

Meeting of the

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 7 September 2010 at 5.30 p.m.

A G E N D A

VENUE

M71, 7th Floor, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove Crescent, London,
E14 2BG

Members:	Deputies (if any):
Chair: Councillor Ann Jackson	
Vice-Chair: Councillor Ahmed Adam Omer	
Councillor Stephanie Eaton	Councillor Alibor Choudhury, (Designated Deputy representing Councillors Ann Jackson, Ahmed Omer, Rajib Ahmed, Rabina Khan, Lesley Pavitt and Zenith Rahman)
Councillor Tim Archer	Councillor Lutfur Rahman, (Designated Deputy representing Councillors Ann Jackson, Ahmed Omer, Rajib Ahmed, Rabina Khan, Lesley Pavitt and Zenith Rahman)
Councillor Harun Miah	Councillor Peter Golds, (Designated Deputy representing Councillor Tim Archer)
Councillor Rajib Ahmed	Councillor David Snowdon, (Designated Deputy representing Councillor Tim Archer)
Councillor Rabina Khan	Councillor Shelina Aktar, (Designated Deputy representing Councillors Ann Jackson, Ahmed Omer, Rajib Ahmed, Rabina Khan, Lesley Pavitt and Zenith Rahman)
Councillor Lesley Pavitt	
Councillor Zenith Rahman	

[Note: The quorum for this body is 3 voting Members].

Co-opted Members:

Vacancy	– (Parent Governor Representative)
Mr Mushfique Uddin	– (Muslim Community Representative)
Vacancy	– Roman Catholic Diocese of Westminster Representative
Canon Michael Ainsworth	– (Church of England Representative)
Mr Ahbab Miah	– (Parent Governor Representative)

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:

Amanda Thompson, Democratic Services,

Tel: 020 7364 4651, E-mail: amanda.thompson@towerhamlets.gov.uk

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 7 September 2010

5.30 p.m.

SECTION ONE

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To note any declarations of interest made by Members, including those restricting Members from voting on the questions detailed in Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992. See attached note from the Chief Executive.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

3 - 12

To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 3 August 2010.

4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

To be notified at the meeting.

5. REQUESTS FOR DEPUTATIONS

To be notified at the meeting.

6. SECTION ONE REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

There were no Section One reports 'called in' from the meeting of Cabinet held on 4 August 2010.

7. SCRUTINY SPOTLIGHT

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Josh Peck, will attend to report on his portfolio.

(Time allocated – 30 minutes)

8. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK ISSUES

8.1 The Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy - Adoption of the Plan

13 - 60

Clerks Note:

Appendix One to this report was circulated to all Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in CD format under separate cover on 23 August 2010.

A hard copy is also attached to the Cabinet Agenda for 7 September.

(Time Allocated – 30 mins)

9. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MONITORING AND MANAGEMENT

9.1 Appointment of Co-opted Members 61 - 66

(Time allocated – 5 minutes)

9.2 Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2010/2011 67 - 86

(Time allocated – 15 minutes)

10. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF SECTION ONE (UNRESTRICTED) CABINET PAPERS

(Time allocated – 10 minutes).

11. ANY OTHER SECTION ONE (UNRESTRICTED) BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

12. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

In view of the contents of the remaining items on the agenda the Committee is recommended to adopt the following motion:

“That, under the provisions of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting for the consideration of the Section Two business on the grounds that it contains information defined as Exempt in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972.”

EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL SECTION (Pink Papers)

The exempt committee papers in the agenda will contain information, which is commercially, legally or personally sensitive and should not be divulged to third parties. If you do not wish to retain these papers after the meeting, please hand them to the Committee Officer present.

13. SECTION TWO REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

14. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF SECTION TWO (RESTRICTED) CABINET PAPERS

(Time allocated 15 minutes).

15. **ANY OTHER SECTION TWO (RESTRICTED)
BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS
URGENT**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 2

DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS - NOTE FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE FOR MEMBERS OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

This note is guidance only. Members should consult the Council's Code of Conduct for further details. Note: Only Members can decide if they have an interest therefore they must make their own decision. If in doubt as to the nature of an interest it is advisable to seek advice **prior** to attending at a meeting.

Declaration of interests for Members

Where Members have a personal interest in any business of the authority as described in paragraph 4 of the Council's Code of Conduct (contained in part 5 of the Council's Constitution) then s/he must disclose this personal interest as in accordance with paragraph 5 of the Code. Members must disclose the existence and nature of the interest at the start of the meeting and certainly no later than the commencement of the item or where the interest becomes apparent.

You have a **personal interest** in any business of your authority where it relates to or is likely to affect:

- (a) An interest that you must **register**
- (b) An interest that is not on the register, but where the well-being or financial position of you, members of your family, or people with whom you have a close association, is likely to be affected by the business of your authority more than it would affect the majority of inhabitants of the ward affected by the decision.

Where a personal interest is declared a Member may stay and take part in the debate and decision on that item.

What constitutes a prejudicial interest? - Please refer to paragraph 6 of the adopted Code of Conduct.

Your personal interest will also be a prejudicial interest in a matter if (a), (b) and either (c) or (d) below apply:-

- (a) A member of the public, who knows the relevant facts, would reasonably think that your personal interests are so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgment of the public interests; AND
- (b) The matter does not fall within one of the exempt categories of decision listed in paragraph 6.2 of the Code; AND EITHER
- (c) The matter affects your financial position or the financial interest of a body with which you are associated; or
- (d) The matter relates to the determination of a licensing or regulatory application

The key points to remember if you have a prejudicial interest in a matter being discussed at a meeting:-

- i. You must declare that you have a prejudicial interest, and the nature of that interest, as soon as that interest becomes apparent to you; and
- ii. You must leave the room for the duration of consideration and decision on the item and not seek to influence the debate or decision unless (iv) below applies; and

- iii. You must not seek to improperly influence a decision in which you have a prejudicial interest.
- iv. If Members of the public are allowed to speak or make representations at the meeting, give evidence or answer questions about the matter, by statutory right or otherwise (e.g. planning or licensing committees), you can declare your prejudicial interest but make representations. However, you must immediately leave the room once you have finished your representations and answered questions (if any). You cannot remain in the meeting or in the public gallery during the debate or decision on the matter.

There are particular rules relating to a prejudicial interest arising in relation to Overview and Scrutiny Committees

- You will have a prejudicial interest in any business before an Overview & Scrutiny Committee or sub committee meeting where both of the following requirements are met:-
 - (i) That business relates to a decision made (whether implemented or not) or action taken by the Council's Executive (Cabinet) or another of the Council's committees, sub committees, joint committees or joint sub committees
 - (ii) You were a Member of that decision making body at the time and you were present at the time the decision was made or action taken.
- If the Overview & Scrutiny Committee is conducting a review of the decision which you were involved in making or if there is a 'call-in' you may be invited by the Committee to attend that meeting to answer questions on the matter in which case you must attend the meeting to answer questions and then leave the room before the debate or decision.
- If you are not called to attend you should not attend the meeting in relation to the matter in which you participated in the decision unless the authority's constitution allows members of the public to attend the Overview & Scrutiny for the same purpose. If you do attend then you must declare a prejudicial interest even if you are not called to speak on the matter and you must leave the debate before the decision.

