

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD AT 6.32 P.M. ON MONDAY, 24 MAY 2021

**COMMITTEE ROOM ONE - TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor Mohammed Pappu (Chair)*

Councillor Bex White*	– Scrutiny Lead for Children & Education
Councillor Faroque Ahmed	– Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment
Councillor Marc Francis Councillor Ehtasham Haque	– Scrutiny Lead for Housing & Regeneration
Councillor Denise Jones	–
Councillor Gabriela Salva Macallan*	– Scrutiny Lead for Health & Adults
Councillor Leema Qureshi	– Scrutiny Lead for Resources & Finance
Councillor Andrew Wood*	

Co-opted Members Present:

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

*Members present in person and able to vote ((Remaining Members attended from remote locations)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor Asma Begum
Councillor Sirajul Islam
Councillor Puru Miah
Councillor Mufeedah Bustin

Officers Present:

Sharon Godman	– (Director, Strategy, Improvement and Transformation)
Afazul Hoque	– (Head of Corporate Strategy & Policy)
Daniel Kerr	– (Strategy and Policy Manager)
Matthew Mannion	– (Head of Democratic Services,

David Knight

Governance)
– (Democratic Services Officer,
Committees, Governance)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received at the meeting.

2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST AND OTHER INTERESTS

The following Members for transparency declared a potential interest in relation to Item 9 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

3.1 26th April 2021

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

RESOLVED

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 26th April 2021 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. APPOINTMENT OF SCRUTINY LEAD MEMBERS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEES FOR 2021-21

The Committee noted that the Cabinet on 24th March 2021 had considered a report from the Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic (BAME) Inequalities Commission and had **RESOLVED** to note the work that the Commission has undertaken during the four-month period and agreed the recommendations as set out in the report. This decision however had been 'Called-In' by Councillor Puru Miah (signed also by Councillors Peter Gold; Rabina Khan; Harun Miah

and Andrew Wood). The main points raised as result of the questioning may be summarised as follows:

The Committee **noted** the:

1. Cabinet report,
2. Cabinet Decision of the 24th March 2021
3. “call in” requisition from the Call-in Members,
4. representations by the Call-in Members, and
5. representations by the Executive.

In addition, it was noted that in accordance with the OSC Protocols and Guidance adopted by the Committee at its meeting on 4th June 2013, any Committee Member(s) who present(s) the “Call In” is (are) not eligible to participate in the general debate.

Summary of the Call-in:

The Committee:

- ❖ **Noted** that the Call-In Members had made two proposals (i) for Mayor and Cabinet not to just note the report, but instead to have it translated into community languages and produced in a non-digital format which should then be distributed in places like Ideas stores and GP surgeries. Then put out to further consultation for a six-month period; and (ii) for an independent panel to be formed to investigate the allegations of racial discrimination made to the Commission and for the panel to report its finding to the full council.
- ❖ **Observed** that the decision was considered by the Call-In Members to be in breach of Tower Hamlets Council’s common law duty and statutory duties under the law. As when the BAME Inequalities Report had been launched in October 2020, one of its stated aims had been to “engage and operate at the heart of the LBTH communities to hear about people’s lived experience and solutions, specifically Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic women and young people who experience higher levels of inequality”. Therefore, the Call-In Members felt that residents had a legitimate expectation for the Council to keep its promise and to consult them fairly, or allow BAME residents, the proper means to engage with the Commission.
- ❖ **Noted** that the Call-In Members felt that the Council had breached its statutory duties, in particular, the Public Sector Equalities Duty as set out in s.149 of the Equalities Act 2010. This was by inadequately providing the means for BAME residents to engage with the commission and consultation, the Council had therefore failed in its Public Sector Equalities Duties. As the Council in its consultation and engagement with the Commission and report had apparently failed to give due regards to the needs of BAME residents.
- ❖ **Noted** that the Call-In Members considered that the decision to note the report within a week of its publication by the Mayor and Cabinet, when adequately not enabling BAME residents to engage with the Commission or its consultation goes against the stated object of the

report. The Call-In Members also felt that it is unreasonable for the Mayor and Cabinet to believe that less than a one-week period is satisfactory to gather views on a report that had taken five months to formulate.

