell - Chief Executive - Tower Hamlets GP Care Group to provide a response.
- The Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) advises that the first priorities for any COVID-19 vaccination programme should be the prevention of COVID-19 mortality and the protection of health and social care staff and systems. Secondary priorities to include vaccination of those at increased risk of hospitalisation and at

increased risk of exposure, and to maintain resilience in essential public services.

In conclusion, the Chair:

1. **Thanked** Somen Banerjee – Director of Public Health for his presentation and for the high level of detail that he had provided; and
2. **Noted** that they had considered (i) the Covid-19 and its impact on schools and young people; (ii) the importance of developing an effective social media strategy to ensure that the people in Tower Hamlets have access to the correct information; (iii) how to reach out to those not contactable via text or mobile phone; (iv) testing in schools in the Borough and that it had been necessary to make prompt decisions in terms of the locations of testing sites; and (v) the position of East One Health and Whitechapel Health Centre in regard to the vaccination programme.
3. **Reminded** the Committee that he had received the Mayor's response to the Committee's COVID Review and that the reviewed recommendations had been circulated to Members and any questions should be sent to him.
4. **Recommended** this item come back to committee when the new programmes within this Directorate were running.

## 8. SCRUTINY SPOTLIGHT

### 8.1 Work Path

The Committee received a presentation from Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman (Cabinet Member for Work and Economic Growth); Vicky Clark (Divisional Director for Growth and Economic Development); and Aelswith Frayne (Interim Head of Employment and Skills) on the Review of WorkPath Services; In addition, the Chair informed the meeting that Tony Wilson (Director at Institute for Employment Studies) and Kayleigh Regan Kibati (WorkPath Client) was in attendance to share their external perspective on community engagement and to inform further discussions by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting. An outline of the discussion is set out below:

Members noted that:

- WorkPath provides a service to support residents who have significant barriers and are far from employment. It offers three programmes including Information Advice and Guidance (IAG), Employer Engagement and Supported Employment. Employer Engagement targets clients who are job ready or recently out of work and Supported Employment targets clients such as 50+, care leavers and women returning back to work

- The WorkPath programme helps young people gain invaluable skills and connections that will give them the best possible chance of success by becoming a stronger employable candidate.
- With regards to Queen Mary University the Council has a good working in partnership with the University to help bridge the gap between Queen Mary's and the workplace. Whilst in terms of wider health sector LBTH is working to maximise opportunities especially within the Mass Vaccination Programme, as LBTH wants to encourage applicants from the local communities to make sure that there is a safe and effective vaccination programme at the same time as continuing supporting the NHS in offering timely access and minimal impact on other services.
- LBTH work closely with Barts Health who have Healthcare Horizons which is their pre-employability training programme this provides eligible 16-29-year olds the opportunity to access entry level jobs and any upcoming apprenticeship vacancies (as and when available) at the Trust.
- Councillor Motin Uz-Zaman indicated that the reason for the 26% drop in performance in 2019-20 was due to (service restructure -reduced team) and IT issues which plagued capturing the outputs and was resolved in the last quarter.
- The main challenges facing the Long-Term Unemployed is a lack of relevant, recent experience, a problem only intensified by companies' unwillingness to take a chance and offer the opportunity to gain the experience. Especially at a time when the level of competition for jobs is far greater than it would ordinarily with a large number of "Job Seekers" only having just left their previous job so in employers eyes they are what is called "work ready" and business owners just want to generate income and profitability therefore their first instinct will be to hire someone who has just "fallen out of work" they consider that they are "work ready" rather than someone that's been out of work for some time. Accordingly, WorkPath focus is currently on supporting those who find it hardest to get work and help them to be better able to compete with those people who have newly "fallen out of work".
- Aelswith Frayne stated: For 2020-21, the target was 800 for the partnership, WorkPath captured 196 registrations and achieved 54 job outputs and are waiting on confirming a further 56 job outputs subject to securing evidence.
- Kayleigh Regan Kibati had participated in the WorkPath "Supported Employment Programme" which is essentially an adult version of Kickstart only that the Council paying for it rather than the Government. It is basically paid work experience combined with training and has proved to be incredibly effective giving people experience and a good grounding to help them find work again including confidence building. As a central part of why long-term unemployment is such a challenge is the importance of overcoming the impact that it has on an individual's self-esteem and emotional well-being.
- The Institute for Employment Studies are currently evaluating Central London Works (CLW) an employment programme designed to support central London residents (**e.g.** Tower Hamlets) or residents referred

from any Jobcentre that falls within the boundaries of the twelve Central London Forward Boroughs to overcome their employment barriers and move into stable, well-paid work.