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON TUESDAY, 3 AUGUST 2010

**M71, 7TH FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT,
LONDON, E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor Ahmed Adam Omer (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Stephanie Eaton
Councillor Tim Archer
Councillor Rajib Ahmed
Councillor Rabina Khan
Councillor Zenith Rahman

Councillor Alibor Choudhury (Substitute)

Co-opted Members Present:

Mr Ahbab Miah – (Parent Governor Representative)

Other Councillors Present:

Councillor David Snowdon
Councillor David Edgar
Councillor Denise Jones
Councillor Joshua Peck

Officers Present:

Afazul Hoque – (Scrutiny Policy Manager, Scrutiny & Equalities, Chief Executive's)
David Galpin – (Head of Legal Services (Community))
Hafsha Ali – (Acting Joint Service Head Scrutiny & Equalities, Chief Executive's)
Ruth Dowden – (Complaints Manager)
Chris Naylor – (Corporate Director, Resources)
Stephanie Ford – (Interim Performance Manager, Strategy & Performance, Chief Executive's)
Judith St John – (Head of Ideas Stores, Communities Localities & Culture)
Matthew Vaughan – (Political Advisor to the Conservative Group)
Chris Saunders – (Interim Political Advisor to the Labour Group, Chief Executive's)

Farhana Khan	– (Scrutiny & Equalities Admin Officer)
Basit Ali	– (Asset Manager, Asset Strategy, Capital Delivery & Property Services, Development & Renewal)
Amanda Thompson	– (Team Leader - Democratic Services)

VICE-CHAIR COUNCILLOR AHMED ADAM OMER IN THE CHAIR

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ann Jackson, Lesley Pavitt and Harun Miah.

Councillor Alibor Choudhury was present as a substitute.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Alibor Choudhury and Rabina Khan declared personal interests in agenda item 6.1 as they were the relevant ward councillors.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Chair reported that further to the update given at the last meeting, he wished to inform the Committee that his Scrutiny Review would now be focusing on empowering minority communities in the Borough with an emphasis on the Somali community.

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

RESOLVED

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 6 July 2010 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record of the proceedings.

4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

None.

5. REQUESTS FOR DEPUTATIONS

None.

6. SECTION ONE REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

6.1 Report Called In - Idea Store Strategy Action Plan Update - Idea Store Watney Market and One Stop Shop

Councillor David Snowden for the Call-In Members referred to the reasons in their requisition and highlighted the main issues that they held with the provisionally agreed decision to create a new Idea Store and One Stop Shop in Watney Market.

Committee Members put detailed questions to Councillor Denise Jones, Cabinet Member for Culture and Creative Industries, Judith St John, Head of Idea Store, and Basit Ali, Interim Head of Asset Strategy, on a number of issues including the decision to combine an Idea Store and One Stop Shop, what would happen to the existing Idea Store, the potential for other commercial and residential uses, the suitability of the location, why only one valuation was sought, whether any Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) were consulted, the marketing of the site, use of S106 monies and how consultation processes were undertaken.

Ms St John and Mr Ali responded on behalf of the Cabinet in detail on the points raised stating that there would be no gap in service provision, there were significant planning and development constraints that would prevent the land being commercially marketable, the risks involved for private developers were too great and site too small for RSLs for the land to achieve any value, and that the £2m lottery funding would be lost if the project did not go ahead.

The Committee were informed that it was considered normal practice to seek just one valuation, and that full consultation had been carried out with residents regarding the proposed project.

Members of the Committee who were also the relevant Ward Councillors expressed concern that residents had only recently been informed of the proposals for the site and had not been asked to express a preference for anything else. The structure itself was overbearing and there were concerns regarding the safety aspects of combining a library with a One Stop Shop.

After responding to questions Councillor Jones, and Councillor Edgar who was present for another item and who had been part of the Cabinet when the original decision was made, left the meeting while the Committee made its decision.

Following the debate the Committee voted on whether to refer the item back to the Cabinet for further consideration and on a vote of 5 FOR, 1 AGAINST and 1 ABSTENTION it was

RESOLVED:

That the decision be referred back to the Cabinet requesting that:

- 1) A second independent valuation of the plot of land listed in Appendix 1 of the report for development of the new Idea Store Local and One Stop Shop is undertaken;
- 2) Further community consultation is undertaken to establish exactly what local residents would like to see the land used for;
- 3) The source (s) of the s106 funding required to support this project are identified; and
- 4) The need for an Idea Store in Watney Market and investment in the existing Watney Market Library is reviewed.

7. SCRUTINY SPOTLIGHT

Councillor David Edgar, Lead Member for Resources, gave a presentation on the key issues, achievements, and challenges arising from his portfolio.

Councillor Edgar stated that the role of the Directorate was to help colleagues in Council and partners across the borough – including NHS Tower Hamlets – deliver the best public services with the resources it had at its disposal.

Achievements in 2009/10 included:

- Rushmead and Cheviot One Stop Shops completely re-furbished
- Recently independent monitored mystery shopping of One Stop Shops had given four out of five visits the maximum 100% score
- £100 pensioner discount delivered to nearly 4,000 pensioners
- The business rate deferral scheme – brought in to help businesses with the increase in business rates – implemented and over 700 local businesses supported
- £2 million additional benefit entitlements identified and paid to Tower Hamlets pensioners
- Continuing focus on establishing a workforce to reflect the community: 60% of staff were female; 50% BME and 20% Bangladeshi. Steady progress was also being made to ensure better representation of BME and Bangladeshi staff at more senior grades
- A 50% reduction in agency staff
- A 30% improvement in return rate on the staff survey - the overall results showed that the Council scored above average in half the key measures compared to similar organisations and average on the rest
- The first council in London to achieve compliancy to the government's code of connection enabling secure interactions between local authorities and central government departments through GCSx and Encryption.

Councillor Edgar advised that the overarching challenge for the next few years was responding to a significant reduction in funding in ways that reduced costs while minimising the impact on the users of the services provided.

The challenges for 2010/11 included:

- Supporting the development of a balanced budget strategy for 2011/12 to 2013/14
- Working with Directorates to identify further opportunities for efficiency savings and reducing costs
- Implementation of the Council's information management strategy – to lay the foundations for future improvements in services and reduced costs
- An increasing focus on workforce planning including the number of buildings occupied, levels of agency staff, and the number of management layers.

Members of the Committee asked questions on a number of related issues including the cost of the Rushmead/Cheviot refurbishments, the impact of the Business Rates Deferral Scheme, procurement methods, reductions in the agency staff, the use of S106 monies, financial control of Tower Hamlets Homes, waste minimalisation, levels of variance between Directorate's budgets, and the impact of moving to 12 monthly instalments for Council Tax collection.

Councillor Edgar then responded in detail to the concerns raised, highlighting in particular:

- The Council were alert to the risks of reducing the number of agency staff and aware of when this was not appropriate
- The Council kept an oversight of the financial control of Tower Hamlets Homes
- The Chair of the Council's Planning Committees had asked for more information to be provided on S106 monies when considering applications
- The possible introduction of a Waste Minimalisation Strategy would be looked into
- The overall budget position needed to be considered as opposed to individual directorates, and the total picture reflected well
- Moving to 12 monthly payments had been the right thing for residents as it enabled better household budgeting

The Chair thanked Councillor Edgar for his presentation.

8. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK ISSUES

8.1 Budget 2011/12 - 2013/14 - Resource Allocation and Budget Review

It was agreed that this report due to be considered as urgent business would be taken together with the previous item in order that Councillor Edgar could respond to the related questions.

RESOLVED

That the contents of the report be noted.

9. PERFORMANCE MONITORING

9.1 Strategic Performance and Corporate Revenue Budget Monitoring 2009/2010 Year End Report

Councillor Josh Peck, Deputy Leader of the Council, and Councillor Edgar, Lead Member for Resources, presented the Council's combined annual service and financial performance report, which covered the authority's progress against the actions in the Strategic Plan, Strategic and Priority performance Indicators and its financial position for year end 2009/10.