- ❖ **Observed** that although serious allegations of discriminations had been made to the Commissioners, the Mayor and Cabinet had not applied the MacPherson principles in treating the allegations as racist incidents and investigating them. This was felt by the Call-In Members had left the Council open to the charge of an apparent cover-up, by failing to investigate adequately allegations of racial discrimination.
- ❖ **Noted** that according to the Call-In Members the Commission had not kept to that promise in regard to consultation and engagement of BAME residents with the commission or the report. For example (a) All the consultations were conducted online in a Borough with high levels of data poverty, which it was felt disproportionately affects the BAME residents; (b) No translations were provided in a consultation aimed at BAME residents, many of whom have difficulties with the English language.

Summary of the Executives response

The Committee

- ❖ **Noted** that LBTH had actively reached out to communities through third sector; and partner agencies including help from these agencies the facilitation of translating the consultation documents. Also the Lead Member indicated that she was very happy to discuss any concerns raised with the Call-In Members.
- ❖ **Recognised** that the Commission had, had to undertake its work during the exceptional circumstances created by the coronavirus pandemic and it was accepted as relevant to the way that the consultation had been conducted.
- ❖ **Noted** that achieving true equality in LBTH is not a feat the Council can achieve alone and the collective efforts of all partners is critical in ensuring the successful implementation of these recommendations. The Commission therefore had recommended that a subgroup of the Tower Hamlets Partnership Executive Group should be established to lead on delivery of the recommendations and work with.
- ❖ **Observed** that the Commission had adopted a bottom up approach whereby they had gathered together a range of groups/agencies with a shared common interest on the issues under consideration and who had taken part in a series of interactive discussions. These groups it was noted had helped to give the Commission an appreciation of how residents felt, about their lived experience and what they felt were possible solutions.
- ❖ **Noted** that much of the evidence gathered by the Commission had suggested that institutional and structural racism is a key barrier in accessing services and progression in life and employment.
- ❖ **Understood** that the recommendations set out in the report will be delivered through the Tower Hamlets Partnership Executive Group.

The Council will assume a lead role and will act as a facilitator to engage and support partners in both the public and private sector to respond to these recommendations.

Summary of Committee discussion

The Committee:

- ❖ **Recognised** that the report provides recommendations to improve the inequalities of local BAME Communities. It highlighted a number of areas where the Borough's BAME communities are experiencing poorer outcomes including in the areas of employment, health, and community leadership. However, although the Committee had reservations about how the work the Commission had been undertaken it felt that if the recommendations from the Commission were not taken forward now it would mean that there would be delays in (i) addressing the inequalities currently facing the local BAME communities in the Borough; (ii) investigating the allegations of racial discrimination made to the Commissioners; and (iii) making those radical changes required to the close inequality gaps by advancing opportunities and ensuring the experience of racism within structures and institutions is eradicated.
- ❖ **Indicated** that whilst it was clear that there has been significant progress in the Borough, the Committee had reservations about the slow pace of change which it was felt that had not been either (a) quick; or (b) radical enough.
- ❖ **Indicated** that they considered that this was an ongoing piece of work to (i) build that element of trust between the Council, it's partners and the communities that they seek to serve; and (ii) address the allegations of racial discriminations that had been made to the Commissioners.

As a result of a full and wide-ranging discussion the Committee moved to the vote and Councillors Gabriela Salva Macallan; Bex White and Mohammed Pappu **RESOLVED** that whilst the decision was to be **reaffirmed**.

1. a paper would be **produced** on what concerns of discrimination were raised and how the Council had responded, and
2. an **update report** on the progress of the action plan would be brought back to the Committee to review later in the year.

Finally, the Chair also thanked all those in attendance for their time and participating in this process.

7. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

7.1 Call-In Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic Inequalities Commission Report

The Committee noted that the Cabinet on 24th March 2021 had considered a report from the Black, Asian & Minority Ethnic (BAME) Inequalities Commission and had **RESOLVED** to note the work that the Commission has

undertaken during the four-month period and agreed the recommendations as set out in the report. This decision however had been 'Called-In' by Councillor Puru Miah (signed also by Councillors Peter Gold; Rabina Khan; Harun Miah and Andrew Wood). The main points raised as result of the questioning may be summarised as follows:

The Committee **noted** the:

1. Cabinet report,
2. Cabinet Decision of the 24th March 2021
3. "call in" requisition from the Call-in Members,
4. representations by the Call-in Members, and
5. representations by the Executive.