- Based on the Institute for Employment Studies experience London Boroughs and the Combined Authorities in the North of England are much further along and much better equipped to address the impact of Covid-19 on the local economy and labour market.
- Whilst LBTH has good community-based provision in the West Midlands authorities are connecting communities with how they can engage in really disadvantaged neighbourhoods and to provide support within such disadvantaged local areas rather than trying to target specific individuals at the neighbourhood level. Which is something LBTH might wish to consider.
- There are definite benefits in local government of sharing such good practice and authorities learning from each other.

In conclusion, the Chair:

**Thanked** Motin Uz-Zaman; Vicky Clark; Aelswith Frayne; Tony Wilson; and Kayleigh Regan Kibati for attending tonight's meeting and for the information that they had provided which would help to inform further discussions by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

## 8.2 Budget Update

The Committee received a presentation that was intended to inform discussion for the next Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting. The presentation included (i) Introductions from Cllr Candida Ronald, Cabinet Member for Resources, and the Voluntary Sector as well as Kevin Bartle (Interim Corporate Director, Resources); (ii) Economic Outlook for Local Government; (iii) Update on the MTFS process; (iv) Spending Review 2020-main impacting factors; and (v) The Budget Consultation Process.

A summary of the discussions on the presentation is set out below:

Members:

- Noted that in February 2021 the Council will agree its budget for 2021-22. In line with previous years, the Council has carried out consultation with residents, businesses, and other key stakeholders to help inform budget decisions. This report for noting provides the results of the Council's 2021-22 budget consultation that was carried out from October to December 2020.
- Noted that due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, Tower Hamlets now finds itself in a materially changed environment from that which existed in February 2020 when the budget and medium-term financial strategy were approved by the Council.
- Noted that ongoing financial pressures, including responding to Covid-19, mean that despite saving £200m since 2010-11, the Council now must save a further £30m by 2024.

- The impact of Covid-19 has highlighted the importance of public services. However, while the Government said that local councils should do 'whatever it will take' to support their communities they have not fully covered the reduced income and increased costs that the Council has faced.
- Was informed that the Government's Core Spending Power calculation makes assumptions about the level of growth in the Council Tax base and that LBTH will increase Council Tax each year up to the referendum limit.
- Was reminded that following receipt of the final settlement, the Chief Finance Officer (CFO) will then need to be assured of the robustness of estimates and adequacy of reserves and this it was noted will be covered in the report to Cabinet on 27 January 2021.
- Whilst appreciating the challenging financial situation indicated that it would be helpful to have more financial information. Accordingly, the Committee raised a question on Temporary Accommodation overspend and asked if this was directly related to Covid or for other reasons. In response it was noted that this was historical.
- Wanted to look at which services should be contributing towards savings and to have assurances that any increase in Council Tax would give consideration of the impact on those who would struggle to pay.
- Wanted details of the methodology used that had indicated the financial difficulties that the Council would face in the current economic circumstances.
- Whilst accepting that the Council faces several challenges if it is to set a balance budget concern was expressed that running the consultation when it did mean that there was not enough involvement from residents and businesses and this impacts on how informed decision-making process will be.
- Noted that next year the budget consultation would start earlier
- Also were concerned that (i) whilst LBTH had already made significant savings, since 2010-11 it would have to make difficult financial decisions if it is to balance its budget; (ii) about what might happen if LBTH cannot achieve a balanced budget; and (iii) LBTH would not deliver the budget savings that had been already agreed.
- Were reminded that whilst the Council is free to determine the level of reserves it holds they are accountable to the electorate for the decisions they make. Also whilst the Council may use its reserves to address times of uncertainty such as the impacts of coronavirus (**E.g.** the revaluation of business rates) but should keep sufficient sums of money in reserve so that it has a financial cushion to meet any other sudden unexpected costs (**E.g.** The Council maintains a range of budget provision and has earmarked reserves for specific risks and general reserves for unforeseen events and risks).

The Chair Moved and it was: -

**RESOLVED** to:

- **Thank** Cllr Candida Ronald and Kevin Bartle for attending tonight's meeting and for the information that they had provided which would help to inform further discussions by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting;
- **Receive** any details of the methodology of economic modelling impact the Council has; and
- **Receive** any new financial information that might affect the budget as soon as it arises.