The Committee noted the following responses to questions:

- The Government's targets in relation to Children, Schools and Families had gone down, however the Council continued to set challenging targets in this area which often resulted in them not being met.
- The Council was confident it was doing all it could for Looked After Children however it was keen to try and increase placements inside the Borough as it was felt that this would provide a more secure environment. Foster families therefore received priority on the housing waiting list.
- Business Rates – Collection Performance had exceeded the target set by 1.3%
- The move to 12 monthly instalments for Council Tax collection meant that the recovery process for the final payment would be completed after year end.
- Tower Hamlets' innovative participatory budgeting project – 'You Decide' had enabled 815 residents from around the Borough to decide how almost 2.4m would be spent.
- The Council had already made progress in achieving savings by reducing the number of agency staff and streamlining services, and substantial work was being undertaken to improve the way services

were delivered. The Council would also be vacating Anchorage House as soon as the lease expired.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

9.2 Corporate Complaints and Social Care Complaints Annual Report 2009/2010

Councillor Josh Peck, Deputy Leader of the Council, supported by Ruth Dowden, Corporate Complaints Manager, introduced the report detailing a summary of the complaints received by the Council through the Corporate Complaints procedure during the period April 2009 to March 2010, and those received by the Local Government Ombudsman for the same period.

The Committee noted that there had been significant improvements in response times at each of the three complaint stages, and the Local Government Ombudsman had commented positively in the Annual Letter to the Council regarding the focus on local resolution and prompt responses.

Members of the Committee raised a number of questions concerning the compensation recommended by the Ombudsman following a case of maladministration, the effectiveness of each complaint stage, the high level of Lap 1 complaints, publicity of the service, and complaints concerning Tower Hamlets Homes.

Ruth Dowden provided the following responses:

- The Ombudsman's recommendation was still being considered by the Council's Assistant Chief Executive, Legal Services.
- Research was being undertaken to see if complaints not upheld at Stage 1 were then overturned at a later stage.
- In order to target specific groups, additional publicity was undertaken, and Social Care departments issued service users with complaints information and leaflets.
- Sometimes factors such as housing could influence the high level of complaints received for a particular area.
- Tower Hamlets Homes investigated their own complaints at stages 1 & 2, but the Council retained responsibility at stage 3 and Ombudsman.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

10. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF SECTION ONE (UNRESTRICTED) CABINET PAPERS

RESOLVED

That the following Section 1 pre-decision questions be submitted to Cabinet for consideration:

Agenda Item 6.1 LBTH Housing Strategy – Annual Review for 2009/10 and the Annual Strategy Refresh (CAB 017/101)

1. What risk assessment has been undertaken in regards to Tower Hamlets Homes not achieving its 'Two Stars' rating?
2. What is the contingency plan for delivering decent homes in the events that THH does not achieve 2-star rating?
3. Has the Council done anything to gain insight about the methods used by Phoenix Housing Co op that may be of use in better fiscal management of housing stock?

Agenda Item 7.4 Framework for Minor Works and Repairs (CAB 022/101)

1. Is there any possibility of entering into partnership with other councils to get a less costly procurement process for Minor works?

Agenda Item 7.5 Allocation process for Council-owned property to Third Sector Organisations (CAB 023/101)

1. Has the Cabinet considered procuring an external agency to manage the third sectors use of Council buildings to ensure efficiency and fairness?
2. Will there be a review against these criteria of existing allocations?
3. Who sits on the Asset and Capital Strategy Board?
4. How will the Asset and Capital Strategy Board determine applications between applicants of equal merit?
5. Will there be an appeal process?

11. ANY OTHER SECTION ONE (UNRESTRICTED) BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

The meeting ended at 9.30 p.m.

Vice-Chair, Councillor Ahmed Adam Omer
Overview & Scrutiny Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 8.1

Committee/Meeting: Overview & Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet	Date: 7 & 8 September 2010	Classification: Unrestricted	Report No: 8.1
Report of: Corporate Director Aman Dalvi Originating officer(s) Jennifer Richardson Strategic Planning Manager		Title: LDF Core Strategy: Adoption of the plan Wards Affected: All Wards	

Lead Member	Cllr Marc Francis Lead member for Housing Heritage and Planning
Community Plan Theme	A Great Place to Live
Strategic Priority	All Priorities

1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Council officers have been working toward preparing the Local Development Framework– Core Strategy. The Core Strategy is the most important part of the Local Development Framework as it sets the spatial vision and the priorities for the next 15 years and beyond.
- 1.2 The Core Strategy has been through an extensive preparation process over the last 3 years, including evidence base collection, option testing, public consultation, member approval and independent examination. The Core Strategy has now been found sound by the Planning Inspector and therefore is now able to be considered by the Council for its adoption.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Overview and Scrutiny is recommended to consider the report and pass any comments it wishes to make to Cabinet

Cabinet is recommended to:-

- 2.1 Consider the Final Core Strategy in Appendix 1 and the Inspectors report and three Annexes as included in Appendix 2.
- 2.2 Recommend that full Council adopt the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (including the Inspectors required amendments) to be a part of the Borough's Development Plan.

3. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

- 3.1 The decision to adopt the Core Strategy is required in accordance with Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (Section 23 – Adoption of a Local Development Document), if the local authority seeks to enact the policies included in the plan.
- 3.2 It should be noted that, in accordance with Section 23 (3) and (4), the planning inspector's report is binding, meaning that the local authority must adopt the plan with the changes that are recommended.

4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 4.1 The Council may alternatively choose not to adopt the Core Strategy, including choosing not to adopt any one of the Inspectors binding recommendations. This would mean that the work undertaken would be aborted and work would start again on the production of the Core Strategy.
- 4.2 There are substantial risks and implications associated with this option including risks of not having an up to date planning framework to manage growth and change, as well as significant cost implications. It would also undermine for the current work being undertaken on the second tranche of plans coming forward as a part of the Local Development Framework.
- 4.3 This in turn would significantly limit the Council to deliver other priorities such as the delivery of new homes, including family homes, new jobs and critical infrastructure including a possible new in borough waste facility, new primary and secondary schools and other essential infrastructure critical to support the development of sustainable communities and deliver the borough's Community Plan vision and objectives.

5. BACKGROUND

- 5.1 The adoption of the Local Development Framework - Core Strategy is the last step in a long process of developing a core strategy for the Council. The Core Strategy has regularly been reported to the Cabinet and Council throughout its stages of production, including most recently been approved by Council on 9 December 2009 for its submission to the Secretary of State.

6. BODY OF REPORT

- 6.1 The Local Development Framework – Core Strategy is the spatial interpretation of the Community Plan and thus is one of its central delivery tools. The Core Strategy sets out the strategy for how the borough will seek to manage physical change, including illustrating where and when growth and change will happen in the borough. In Tower Hamlets context this strategy outlines an ambitious growth strategy, as the borough takes on its role as one of the fastest growing borough in country.

- 6.2 The Core Strategy has been through an extremely comprehensive process of production and approval. Previous reports considered by the Council, including the report to Council on 9 December 2009, outline in detail the extensive work, including the development of evidence base, the testing of options and the public consultation and partnership working that underpins this strategy.
- 6.3 Following Council resolution, the Council submitted the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State on the 18 December 2009. The Secretary of State then appointed Sue Turner to undertake an examination into the soundness of the Core Strategy.
- 6.4 The examination comprised nine hearings over five days between 13 and 21 April 2010. These were attended by Cllr Francis, the Chief Executive, the Director of Development and Renewal as well as a number of senior managers over the course of the examination.
- 6.5 On 15 July 2010 Council received the Final Report from the Planning Inspectorate. This report found that the Core Strategy was sound subject to a number of minor amendments.
- 6.6 The Inspectors report, including all the required changes that have been made to the Core Strategy prior to adoption, are included in Appendix 2 of this report.
- 6.7 The adoption of the Core Strategy brings to an end a long and at times difficult preparation process. The radical overhaul of the planning system in 2004 was subject to some well publicised ‘teething troubles’, which Tower Hamlets experienced first hand in 2007.
- 6.8 The Tower Hamlets Core Strategy 2010 has now been recognised by number of bodies as an example of best practise for the country. In particular the Council has been recognised for its work on place-making, incorporating design into planning and for its collaborative working with the local strategic partnership (in particular our work on infrastructure planning and working with NHS Tower Hamlets to address issues of health and planning).
- 6.9 The production of this plan represents a truly collaborative and innovative process; across both the Council and the wider partnership. The strategic planning team would like to take this opportunity to thank officers from across the Council, key external stakeholders, the corporate management team, the Partnership, the Chief Executive, members and local people for their significant contributions that have shaped development of this plan over a number of years.