In addition, it was noted that in accordance with the OSC Protocols and Guidance adopted by the Committee at its meeting on 4th June 2013, any Committee Member(s) who present(s) the "Call In" is (are) not eligible to participate in the general debate.

Summary of the Call-in:

The Committee:

- ❖ **Noted** that the Call-In Members had made two proposals (i) for Mayor and Cabinet not to just note the report, but instead to have it translated into community languages and produced in a non-digital format which should then be distributed in places like Ideas stores and GP surgeries. Then put out to further consultation for a six-month period; and (ii) for an independent panel to be formed to investigate the allegations of racial discrimination made to the Commission and for the panel to report its finding to the full council.
- ❖ **Observed** that the decision was considered by the Call-In Members to be in breach of Tower Hamlets Council's common law duty and statutory duties under the law. As when the BAME Inequalities Report had been launched in October 2020, one of its stated aims had been to "engage and operate at the heart of the LBTH communities to hear about people's lived experience and solutions, specifically Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic women and young people who experience higher levels of inequality". Therefore, the Call-In Members felt that residents had a legitimate expectation for the Council to keep its promise and to consult them fairly, or allow BAME residents, the proper means to engage with the Commission.
- ❖ **Noted** that the Call-In Members felt that the Council had breached its statutory duties, in particular, the Public Sector Equalities Duty as set out in s.149 of the Equalities Act 2010. This was by inadequately providing the means for BAME residents to engage with the commission and consultation, the Council had therefore failed in its Public Sector Equalities Duties. As the Council in its consultation and engagement with the Commission and report had apparently failed to give due regards to the needs of BAME residents.

- ❖ **Noted** that the Call-In Members considered that the decision to note the report within a week of its publication by the Mayor and Cabinet, when adequately not enabling BAME residents to engage with the Commission or its consultation goes against the stated object of the report. The Call-In Members also felt that it is unreasonable for the Mayor and Cabinet to believe that less than a one-week period is satisfactory to gather views on a report that had taken five months to formulate.
- ❖ **Observed** that although serious allegations of discriminations had been made to the Commissioners, the Mayor and Cabinet had not applied the MacPherson principles in treating the allegations as racist incidents and investigating them. This was felt by the Call-In Members had left the Council open to the charge of an apparent cover-up, by failing to investigate adequately allegations of racial discrimination.
- ❖ **Noted** that according to the Call-In Members the Commission had not kept to that promise in regard to consultation and engagement of BAME residents with the commission or the report. For example (a) All the consultations were conducted online in a Borough with high levels of data poverty, which it was felt disproportionately affects the BAME residents; (b) No translations were provided in a consultation aimed at BAME residents, many of whom have difficulties with the English language.

Summary of the Executives response

The Committee

- ❖ **Noted** that LBTH had actively reached out to communities through third sector; and partner agencies including help from these agencies the facilitation of translating the consultation documents. Also the Lead Member indicated that she was very happy to discuss any concerns raised with the Call-In Members.
- ❖ **Recognised** that the Commission had, had to undertake its work during the exceptional circumstances created by the coronavirus pandemic and it was accepted as relevant to the way that the consultation had been conducted.
- ❖ **Noted** that achieving true equality in LBTH is not a feat the Council can achieve alone and the collective efforts of all partners is critical in ensuring the successful implementation of these recommendations. The Commission therefore had recommended that a subgroup of the Tower Hamlets Partnership Executive Group should be established to lead on delivery of the recommendations and work with.
- ❖ **Observed** that the Commission had adopted a bottom up approach whereby they had gathered together a range of groups/agencies with a shared common interest on the issues under consideration and who had taken part in a series of interactive discussions. These groups it was noted had helped to give the Commission an appreciation of how residents felt, about their lived experience and what they felt were possible solutions.

- ❖ **Noted** that much of the evidence gathered by the Commission had suggested that institutional and structural racism is a key barrier in accessing services and progression in life and employment.
- ❖ **Understood** that the recommendations set out in the report will be delivered through the Tower Hamlets Partnership Executive Group. The Council will assume a lead role and will act as a facilitator to engage and support partners in both the public and private sector to respond to these recommendations.