## 9. SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES

The Committee received a report that provided an outline of the review of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules. A summary of the discussions on the report is outlined as follows:

The Committee noted that:

- During the review of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Part B of the Council's Constitution, section 30), Corporate Strategy and Policy it was found that some terms, processes, and arrangements needed to be updated to reflect current practice and improve clarity.
- In a report, submitted for General Purposes Committee on the 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020, it had agreed that the Councillor Call for Action should be more explicit. In summary, the proposed changes being (i) To the role of overview and scrutiny add: Consider any local matter referred to the Committee by a Councillor in accordance with the Council's Councillor Call for Action procedure; (ii) Overview and Scrutiny Committee terms of reference to include: To consider any local government matter referred to the Committee by a Councillor in accordance with section 9FC(c) of the Local Government Act 2000 which is relevant to the functions of the committee and is not an excluded matter; (iii) Under 'Agenda Items' add a reference to Councillor Call for Action and updating the list of excluded matters.
- Regarding Overview and Scrutiny Committee Co-opted Members it had been agreed that the number of such members go from six to two. With the six co-opted members now on the Children and Education Scrutiny Sub-Committee.
- The Scrutiny Sub-Committee would now be able to (i) hold five times a year instead of the current four; and (ii) to change the Sub-Committee theme if felt appropriate.
- The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will report to Council, Cabinet or the Mayor or appropriate Cabinet Member and make recommendations as appropriate. All reports from Scrutiny Sub-Committees will be

agreed by the relevant sub-committee and the Chair of that Committee will provide an update at the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. If the report cannot be agreed by the Sub-Committee, or if there are not any meetings of Sub-Committee, and in other exceptional circumstances, the report can be agreed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Once it has formed recommendations on proposals for development, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Sub-Committees will prepare a formal report and submit it to the Executive Mayor and relevant Cabinet Member and Senior Officers for consideration and a formal response (if the proposals are consistent with the existing budgetary and policy framework) or to Council as appropriate (**E.g.** if the recommendation would require a departure from or a change to the agreed budget and policy framework).

- Following discussions with the Mayor's Office non-executive councillors would now exclude any paid Mayor advisers.

The Chair **Moved** and it was: -

**RESOLVED** to:

1. **Note** the outdated terms, and processes and arrangements needing clarification in the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Part B of the Council's Constitution section 30);
2. **Recommended** an amendment precluding paid Mayoral Advisers from the Membership of Overview and Scrutiny Committees; and
3. **Agree** to the proposed changes to section 30 of the Constitution to improve and clarify the Council's scrutiny procedures.

## 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 Mayor in Cabinet on the 16<sup>th</sup> December 2020 (**See attached appendix**).

## 11. **VERBAL UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS**

The Committee **noted**:

- The updates that had been submitted from the Scrutiny Leads; and
- That the update from the Scrutiny Lead for Health and Adults would be circulated with the minutes.

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

The Committee received the following items of business:

**Call-In: Amendments to the Council's Housing Allocations Scheme**

Members noted that:

- The Committee welcomed the Mayor's decision to revise his decision in Cabinet on 23rd September removing existing social tenant's under-50 from Band 3 and reinstate all these applicants to their former position within the Common Housing Register.
- The practice of discharging LBTH's duty to homeless families into the Private Rented Sector (PRS), should be the subject of a review which would (i) Consider the way that people are treated with reference to the communication with them; and (ii) consider the satisfaction of people who have had been discharged into the PRS.

### **Spotlight Presentations**

Members noted that:

- Spotlight Presentations need to be brief and to the point with 10 minutes being the ideal length of a presentation, and so all presenters should come in under this mark. Then Members can focus on the content; there will be more time for questions and discussion

### **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

### **18. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY - ACTION LOG**

Noted

**The meeting ended at 8.30 p.m.**

**Chair, Councillor James King  
Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

This page is intentionally left blank



Meeting of the

# CABINET

---

Wednesday, 16 December 2020 at 5.30 p.m.