Next Steps

- 6.10 Subject to the Council resolving to adopt the Core Strategy in accordance with the recommendation of this report, the Core Strategy will become the principle plan within the Tower Hamlets Local Development Framework. This

decision will be published in local press, on the Council website and all interested parties who have involved in the production of these plans will be notified of this decision.

- 6.11 Work has already started on the development of next phase of local development plan documents which will support the Core Strategy. These include: the Site and Place-making DPD, the Development Management DPD and the Fish Island Area Action Plan.

7. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

- 7.1 This report seeks approval by Cabinet to submit the Core Strategy (including the Inspectors required amendments) to full Council, for adoption towards the Local Development Framework.
- 7.2 As outlined in the report to Cabinet in September 2009, the Core Strategy will underpin key decisions in relation to the allocation of the limited resources available within the Borough, and will influence the shaping of the Council's Capital Strategy.
- 7.3 The ongoing medium and long term financial planning of the Council will need to take account of the growth pressures contained within the Core Strategy. A robust monitoring process will review the reported outputs of the population change and growth model, including assessments of housing completions and their implications on infrastructure. Reports will be considered quarterly by the Council's Asset Management and Capital Strategy Board.
- 7.4 Following adoption of the Core Strategy by full Council, there will be revenue expenditure incurred in the production of the document. This will be funded through existing identified resources.

8. CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL SERVICES)

- 8.1 The Core Strategy is adopted by a local planning authority under section 23 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). The authority may only adopt the Core Strategy if they accept the modifications to the Core Strategy suggested by the Inspector to this report as these modifications are binding on the authority.
- 8.2 The Cabinet are being asked to decide whether or not to recommend to Full Council that the Core Strategy is adopted with the required amendments. This is because the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations 2005 provide that the process of preparation of development plan documents is an Executive responsibility but the formal process of submission to the Secretary of State and adoption are the responsibility of Full Council.

9. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 The Core Strategy delivers the spatial component of the Community Plan. It is the principal strategy that will deliver One Tower Hamlets through proactively planning and designing for the different places that make up Tower Hamlets.
- 9.2 The Core Strategy recognises that each place is different, and how they all have their role and function but all come together to help build an outward looking One Tower Hamlets. Through extensive consultation in conjunction with the Partnership, the quality and needs of each place have been addressed and visions have been generated to shape the future of each place in the borough.
- 9.3 Full consideration and engagement has ensured that the vision of One Tower Hamlets is embedded throughout the Core Strategy, in order to translate that vision in a spatial sense for the borough by delivering high quality places through place-making.
- 9.4 The Core Strategy is also supported by an Equalities Impact Assessment. The Equalities Impact Assessment considered impacts which are relevant for the Core Strategy as well as for development more generally. As a result the suggested mitigated activities have been embedded within the Core Strategy and will also be taken forward through the forthcoming development plan documents. This is in accordance with the Equalities Impact Assessment golden thread approach for the Local Development Framework. The Core Strategy Equalities Impact Assessment specifically recognised place-making as a vital component of this Strategy and recognised its importance in designing and developing places.

10. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

- 10.1 The Core Strategy has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Directive 2001/42/EC. The Core Strategy includes strategies and policies to assist mitigate and adapt to climate change and will assist the Council to meet Ni186, which looks to reduce CO₂ emissions per capita across the borough by 60% in 2025 and contributes to meeting Ni197 for biodiversity improvements.

11. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 A risk management matrix has been developed for this project in accordance with Corporate Policy. The key risks have been regularly discussed with the Core Strategy Steering Group and reported to the Council's Corporate Management Team. Many of the identified risks have been successfully mitigated through robust evidence base, as well as proactively engagement of partners and key stakeholders. The most significant risk relates to the ongoing changes to national planning policy and legislation and the plan

making guidance, although recent changes have allowed for a greater degree of flexibility.

- 11.2 An LDF Programme Board has now been established, which is chaired by the Director of Development and Renewal, to ensure the effective implementation of the Core Strategy, through effective management of the forthcoming plans.

12. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 The Core Strategy function is to best manage the physical environment such that we achieve the Community Plan theme of a Great Place to Live. The Core Strategy includes a priority of 'Creating attractive and safe streets and spaces'. Its focus on the importance of design seeks to design out crime through high quality and intelligence design solutions.
- 12.2 Officers have worked with the Borough Commander and other representatives the Tower Hamlets Borough Police throughout the development of this Strategy. The future infrastructure needs for police has also been addressed.

13. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT

- 13.1 Much of the evidence base prepared to inform the Core Strategy has been designed to provide both evidence for the Core Strategy, as well as informing other reports and strategies. This shared evidence includes (but is not limited to), the Town Centre Spatial Strategy, the Population Change and Growth model, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, the Waste Evidence Report, the Urban Structure and Characterisation report and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Where appropriate, costs have also been shared between parties.
- 13.2 One key example is Population Change and Growth model which the Partnership's Joint Intelligence Group will use to understand the nature and location of population growth across the borough and how that will impact on service provision in Tower Hamlets over time.

14. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – The Tower Hamlets Core Strategy
Appendix 2 – The Final Report for the Tower Hamlets Core Strategy
(including Annex 1, 2, and 3)

**Local Government Act, 1972 Section 100D (As amended)
List of "Background Papers" used in the preparation of this report**

Brief description of “background papers”

Name and telephone number of holder
and address where open to inspection.

Equalities Impact Assessment

Jennifer Richardson, x5375

This page is intentionally left blank



Report to the London Borough of Tower Hamlets

by Sue Turner RIBA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 8000

15 July 2010

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

SECTION 20

**REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE LONDON BOROUGH OF
TOWER HAMLETS CORE STRATEGY**

DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

Document submitted for examination on 18 December 2009

Examination hearings held between 13 and 21 April 2010

File Ref: E5900/429/9

ABBREVIATIONS

AAP	Area Action Plan
AHVS	Affordable Housing Viability Study
CAZ	Central Activity Zone
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CS	Core Strategy
DPD	Development Plan Document
EIA	Equalities Impact Assessment
ELS	Employment Land Study
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
IDPR	Infrastructure Delivery Plan Report
LAP	Local Area Partnership
LDF	Local Development Framework
LIL	Local Industrial Location
LOL	Local Office Location
OSS	Open Spaces Strategy
POL	Preferred Office Location
PPCG	Planning for Population Change and Growth
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMNA	Strategic Housing Market and Needs Assessment
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SIL	Strategic Industrial Land
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
SMOWS	Small and Medium Office and Workplace Study
SO	Strategic Objective
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
TCSS	Town Centre Spatial Strategy
THHS	Tower Hamlets Housing Strategy
USCS	Urban Structure and Characterisation Study
WEB	Waste Evidence Base Report
WHS	World Heritage Site

Non-technical Summary

This report concludes that the Tower Hamlets Core Strategy provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the Borough over the next 15 years. The Council has sufficient evidence to support the strategy and can show that it has a reasonable chance of being delivered.

A limited number of changes are needed to meet legal and statutory requirements. These can be summarised as follows:

- Wording changes suggested by the Council to ensure that there is better explanation of how and when policy tools and designations will be designated and defined;
- Extension of the timescale for delivery of infrastructure on the Leven Road Gasworks site to ensure delivery timescales are realistic;
- Amended wording to allow the potential for developer contributions to be managed via the Community Infrastructure Levy;
- Re-organisation of the Programme of Delivery to improve its clarity and strengthen the key role it plays in the implementation of the plan;
- Amendments to improve consistency with the London Plan; and
- Re-location of the placemaking section to an Annex to avoid inconsistencies within the main part of the strategy.