Summary of Committee discussion

The Committee:

- ❖ **Recognised** that the report provides recommendations to improve the inequalities of local BAME Communities. It highlighted a number of areas where the Borough's BAME communities are experiencing poorer outcomes including in the areas of employment, health, and community leadership. However, although the Committee had reservations about how the work the Commission had been undertaken it felt that if the recommendations from the Commission were not taken forward now it would mean that there would be delays in (i) addressing the inequalities currently facing the local BAME communities in the Borough; (ii) investigating the allegations of racial discrimination made to the Commissioners; and (iii) making those radical changes required to close inequality gaps by advancing opportunities and ensuring the experience of racism within structures and institutions is eradicated.
- ❖ **Indicated** that whilst it was clear that there has been significant progress in the Borough, the Committee had reservations about the slow pace of change which it was felt that had not been either (a) quick; or (b) radical enough.
- ❖ **Indicated** that they considered that this was an ongoing piece of work to (i) build that element of trust between the Council, its partners and the communities that they seek to serve; and (ii) address the allegations of racial discriminations that had been made to the Commissioners.

As a result of a full and wide-ranging discussion the Committee moved to the vote and Councillors Gabriela Salva Macallan; Bex White and Mohammed Pappu **RESOLVED** that whilst the decision was to be **reaffirmed**.

3. a paper would be **produced** on what concerns of discrimination were raised and how the Council had responded, and
4. an **update report** on the progress of the action plan would be brought back to the Committee to review later in the year.

Finally, the Chair also thanked all those in attendance for their time and participating in this process.

8. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION

8.1 Air Quality Challenge Session

The Committee received a report in relation to the Challenge Session which had examined the Council's commitments to air quality and made a number of recommendations for members consideration. The main points raised as result of the questioning on the report may be summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- ❖ Was **informed** that the Challenge Session, chaired by Councillor Faroque Ahmed, Scrutiny Lead for Environment and Community Safety, had taken place on 30th March 2021. In light of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the challenge session was held virtually in order to comply with the Government's requirements for social distancing.
- ❖ **Noted** that the Challenge Session had resulted in the development of a number of recommendations including that the Council should set up more air quality monitoring stations in key areas including around construction sites, by prioritising funding of air quality monitoring in future capital programmes so that it is proactive in collecting long-term accurate live air quality data from all parts of the Borough not just certain sites; and to make monitoring data more accessible so residents are better informed to make decisions and promote behavioural change.
- ❖ **Commented** that the Council needed to identify existing air quality measures in the current capital programme and prioritise them for delivery, such as EV charging points.
- ❖ **Stated** that there should be a more ambitious programme in regard to the installation of EV charging points as this is also likely to encourage further uptake of electric vehicles. As a key deterrent in the purchase of EV's is the inconvenience of charging and so this would demonstrate an ideal solution to this concern.
- ❖ **Commented** that with the Government announcing all cars sold by 2030 are to be electric, the demand for more convenient charging stations that suit drivers' lifestyles is only going to increase. Therefore, it was important to identify new locations for installing charging points.
- ❖ **Indicated** that it wished to receive an update from the relevant Chief Officers on the current situation and what has been done to (i) monitor the environment, (ii) controlling emissions; and (iii) what enforcement action is being taken.

Recommendations:

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is recommended to:

1. **Noted** the attached Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Challenge Session Report and **agreed** the recommendations; and
2. **Agreed** to submit the attached report to the Mayor and Cabinet for

executive response.

8.2 Improvement Plan

The Committee received a report that summarised the Committee's work in reviewing the scrutiny function in Tower Hamlets and submits an Improvement Plan to implement a range of actions in 2021-22 to improve and enhance scrutiny. The main points raised as result of the questioning may be summarised as follows:

The Committee:

- ❖ **Noted** that from March to April 2021, scrutiny officers had run a survey for scrutiny members, executive members, and non-executive members as part of a health check on scrutiny to help evaluate the effectiveness and impact of overview and scrutiny for 2020-21, as well help to inform areas for improvement for the next municipal year. The survey had also been sent to officers involved in scrutiny throughout the year, for their feedback.
- ❖ **Noted** that there had been two away-days in April 2021 to reflect on the achievements of scrutiny over the municipal year, and to formulate improvements that could build upon scrutiny's success.
- ❖ **Noted** that the survey and the away days had formed the basis for the development of an Improvement Plan for 2021-22 (Attachment as appendix 1 to the report). The Improvement Plan had suggested actions to implement in seven areas of the scrutiny function at Tower Hamlets as detailed within the report.
- ❖ **Commented** that the monitoring service delivery and achievement against targets to ensuring best value or value for money (VFM) in all that the Council does is not as consistent as it should be and therefore needs to the subject of closer oversight by the Committee.