---

## TABLED PAPERS

---

|  | <b>PAGE<br/>NUMBER</b> |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>5.1 Chair's Advice of Key Issues or Questions</b>   |                        |
| Pre-Decision Scrutiny Questions and officer responses. | <b>3 to 12</b>         |

If you require any further information relating to this meeting, would like to request a large print, Braille or audio version of this document, or would like to discuss access arrangements or any other special requirements, please contact:

Matthew Mannion, Democratic Services **Page 13**

Tel: 020 7364 4651, E-mail: [matthew.mannion@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:matthew.mannion@towerhamlets.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank



# **PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY QUESTIONS (PDSQ) FOR CABINET**

Wednesday, 16 December 2020 at 5.30 p.m.

|   | <b>PAGE<br/>NUMBERS</b> |
|---|-------------------------|
| <b>6.2 ADOPTION OF THE HIGH DENSITY LIVING<br/>SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT</b>  | <b>3 - 6</b>            |
| <b>6.3 SPITALFIELDS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN –<br/>VALIDATION OF SUBMISSION</b>           | <b>7 - 8</b>            |
| <b>6.4 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND SOCIAL CARE<br/>OMBUDSMAN, DETERMINATION OF OUTCOME</b> | <b>9 - 10</b>           |

This page is intentionally left blank

| 6.2 Adoption of the High Density Living Supplementary Planning Document  |   |
|--|---|
| Question   | Response  |
| <p>Why does the term “Grenfell” not appear in the document given the enormous consequences of what we continue to discover about dense buildings, the word “Fire” appears only 3 times in 214 pages. The words crime, terrorism, bomb, CCTV, social media, broadband, internet, wi-fi, money, £, financial also do not appear anywhere and the term service charge appears only twice in Council written text.</p> | <p>It is important to understand the scope of planning policy and Supplementary planning documents (SPDs) in particular. As per planning legislations, SPDs should build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in an adopted development plan (which is the London Borough of Tower Hamlets Local Plan and London Plan). As they do not form part of the development plan, they cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan. In regard to the various topics highlighted in the question we provide more detailed responses below:</p> <p><b>Fire</b><br/>It is not the role of planning policy (Local Plan and SPDs) to cover the detail of fire matters. This is the remit of Building Regulations. It was agreed that fire was not included in the scope of this documents as planners are not fire safety experts and it would be important that the right expertise was used to provide guidance on these matters, which are often complex and affected by a range of variables.</p> <p>As part of the Hackett review the government is updating building regulations on fire safety. At a London level they intend to publish a London Plan that includes a policy on fire safety however it does not provide advice on the actual design, it is more about ensuring that the issues are taken account of at the early stage – again because it is not for Planning to provide advice on fire safety, that responsibility sits with government through the building control regs.</p> <p><b>Crime/terrorism/bomb/CCTV</b><br/>The term used in the document to refer to criminal activity is ASB or anti-social behaviour which, as recognised in the document and supporting text/evidence, is an important challenge in this form of developments. This SPD addresses ASB through design recommendations that will minimize opportunities for crime and ASB. These include, location of communal amenity areas in prominent visible locations where residents will frequently be passing, in addition to having concierges in prominent locations with views on lobbies and communal spaces. Guidance on the design of</p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>public realm and security features have been provided in the section around the building. We do not consider it appropriate for a planning policy document to stipulate what tools the police and responsible authorities should use to manage crime, terrorism and ASB. As a result this SPD does not include specific references to design requirements related to these.</p> <p><b>Social media</b><br/>The management of buildings falls outside the scope of this document and planning. However given the importance of management, recommendations have been added in the form of further considerations. In particular there are recommendations for the setting up of Residents Associations and management of spaces through online platforms.</p> <p><b>Broadband/internet/wi-fi</b><br/>The document recognises the increasing trend of working from home. Unfortunately Tower Hamlets planning does not currently have the remit to control the rollout of WIFI systems in areas or within buildings.</p> <p><b>Money/Financial/Service charge</b><br/>In the SPD reference to cost and service charges are made throughout the document to recognise its implication in the everyday life of residents and managers at high density developments. It is agreed that service charges and other cost implications are a large part of life in HDL, and this was identified through the survey. The SPD aims to avoid some of the service charge implications by suggesting design solutions that minimize management cost, such as for example location of communal amenity spaces and play spaces closer to the ground, with greater levels of overlook to avoid more extensive management requirements. Concierges were identified as key to support residents quality but service charge implications are recognised in the document. Where these cannot be provided, due to service charge implications, ensuring some management presence through better location of staff facilities is encouraged. Economies of scale in management resources are encouraged. From case studies when a developer continues to manage the scheme or when one</p> |
|--|---|