Most of the changes recommended in this report are based on suggestions put forward by the Council during the Examination in response to points raised by participants. They do not alter the essential thrust of the Council's overall strategy.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Under the terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the purpose of the independent examination of a development plan document (DPD) is to determine:
- whether it satisfies the requirements of s19 and s24(1) of the 2004 Act, the regulations under s17(7), and any regulations under s36 relating to the preparation of the document
 - whether it is sound.
- 1.2 This report contains my assessment of the *London Borough of Tower Hamlets Core Strategy DPD* in terms of the above matters, along with my recommendations and the reasons for them, as required by s20(7) of the 2004 Act.
- 1.3 I am satisfied that the Core Strategy (CS) meets the requirements of the Act and Regulations. My role is also to consider its soundness against the three criteria of soundness set out in Planning Policy Statement 12: creating strong, safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (PPS12) paragraphs 4.51-4.52. In line with national policy, the starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The changes I have specified in this report are made only where there is a clear need to amend the document in the light of the legal requirements and/or the criteria of soundness in PPS12. None of these changes should materially alter the substance of the plan and its policies, or undermine the sustainability appraisal and participatory processes undertaken.

Post Publication Minor Changes

- 1.4 The submission CS was accompanied by a *Matrix of Changes Table* (Core Document 60). Changes in this document correct typographical errors, address points of clarification and deal with factual updates. They do not undermine the sustainability appraisal or the participatory process previously undertaken and they do not affect or change the overall strategy or any policies in the CS. For these reasons I endorse the changes in the *Matrix of Changes Table* and the starting point for the examination is the submitted CS as amended by the matrix.

Organisation of the report

- 1.5 Section 2 of this report considers the legal requirements and Sections 3 and 4 address the main issues and other matters considered during the examination in terms of testing justification, effectiveness and consistency with national policy.

Recommended changes

- 1.6 A number of changes have been suggested by the Council and these are presented, together with changes that I consider

necessary to ensure soundness, in three Annexes attached to this report.

Annex A: Council's changes C1 – C23
Required for soundness

This is a list of changes that the Council has suggested. These changes are taken from the *Matrix of suggested changes* (Core Document 161B) which the Council prepared during the examination and publicised on its website. However not all of the changes suggested in the Council's matrix are required to ensure soundness. Annex A therefore only lists only the Council's suggested changes that are essential for soundness.

Annex B: Inspector's changes IC1 – IC6
Required for soundness

IC1 – IC3 and IC6 all support or expand upon changes that the Council has suggested in **Annex A**. IC4 is based on a statement of common ground between the Council and National Grid. IC5 relates to the placemaking section of the CS.

None of the changes in **Annex A** or **Annex B** undermines the *Sustainability Appraisal* or the participatory process previously undertaken. They do not affect or change the overall strategy or any policies in the CS. They are all addressed in this report.

Annex C: Council's minor amendments
Not required for soundness

This is a schedule of minor changes suggested by the Council or participants during the examination, set out in the *Matrix of Post Submission Changes* (Core Document 161) and published on the Council's website during the examination. These changes are not required to address soundness and are not referred to in this report. They ensure consistency and correct inaccuracies and drafting errors. I endorse them as they add coherence and clarity to the CS and ensure consistency.

- 1.7 A recurrent difficulty in this CS is the reliance on endnotes which refer to evidence base documents to justify the strategy. The endnotes refer to entire documents and in order to fully understand the reasoning and justification for some policies a detailed reading of these documents is required. This has been exacerbated because the "why we have taken this approach" sections, which are intended to justify and explain policies and link them to the supporting evidence, are placed after the policies. Consequently the CS does not flow or unfold in a logical way and is not an easily accessible document. **This has represented a barrier to engagement with the local community.**

- 1.8 In most cases this does not make the CS unsound and justification for all policies can be found in the evidence base. However in several instances the absence of narrative to explain the approach taken is a serious deficiency, with some policies unsupported by reasoning within the CS. Some of the changes that the Council has suggested are required to make the CS a coherent and accessible document and facilitate participation in future DPDs.

2. LEGAL COMPLIANCE

- 2.1 The *Tower Hamlets Core Strategy DPD* is contained within the Council's *Local Development Scheme* the updated version being approved in November 2009. There, it is shown as having a submission date of December 2009.
- 2.2 The Council's *Statement of Community Involvement* (SCI) was adopted in 2008. Following the introduction of the Town and Country (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 the Council began a review of the SCI and an amended SCI was adopted in November 2009. The Council's Regulation 30(1) (d) statement explains that engagement and consultation was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the 2008 SCI but taking account of changes in the 2008 Regulations and PPS12.
- 2.3 During the examination some participants were critical of the accessibility of the CS and of the effectiveness of the consultation process. However having considered the SCI and the Council's *Statement of Participation* together with all the points put forward in the examination hearings I am satisfied that the consultation process has been carried out in accordance with the SCI.
- 2.4 Alongside the preparation of the CS it is evident that the Council has carried out a parallel process of sustainability appraisal.
- 2.5 In accordance with the Habitats Directive the CS has been the subject of a screening exercise which concludes that there is no need for an Appropriate Assessment to be undertaken.
- 2.6 I am satisfied that the CS has regard to national policy. In a letter dated 29 October 2009 the Mayor of London has indicated that the CS is in general conformity with the approved *London Plan* and I am satisfied that it is in general conformity. I am satisfied that the CS has had regard to the sustainable community strategy for the area.
- 2.7 I am satisfied that the CS complies with the specific requirements of the 2004 Regulations (as amended) including the requirements in relation to publication of the prescribed documents; availability of them for Inspection and local advertisement; notification of DPD bodies and provision of a list of superseded saved policies.
- 2.8 Accordingly, I am satisfied that the legal requirements have all been satisfied.

3. SOUNDNESS – MAIN ISSUES

- 3.1 PPS12 states that for a Core Strategy to be sound it should be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Taking account of all the written evidence together with discussions that took place at the examination hearings I have identified nine main issues that require detailed consideration.

Issue 1: Setting the scene and the big spatial vision.

Does the strategic vision address the priorities identified in the Community Plan and embrace the critical issues for the Borough?

- 3.2 The CS vision statement is entitled "Reinventing the Hamlets." Tower Hamlets will play a significant part in developing London as a sustainable, global city but there will also be an emphasis on regeneration and the prosperity of the economic hubs will filter down to the "places" of Tower Hamlets. The five key priority outcomes of the CS flow from the *Community Plan* and the CS sets out five transformational programmes which outline the ways in which the spatial vision will be delivered.
- 3.3 The *Community Plan* identifies a number of challenges faced by the borough in its aim of improving the quality of life for everyone who lives and works in the borough. These include low housing affordability, a legacy of poor quality social housing, stark inequality, with Tower Hamlets the third most deprived borough in the country, ethnic diversity and high unemployment levels. Clearly some policy solutions to these challenges lie outside of spatial planning. However it is clear that the overall strategy is underpinned by regeneration and sustainable growth.
- 3.4 The transformational delivery programmes indicate that regeneration, housing investment and the provision of open space will help to address critical issues identified in the *Community Plan*. It is also evident that many of the strategic objectives (SOs) and policies will play a key role in tackling poverty and inequality.

Does the spatial vision make it clear that the CS will address these issues and deliver regeneration as well as growth?