As a result of discussions on this report the Committee **Resolved** to:

3. **Note** the activity undertaken by the 2020-21 Overview and Scrutiny Committee to understand the strengths and weaknesses of scrutiny at Tower Hamlets: and
4. **Agree** to implement the draft Improvement Plan for 2021-22.
5. **Agree** for the Overview & Scrutiny Chair to make further amendments to the Improvement Plan

9. 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 26th May 2021 (**See attached appendix**).

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

Nil items

11. 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.

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

Nil item

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

Nil items

The meeting ended at 8.33 p.m.

Chair, Councillor Mohammed Pappu
Overview & Scrutiny Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

Overview & Scrutiny PDSQs 26.04.2021

Item 6.1 Strategic Plan 2021-24	
Questions	Response
1. When and how will targets for the Strategic Plan be created?	The council's target setting principles are set out in target setting guidance agreed as part of the Performance Management and Accountability Framework in August 2020. The approach adopted allows for sufficient flexibility so that we can take into account factors that may be affecting local government including the impact of the pandemic and expected budget constraints. The Mayor, Members and the Corporate Leadership will review and agree targets by 2 nd June 2021.
2. Page 8 - Tower Hamlets is now the densest Borough since mid-2019 see ONS - 16,427 people per square km - can this be corrected https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/annualmidyearpopulationestimates/mid2019estimates	The statistic will be amended to reflect the most recent population estimates published in June 2020.
3. Page 9 - why have ASB rates not been added - we have highest in the country ?	The number of ASB reports is closely monitored by operational teams and at directorate level in the council. Number of cases of ASB reported per month is a key community safety operational performance metric and reported monthly at a divisional and directorate level. In 2020/21 there were 3,200 reports of ASB which is nearly double the number of reports in 2019/20 (1696). The number of ASB reported cases does not appear in the strategic plan as it is operational data. The metrics in the strategic plan are designed to report progress against our priority areas and outcomes, in other words, to measure if anyone is better off due to the work the council carries out. Outcome 7 is about resident perceptions about how ASB is being addressed and how safe they feel in their localities. Perceptions of the council and partner responses to ASB are included in Outcome 10 which focuses on the effectiveness of the council's partnership working.

Overview & Scrutiny PDSQs 26.04.2021

Page 14

<p>4. Page 9 - see Internal Report that suggests numbers on housing waiting list maybe materially overstated ? Can this be minuted?</p>	<p>The data in the report is a snapshot for the period to the end of 2019 and was the most up to date data available at the time of drafting the Strategic Plan. Recent internal reports may reflect more up to date data available to the service.</p>
<p>5. Page 9 - 2019 NOX Diffusion Tube results suggest that 40% is overstated - where does this stat come from?</p>	<p>There is an error with the 40% figure/box in the table – this is incorrect, with the 77% figure being correct – this will be amended for the final version. The data provided is from the London Atmospheric Emissions (LAEI) the key tools for air quality analysis and policy development in London. The most up to date data provided is for 2019.</p>
<p>6. Page 12 - where is additional COVID funding in this table?</p>	<p>Covid grant funding allocations are announced throughout the year and are not, therefore, included in the Council's medium-term financial strategy (MTFS) budget. The Council has, however, agreed to create a £3m Covid Recovery Fund using part of its New Homes Bonus grant in 2021-22. To date MHCLG has announced a 2021-22 Covid-19 expenditure pressures grant allocation of £12.985m and a part-year extension to the reimbursement scheme for lost sales, fees and charges income. Further announcements for Covid grant funding will be reported as part of the 2021-22 budget monitoring process.</p>
<p>Item 6.2 Tower Hamlets Plan Annual Report and priorities going forward</p>	
<p>1. Page 10 of 31 draws on data from 2017/18 – 2019/20. However, the infographics' data spans is inconsistent. For example, 77% of residents exposed to N02 levels that exceed the EU limit and 45.5% of children and young people accessing timely mental health support - refers to data from 2017/18 only. Can you clarify the reasons for the above?</p>	<p>1.1 The data provided is from the London Atmospheric Emissions (LAEI) the key tools for air quality analysis and policy development in London. The most up to date data provided is for 2019. The infographic will be amended to include reference the 2019-20 time period.</p> <p>1.2 Due to pressures resultant from the Covid-19 pandemic we are currently unable to obtain up to date, validated data for this measure due to partner (CCG) capacity reasons. We expect to be able to restart reporting against this measure once these capacity pressures ease. Unvalidated data available suggests more</p>