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>management company manages both affordable and private were most effective.</p>   |
| <p>The SPD contains no specific policy recommendations as a response to COVID-19 or coronavirus type pandemics in the future despite the consultation period including a large part of the 1st lockdown and clear evidence about the importance of space, filtration, ventilation and surface materials as a response to pandemics. Why?</p> | <p>Covid-19 has led to places and spaces being used differently and is likely to lead to long term changes in how cities and buildings function. Timing and project scope did not allow for complete restructure in response to the crisis and in the early stages of the pandemic, during the preparation of the document, there was a lack of sufficient published evidence. However, the key aim of the HDL and much of the guidance has become even more important in light of the pandemic and in the SPD we emphasized the importance of generous circulation spaces, increasing natural ventilation and provision of usable private amenity spaces. There are also design guidelines recommending the use of robust materials that are easy to clean in corridors and other communal areas.</p> |
| <p>Will any omissions be dealt with in the Tall Building SPD or does LBTH not consider these material issues?</p>  | <p>It is not anticipated that the Tall Buildings SPD will consider these, for the reasons given above.</p> <p>On the broader potential implications of covid on how cities and places are used and function, this will be something that will be considered as part of any future review of the Plan.</p>  |

This page is intentionally left blank

| 6.3 Spitalfields Neighbourhood Plan – Validation of Submission  |  |
|---|--|
| Question  | Information Question Response  |
| <p>What is the financial cost of the administration of the Neighbourhood Plan development process to the council?</p> | <p>The Neighbourhood Plan development process would have administration costs to the Council, associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- senior officer guidance and support throughout, along with expertise from other services, such as legal, design &amp; heritage and development management – depending on the nature of the policies being drafted</li> <li>- an examination in public (EiP)</li> <li>- a referendum</li> </ul> <p>The senior officer time committed to the development process of a plan is dependent on the content, complexity and length of the Neighbourhood Plan. It should be noted that, before a Neighbourhood Plan can be progressed, a forum and area would need to be established. For each of these stages, the Council is required to provide support and advice.</p> <p>Council’s experience of an Examination in Public (EiP) for a Neighbourhood Plan has been at the cost of approximately £7,000. This would vary according to the number of days required for the EiP as well as whether the Inspector requests hearings or not.</p> <p>A referendum is estimated to cost £20,000.</p> <p>It should be noted that for each forum and area designated, there is a grant awarded to the Local Authority of £5,000, and for a referendum there is financial support of £20,000 from the Government to pay for each referendum (regardless of size or other factors).</p> |

This page is intentionally left blank

| 6.4 Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman, Determination of Outcome  |   |
|---|---|
| Question  | Response  |
| <p><b>6.4a Appendix 1 - Draft report by the Local Government and Social Care</b></p> <p>How many people applied for disabled parking bays in 2018 and 2019 (or similar period) and were either approved or rejected?</p>  | <p>There has been a total of 197 applications between 2018/19</p> <p>Approved = 76<br/>Rejected = 82<br/>Closed = 39 as they did not provide further evidence required upon request.</p>  |
| <p>How many previous applicants who have been refused a parking bay over the past year have now been written to by the parking team informing them of the changes to its policy?</p>  | <p>We wrote to a total of fifty applicants who were refused a parking bay over the past year.</p>   |
| <p>How many of these residents have subsequently had a fresh mobility assessment which has resulted in their being assigned a personalised disabled parking bay?</p>  | <p>To date three of the applicants that were written to have made fresh applications, however two have off street parking and therefore do not qualify and a further one has been rejected as they did not have 12pts on their PIP (personal independence payment) of DLA mobility. None of these cases had hidden disabilities.</p>  |
| <p>The date of the draft report from the Ombudsman is August 2020, thus 3 months have already elapsed. Have the agreed actions been taken? Have there been any subsequent appeals following letters to all those who have recently applied for a personal disabled bay?</p> | <p>We have taken all the agreed actions including the installation of a bay ahead of time.</p> <p>There have been no appeals following the letter sent to previous applicants.</p>  |
| <p>It is recommended to contact applicants who have been refused a parking bay and inform them of the changes to its policy.</p> <p>Could the changes have cost implications</p>  | <p>20.11.20 as recommended by the ombudsman we wrote to all applicants who had previously been refused a bay informing them that they could reapply following changes to the policy. The only cost implications are the Traffic Management Orders which will be combined with the current programme of current applications.</p> <p>The ombudsman action was for us to inform the previous applicants to reapply and not to</p> |

|   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>and is there budget? Should applicants appeal against previous decisions and request the Council to install parking spaces for them and provide some compensation?</p> | <p>appeal the decision.</p> |
|---|-----------------------------|