- 3.5 Community groups have raised concerns that addressing deprivation, diversity and housing need is given insufficient prominence in the spatial vision. There is a perception that it has been given lower priority than driving sub regional growth and delivering the *London Plan* growth agenda and targets. Furthermore there is scepticism about reliance on economic prosperity "filtering down" to benefit the borough's communities.
- 3.6 Thus it seems that the CS is not successful in explaining the context, "telling the story" of how the strategy has emerged and summarising the overall strategy. Some contextual information is

set out in "diverse communities and distinct places" but this does not describe clearly the social and economic challenges facing the area. "Why we have taken this approach" which follows the Vision Statement and which should explain the issues that it will address focuses almost entirely on "place making."

- 3.7 A clear and coherent urban structure can undoubtedly contribute to sustainable growth and regeneration, but an over emphasis on the physical environment has led members of the local community to fear that the social and economic priorities from the *Community Plan* have been overlooked. There is no mention in this section of the regeneration, economic diversification and growth which are key to the vision and strategy.
- 3.8 It is clear from reading the CS and the evidence base that critical issues from the *Community Plan* feed directly into the overall vision. Furthermore the five priority outcomes, especially "Strengthening neighbourhood well being" and "Enabling prosperous communities" are aligned with the themes of the *Community Plan* and the CS strategic objectives provide strong links with its priorities.
- 3.9 To demonstrate that the CS is based on a clear and complete understanding of all the issues facing the borough the Council has suggested that diagrams in *Options and Issues for Places* which show deprivation, ethnicity and demographics and the accompanying text should be inserted into the description of the borough on pages 20 and 21 [C1].

Is the overall strategy the most appropriate given the alternatives?

- 3.10 It is not for a development plan document to set out all the options that have been considered in detail. However the CS gives no indication at all as to how the chosen strategy has emerged. For this it is necessary to look at the evidence base. Early work in *Options and Alternatives 2008* identified two options: refocusing on town centres or organic growth across the borough. The second phase of consultation, *Options and Alternatives for Places 2009*, tested a combined approach with a focus on Town Centres but accepting that there will be organic growth adjacent to the City Fringe and Canary Wharf. This is the approach adopted in the CS.
- 3.11 Clearly the development of the overall strategy has been a complex task. Refocusing on the town centres has had to be balanced with the concentration of development in the *London Plan Opportunity Areas* at Leaside, the Isle of Dogs and the City Fringe, together with areas of regeneration. This is in the context of a shift away from industry to a different range of products and services.
- 3.12 The background evidence does provide an audit trail to demonstrate how and why the preferred strategy was arrived at and demonstrates that this strategy has been developed in parallel with a process of sustainability appraisal. However the evidence base is

extensive, dense and complex and it has been criticised by the local community as being inaccessible. The Council has suggested change C2 to add a summary of how the preferred strategy evolved. This change, which will add clarity and confirm that it is the most appropriate strategy, is required to make the CS sound.

Has the strategy been developed through work with strategic partners and cross boundary working?

3.13 It is clear from the evidence base that the CS has been prepared in partnership with a range of agencies and through working closely with the neighbouring boroughs of Hackney, Newham, Greenwich and the City of London. The delivery partners are not listed in the CS but I am satisfied that they are set out in detail in the *Infrastructure Delivery Plan Final Report (IDPR)*.

3.14 In conclusion, I am satisfied that the overall spatial vision is justified by robust evidence and is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives. To make the CS sound changes C1 and C2 are necessary to ensure clarity and internal consistency. These changes are summarised below and set out in full in Annex A.

C1	Insert diagrams and text from evidence base to expand on "Setting the Scene"
C2	Insert additional text to explain how the preferred approach for the overarching strategy was developed

Issue 2: Refocusing the town centres.

Is the approach to refocusing the town centres justified by robust evidence?

3.15 Policy SP01 defines the town centre hierarchy and how the network of town centres will be extended to achieve strategic objective SO4, a hierarchy of interconnected, vibrant and inclusive town centres. It describes the relationship between the scale and type of uses and explains the scale and role of the town centres.

3.16 The Council has undertaken detailed research into the uses, accessibility and urban design of the borough's town centres in the *Borough Portrait of Tower Hamlets*, the *Retail and Leisure Capacity Study* and the *Spatial Baseline Studies*. These studies feed into the *Town Centre Spatial Strategy (TCSS)*. I am satisfied that the methodology used in this research is robust and its scope is comprehensive. It has informed an up to date picture of the borough's town centres and proposes an effective strategy to 2025.

3.17 The TCSS sets out the existing and proposed hierarchies and the designation criteria on which the new hierarchy is based. It identifies a new policy mechanism for "Activity Areas" at City Fringe and Canary Wharf which will differ from but compliment the London Plan Central Activities Zone (CAZ). It also identifies new District

Centres at Bromley-by-Bow and Brick Lane and a range of new Neighbourhood Centres. The new hierarchy of town centres is set alongside the existing hierarchy in Appendix 4 of the CS.

- 3.18 The CS is informed by the TCSS and its supporting documents. The new designations recommended in the TCSS are put forward in Policy SP01 and the net increase in comparison and convenience retail floorspace, for which the *Retail and Leisure Capacity Study* identified a potential, is directed to town centres as recommended in the TCSS. Policy SO1 does not make it clear that the town centre hierarchy aligns with the *London Plan* and does not explain the identification of the two Activity Areas. The Council has suggested changes to address these matters [C3], [C4] and I agree that these changes are necessary to ensure that the CS is justified and effective.
- 3.19 There is little explanation for the approach taken to refocusing on the town centres and the CS relies on broad references to the TCSS for the reasoning behind the choices that have been made. Rather than providing clear links to the evidence that has informed Policy SP01, figures 17 – 20 of the CS are generic, theoretical diagrams imported from the baseline studies.
- 3.20 I recognise that diagrams can be helpful in explaining the relationship between, for example, urban form and accessibility. But taken out of context these diagrams do not explain the reasoning set out in the TCSS. Furthermore despite attempts in Figure 18 to give local examples of spatial layout types these diagrams are not locally distinctive. Their inclusion does not make the CS unsound but at the examination hearings the local community was very critical of them, finding them unhelpful and irrelevant. It is certainly hard to see how they inform the adjacent policy SP01. In order to make the CS a more accessible document that will encourage participation the Council may wish to consider removing Figures 17 – 20 when the CS is reviewed.
- 3.21 The TCSS recommends undertaking a review of the town centre and activity area boundaries which will be dealt with in lower level DPDs and the Proposals Map. However this intention is not carried through into the CS, where there should be an explanation of how detailed policies for the town centres will be progressed. Change C5 sets out the Council's additional wording to address this matter.

Is the approach to development at the edge of and outside town centres consistent with government guidance in PPS4?

- 3.22 Strategic objectives SO5 and SO6 promote mixed use on the edge of centres and along main streets and areas outside town centres for residential and supporting uses. This approach, set out in Policy SP01.5 is clear and consistent with guidance in PPS4 which, whilst in draft during preparation of the CS, was published during the examination. I am satisfied that it provides a hook for more

detailed policies on small scale uses and provision for day to day shopping to be provided in forthcoming DPDs.

- 3.23 Subject to the changes summarised below and set out in full in Annex A, which are necessary to ensure soundness, the CS approach to refocusing on the town centres is consistent with national and regional guidance, justified by robust evidence and capable of delivery.

C3	Explain the basis for the town centre hierarchy
C4	Explain reason for identifying Tower Hamlets Activity Areas
C5	Explain that the town centre hierarchy will be carried forward in lower level DPDs

Issue 3: Housing supply.

Is the approach to the delivery and location of housing justified and consistent with national planning policy and with the London Plan?