<p>2. As a measure of ‘the percentage residents exposed to N02 levels that exceed the EU limit’ and ‘children and young people accessing timely mental health support’ could you provide the context as to why there is not data available?</p>	<p>children and young people (1,278 children from April to October 2020) were accessing mental health services than projected for the period.</p> <p>Projections completed by the service in Q3 estimated that by 31st March, 2,527 children and young people would have accessed MH services which is in line with the target (35%) though currently we are unable to validate this figure to provide assurance.</p> <p>In 2019/20 2,072 children and young people with diagnosed mental health conditions accessed treatment. The annual performance target (34%) was exceeded.</p>
<p>3. Regarding the ‘% of clients using social care who receive self-directed support (up to 2014/15 also included carers) – Snapshots’. Please could you confirm further details of the Snapshot?</p>	<p>This figure is drawn from the Adult Social Care Outcome Framework (ASCOF) which all councils with Adult Social Care Commissioning Responsibilities have a statutory obligation to provide local data for. Figures are benchmarked at a regional and national level. The measure relates to how well our Adult Social Care (ASC) service is doing as regards a key duty in the Care Act 2014; to ensure that all service users in the community have their needs assessed and are informed that they have in place a direct payment or personal budget which has involved an assessment and support plan which is clear about the outcomes to be achieved and the funding allocated. In 2019/20 the national benchmark figure for this measure was 91.9% and 94.6% in the London region. In Tower Hamlets, performance on this measure had been lagging for the last few years compared to other councils. As part of our continuous improvement work, starting in 2019 we looked into the data and why our performance was below our peer authorities and put in place a plan to drive up performance. Much of this was about ensuring front line staff recorded data correctly on our systems so that this came through in our reported outcomes. Having delivered on our improvement plan our performance currently exceeds the national and regional benchmark levels.</p>

Overview & Scrutiny PDSQs 26.04.2021

<p>4. Measure of 'Number of affordable homes built' – could this include a breakdown of social and Tower Hamlets Living rent?</p>	<p>A breakdown of the number of affordable homes by rent product is available and can be included in the Annual Report.</p>
<p>5. As access to Food is such an important part of Better health and wellbeing could a key measure be included so that this work can be measured effectively?</p>	<p>The council currently is in receipt of DfE funding to support children at risk of food poverty during the school holidays. An additional measure will be added so that we can track the numbers of children benefiting from this funding during 2021/22.</p>
<p>6. Regarding the adoption of the NEL ICS Anchor Charter, to what extent are the Charter's ambitions around '2) Procurement for social value 3) Maximising the social value of our buildings and land', reflected in the Tower Hamlets Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2021-25?</p>	<p>The Tower Hamlets Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2021-25 has been in development with partners since winter 2019. The latest draft has emerged from a series of interviews, engagements and reviews of relevant data and strategies and is currently undergoing public consultation.</p> <p>Procurement for social value:</p> <p>While it is beyond its scope to address procurement more broadly, a priority of the draft Health and Wellbeing Strategy is to work with employers across the borough (particular Small and Medium Enterprises) to improve the health of current employees and workplaces and to advise on tackling health inequalities. Additionally, one of the underlying principles of the strategy is to put equalities and anti-racism at the heart of everything we do, including in our working with partners, and organisations in the borough.</p> <p>Maximising the social value of our buildings and land:</p> <p>One of the draft Health and Wellbeing Strategy's 5 Ambitions is that 'We can all access safe, social spaces near our homes'. This ambition and its underlying principles have significant overlap with the North East London Integrated Care System Anchor Charter's ambition. The principles and actions in the draft strategy relating to this ambition include working with residents in planning, design and development; strengthening communications and engagement with underserved</p>