- 3.24 The CS sets out a target of 43,275 new homes for the plan period from 2010 to 2025, equating to 2885 homes per year. This figure is consistent with the borough's housing target in the emerging replacement *London Plan (2009)*, which is in turn informed by the *London Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2009* (London SHLAA). The housing trajectory is presented as a table in Appendix 2 of the CS. It demonstrates when and where homes will be delivered over the three five year periods to 2025 and is accompanied by detailed information to indicate the timing of delivery in the paired Local Area Partnership areas (LAPs).
- 3.25 The CS housing trajectory is informed by evidence in the *Planning for Population Change and Growth* (PPCG) model. This monitoring and management tool is led by the Local Strategic Partnership. As a live model it enables population change and growth to be monitored to inform infrastructure planning and is based on the expected development of sites with planning permission and potential sites. The evidence base demonstrates that the PPCG model is based on a local understanding and rigorous examination of sites that are capable of coming forward.
- 3.26 The *PPCG Baseline Report* (PPCG Report) sets out key findings from the borough's capacity assessment exercise that was undertaken in July 2009. The PPCG model has enabled the Council to predict with some accuracy the scale and pattern of housing development across the borough. Potential development sites have been identified in accordance with the government's SHLAA process and the suitability, availability and deliverability of the sites has been tested. Although there are some variations between the inputs to the London SHLAA and PPCG model, the housing outputs are closely aligned. I am satisfied that the housing trajectory is based on an up to date and realistic understanding of identified sites in the borough.

- 3.27 Raw data from the PPCG model shows that sites with planning permission will provide the majority of the housing for the first five years of the plan period and will continue to contribute to the supply throughout the plan period. The model indicates that 13,914 homes will be developed in the first five years of the plan period, a shortfall of 511 homes on the draft *London Plan* target. This represents 102/3 homes per annum.
- 3.28 The Council contends that this shortfall will be more than made up by homes provided on sites of 9 or less units, which are excluded from the model and from the London SHLAA. Historic evidence for the last 5 years shows that an annual average of 151 units has been delivered on sites providing 9 or less units and it would be reasonable, in the context of an inner city borough, to assume that this rate would continue. However PPS3 states that unidentified sites such as this should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless there is robust evidence of local circumstances to prevent specific sites being identified.
- 3.29 The housing trajectory indicates that sites with planning permission carry through into second and third five year periods of the plan. Figure 23, placed adjacent to Policy SP02, illustrates the permitted and potential amount of housing development each year set against the emerging *London Plan* target. This shows the high level of activity in years 6 – 11 with a total of 21,442 homes coming forward in this five year period. The bulge in the middle part of the plan period relates to the timing of the release of industrial land and the interdependence between regeneration and growth, which is evident from the CS transformational delivery programmes.
- 3.30 The comprehensive regeneration areas and housing investment and delivery programme include, for example, the *Ocean Estate Regeneration Programme*, which is expected to deliver over 900 units in 2017, and the *Fish Island Area Action Plan*. This DPD, programmed for adoption in 2011, will provide the strategy for mixed use development that is expected to deliver over 2,000 units in Fish Island North and East in 2017.
- 3.31 The supply of housing land in Tower Hamlets is inextricably linked to regeneration, the managed release of industrial land and projects which are to be delivered in partnership with other bodies such as Thames Gateway Development Corporation and other London Boroughs. This leads me to conclude that there are genuine local circumstances that determine the rate of housing land supply and prevent specific sites being identified to deliver the required target for years 1 – 5 of the plan period. On this basis I am satisfied that the reliance on some windfalls for this period and the overall approach to the supply and delivery of housing land is sound.
- 3.32 The map of the borough in CS Figure 21 illustrates the differing rates of growth across the borough and Appendix 2 plots in more

detail how this growth will occur in each of the borough's hamlets in each of the three five year periods covered by the strategy. This provides a very useful indication of where and when high growth will take place. It reflects the areas for greatest regeneration and the *London Plan* Opportunity Areas. The Council has indicated that the target bands in Figure 21 require amendment to ensure accuracy and I support this change [C6].

3.33 Figure 21 shows that growth will take place predominantly in the eastern part of the borough where it is focussed on the Lower Lea Valley and Isle of Dogs Opportunity Areas. It was confirmed at the examination hearings that the lower level of housing growth in the central parts of the borough is indicative of the limited availability of land.

3.34 In conclusion I am satisfied that subject to change C6 to ensure accuracy the CS approach to the supply and location of housing is justified and deliverable.

C6	Amend housing target bands to ensure accuracy
----	---

Issue 4: Providing for a mix of housing type and tenure, specialist housing needs and housing quality.

Are the targets for affordable homes underpinned by a robust assessment of affordable housing economic viability?

3.35 Policy SP02 sets an overall target of 50% for affordable homes throughout the borough. This reflects the borough's annual affordable need shortfall of 2,700 identified in the *Strategic Housing Market and Needs Assessment 2009* (SHMNA) and the level of over occupation which at 16.4% is a great deal higher than the national average of 2.7% of all units. It carries forward the *Community Plan* priority of delivering a range of affordable, family homes for local people and is supported by data in the *Annual Monitoring Report* which identified that the gross affordable homes delivered in 2008/9 were 52% of total homes completed.

3.36 Policy SP02 requires 35% - 50% affordable homes on all sites providing 10 new residential units or more, subject to viability. This is in line with emerging *London Plan* policies on affordable housing. The SHMNA notes that the current 50% target has rarely been achieved across London but recognises that it may be achieved with major grant support on some sites.

3.37 The Council's *Affordable Housing Viability Study 2009* (AHVS) tested a range of sample sites across the borough with varying characteristics against varying affordable housing percentages, tenure splits and sales values. It took account of current market conditions, future market uncertainty and considered the effect of a range of projected sales values on affordable housing viability. It also took account of potential conflict between existing and

alternative use values in high value parts of the borough and was based on the *London Plan* threshold of 10 units.

- 3.38 The study concluded that the delivery of the upper end of the required range, 50% affordable housing, is an ambitious target that many of the sites coming forward will be unable to achieve without grants or funding. Historically sites in the borough have yielded 35% and it is clear that achieving the lower end of the range is realistic. The proposed range reflects a pragmatic balance between viability, the significant local need for affordable housing identified in the *Community Plan* and the SHMNA and consistency with the emerging *London Plan*.
- 3.39 Concerns have been raised that the targets would not be achievable when replacing existing affordable homes. However it would be appropriate for the test of viability to be applied in such cases. As recommended in the AHVS Policy SP02 is supported by a requirement for detailed and robust financial statements to demonstrate why the targets cannot be met. I consider that with this flexibility incorporated into the policy the proposed target range is justified.

Is the tenure split for affordable housing locally justified?

- 3.40 The CS reflects the tenure split for affordable housing in the adopted *London Plan*, with a requirement for 70% social rented and 30% intermediate housing. This target is supported by evidence in the SHMNA, which draws attention to the existing social stock scale and re-let levels and the problem of affordability of shared ownership for local households forming in Tower Hamlets.
- 3.41 The proposed target differs from the emerging *London Plan* which proposes a London wide target of 40% intermediate housing. However I am satisfied that there is sufficient local justification in the SHMNA and the *Tower Hamlets Housing Strategy 2009/12* (THHS) to maintain the higher level of social rented housing proposed in the CS.

Are the targets for family housing justified?

- 3.42 Policy SP02 sets an overall target of 30% of all new housing to be suitable for families (3 beds plus) with 45% of new social rented housing for families. This aligns with the *Community Plan* priority of delivering social and family housing above all other forms of housing and is supported by evidence in the THHS and the SHMNA. The latter identifies a very high level of flats and maisonettes in the borough and recommends that the CS should direct both market and affordable housing to address the impact of future demographic change and household formation change and the needs of larger families.

3.43 The SHMNA provides the base figures from which the targets in SP02 are derived and I am satisfied that these figures are justified by the evidence base. However SP02.5.c, which refers to the identification of locations where larger family housing (of four bed plus) will be sought, omits to refer to the vehicle through which such locations will be identified. To ensure that this part of the policy is effective the Council has suggested appropriate wording to confirm that identification of locations will be dealt with in the *Site and Placemaking DPD* and the *Development Management DPD* [C7].