Overview & Scrutiny PDSQs 26.04.2021

	<p>communities, as well as empowering the views of children and young people to create sustainable change to the environment; and making use of unused open spaces;</p>
<p>Item 6.3 Future of the Private Rented Sector Housing Selective Licensing Designation</p>	
<p>1. What are the measures of success for this policy?</p>	<p>The scheme has enabled the Council to identify where the private rented properties are in this part of the Borough, this has been critical during the pandemic as we have been able to communicate with tenants and landlords directly in regard to protection against eviction. The scheme has also set the standard that landlords must achieve when renting out their property and informs the tenant who is responsible for managing their property. As of March 2021, the Selective Licensing scheme has achieved the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properties licensed: 8146 • Total number of visits and surveys undertaken: 3105 • Property conditions improved: 924 • Enforcement Notices served: 320 • Civil Penalty Notice fines issued: £83,374.27 • Prosecutions for failure to licence and Management Regs: 10 • Rent Repayment Orders (RRO) claimed: £91,000 from May 2019 to date in the Selective Licensing area only. <p>Total RROs for the whole borough (inc. SL area): Claimed: £210,125 (78 applicants) Claims filed and awaiting decision: £267,062 (61 applicants) Claims to be filed: Approx. £160,000 (50 applicants)</p>
<p>2. Can it be reiterated why this area focuses on Whitechapel, Spitalfields & Banglatown and Weavers wards?</p>	<p>Based on the Mayhew Report which reviewed ASB across the Council it was noted that these ward areas have the higher amounts of ASB which is one of the key criteria for introducing the scheme</p>

<p>3. Have other parts of the borough been considered for such a scheme?</p>	<p>Yes, as detailed in the Mayhew report in relation to ASB. However, the Additional Licensing Scheme, which captures all small HMOs, is currently in force throughout the rest of the borough.</p>
<p>Item 6.4 Proposal for the introduction of the borough wide Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) to deal with the possession and use of psychoactive substances (e.g. nitrous oxide) and associated Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB)</p>	
<p>1. When will the PSPO be legally enforceable from?</p>	<p>If Cabinet are minded, to make the Order, at the time of that decision the Order has come into force. We have planned for sufficient signage to be placed around the borough, particularly in those hotspot areas from 3rd May 2021 onwards. Once signage is in place, the order will become legally enforceable.</p>
<p>2. Have we ensured that every Met Police officer & THEO in Tower Hamlets is aware of the PSPO and is ready and able to issue FPN ?</p>	<p>The turnover of police officers that may be working within the Central East Basic Command Unit is high. Therefore the Council ensuring every Met Police Officer in the BCU is aware of the Order and able to issue an FPN is not practical. We have discussed the Order and enforcement of it with police partners. They have been consulted on the Order as part of the formal consultation. We have taken a targeted approach. We anticipate that the vast majority of enforcement by members of the MPS will be undertaken by Neighbourhood Police Officers, Police Community Support Officers, and our council funded police teams within LBTH & THH. As part of our commitment to enhance partnership working, and ensure a better overall service offer for our residents, we have committed to delivering regular bite-size workshops to ensure those neighbourhood police officers are fully versed with all council services, including the powers that exist within the (if the NOX PSPO is agreed) three PSPOs in the borough. All Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers are familiar with PSPO enforcement, have had regular training, are aware of the proposed introduction of this PSPO and already have what they need to enforce where appropriate.</p>

6.7 – GP Enhanced Public Health Services – Direct Award

Public Health GP Enhanced Services – the contract awarded to Tower Hamlets GP Care Group is welcomed and they are active partners in Tower Hamlets Together. However, could the Council outline where and how the governance and oversight of the contract is undertaken by the TH Council directly, including quarterly monitoring?

Contract monitoring meetings are conducted quarterly between the Tower Hamlets Public Health and GP care group, attended by the associate director of Public Health and two Public Health programme leads (commissioners) and representatives from GP care group including clinical leadership (provider). In these meetings, the usual agenda items are quarterly performance report, finance/invoicing, contractual issues, staffing issues, risk log, action plan/recovery plan if underperformance. Moreover, the commissioners have access to the monthly/quarterly dashboards provided by clinical effectiveness group (CEG) which enables early identifications of issues or lower/higher activity.

This page is intentionally left blank