Is the approach to student housing justified?

3.44 Policy SP02 (7) proposes to provide student accommodation through working with the borough's universities and focusing on locations with high accessibility and proximity to the universities. *Student Accommodation in Tower Hamlets 2009* provides the background information that feeds into this policy and notes that provision of student housing needs to be balanced with competing land needs, including other housing priorities such as affordable housing. In this context I consider that the broad intentions set out in Policy SP02 are appropriate to guide the provision of housing for this specialist group.

Does the CS make appropriate provision for gypsy and traveller pitches?

3.45 The borough has one Gypsy and Traveller site at Eleanor Road. Policy SP02 sets out the requirement to safeguard this site and to identify new sites to meet targets in *London Plan* though the *Site and Placemaking DPD*. The criteria which sites should meet are defined in the evidence base in *LBTH Gypsies and Travellers: Criteria for additional sites in Tower Hamlets (2009)* and are set out in the CS. I am satisfied that this part of the policy is clear, is supported by robust evidence and meets national and regional guidance and targets.

Does the CS make it clear that requirements for design standards will be implemented?

3.46 Part 6 of Policy SP02 lists a range of criteria to ensure that all housing is "appropriate, high quality, well-designed and sustainable". In order to ensure that this part of the policy is effective, clear reference should be added to refer to the relevant DPD's which will implement the criteria [C8].

3.47 Subject to changes C7 and C8, to confirm the delegation of detailed matters to lower level DPDs, I am satisfied that the CS is justified and effective in its approach to delivering a mix of housing type and tenure and housing design.

C7	Explain how locations for seeking larger family houses will be identified
C8	Identify the policy vehicle for achieving design standards

Issue 5: Successful employment hubs.

Does the CS provide for a range of employment sizes and types?

- 3.48 Strategic objectives SO15 and SO16 set the overall objectives to support the global economic centres of Canary Wharf and the City Fringe whilst supporting the growth of existing and future businesses in accessible and appropriate locations. The 2009 *Employment Land Study* (ELS) identifies the need to plan for a net increase in office floorspace. The ELS demand forecasting exercise calculates a demand for between 685,000 and 905,000 square metres of office floor space to 2026. It anticipates that 70% of this additional demand is likely to be accommodated in Canary Wharf, 25% in the City Fringe and 5% in the "Local" office market.
- 3.49 Policy SP06 reflects these findings. It directs intensification of office floorspace and larger floor plate offices towards Preferred Office Locations (POLs) in Canary Wharf and the City Fringe areas of Bishopsgate Road, Aldgate and Tower Gateway. The POLs are indicated on CS Figure 30 as irregular shapes, suggesting that their exact boundaries have been decided. However this is not the case and the Council will define and designate the POLs in the *Site and Placemaking DPD* and the *Development Management DPD*. To avoid the impression that these designations have already been made the Council suggests amending Figure 30 to show that the POL locations are indicative [C8A]. To ensure that the CS is sound this should be supported by additional text in Policy SP06.2 to explain that the POL areas will be defined in future DPDs [IC1].
- 3.50 The CS supports a range and mix of employment uses through the designation of Local Office Locations (LOLs), the retention and promotion of flexible workspace and the encouragement and retention of small units of less than 250 sq m suitable for small and medium enterprises. The Council intends to designate and define the LOLs through the *Site and Placemaking DPD* and to ensure soundness this should be clearly stated in the policy [IC2].

Does the CS place sufficient emphasis on micro businesses and their role in addressing the employment needs of the local community, particularly the Black and Ethnic Minority sector?

- 3.51 Concerns were raised during the examination that continued growth in the POLs will be at the expense of smaller businesses and that the role of micro businesses in providing jobs for local people is not recognised in the CS. The POLs will clearly continue to provide a range of jobs for local residents as well as opportunities for suppliers within the borough. However the need to ensure a range of different sized businesses within the borough is supported by the *Small and Medium Office and Workspace Study* (SMOWS), which found in 2006 that 19,000 of the 38,000 jobs in Tower Hamlets were within Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs).

- 3.52 The SMOWS, whilst including micro businesses within the overall SME definition, further defines them as start up businesses and those employing less than five or so people. However the CS does not distinguish micro businesses from SMEs, which are defined in the CS glossary as businesses with less than 250 employees (medium) and less than 50 employees (small).
- 3.53 In considering SMEs and diversity the SMOWS identified that 25% of businesses in London with less than 5 employees were Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) owned and that around 53% of BME owned enterprises employ less than 5 people. This link between micro businesses and BME community is reflected in the SMOWS conclusion that access to good quality, affordable space for small businesses employing less than five people is important to sustain the BME sector in Tower Hamlets. Whilst based on data collated in 2006 this link is recognised in the more recent *Equality Impact Assessment of the CS* (EIA), which identifies the likely effects of the policy on minority owned businesses.
- 3.54 The evidence base demonstrates that micro businesses will play an important role in providing a range of businesses of different sizes in the borough and addressing the *Community Plan* priority of reducing worklessness, particularly for the BME community. Policy SP06.3 sets out a clear direction for delivering a range and mix of employment uses throughout the borough and will encourage and retain units suitable for small and medium enterprises. I am satisfied, from the approach taken in the SMOWS, that the CS definition of small and medium sized enterprises includes micro businesses. The Council has suggested changes to the wording of Policy SP06 to refer specifically to micro businesses, but a minor amendment to the glossary is all that is needed to ensure clarity and make the CS sound [IC3].

C8A	Amend figure 30 to clarify that POLs are indicative only
IC1	Confirm vehicle for designating POLs
IC2	Confirm vehicle for designating LOLs
IC3	Confirm that SME definition includes micro businesses

Issue 6: Strategic Industrial Land (SIL).

Is the proposed release of SIL justified by evidence in the Employment Land Study (ELS)?

- 3.55 The CS records that since 1998 between 130 hectares and 140 hectares of industrial land has been released for other uses, contributing to regeneration in the east of the borough. The decline of industrial employment leads to a recommendation in the ELS that the CS should plan for a further release of between 20 and 50 hectares of industrial employment land over the plan period. Policy SO6 proposes a managed approach to industrial land, safeguarding and intensifying its use in the SILs and Local Industrial Locations (LILs) identified in the ELS and setting out criteria for intensification

through mixed use in some of the LILs. It also proposes partnership working to coordinate the release of SIL at Fish Island North and Fish Island Mid.

- 3.56 The ELS identifies that existing industrial uses at Fish Island North sit uncomfortably with adjacent emerging land uses in the regeneration area at Stratford City and the Olympic Park. It identifies scope for a reduction of B2 (general industrial) and growth of B1 uses as part of an Industrial Business Park. The strategy for releasing SIL at Fish Island is set out in *Fish Island: A Rationale for Regeneration 2009*. The managed and phased release proposed in Policy CP06 is in conformity with the *London Plan*.
- 3.57 Work on the boundaries between the sub areas of Fish Island and the exact amount and location of SIL release will need to be considered together with regeneration aspirations for the wider area. This exercise is being carried out through the *Olympic Legacy Strategic Planning Guidance* and the emerging *Fish Island Area Action Plan (AAP)* and these two delivery mechanisms will set out the exact location of SIL release.
- 3.58 Concerns have been raised that the masterplan framework is progressing slowly and that a firm commitment in the CS to release SIL, not conditional upon a future DPD, is needed to provide clarity and investor confidence and address decline and policy stagnation. However it is clear that work is ongoing on both the *Olympic Legacy Strategic Planning Guidance* and the *Fish Island AAP*, which is included in the LDS as due for adoption in 2011. I am satisfied that through SP06 and the *Fish Island AAP*, which is recognised in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as a critical priority, the CS provides a clear framework and timescale for the release of SIL at Fish Island.
- 3.59 Fish Island South is sufficiently distant from the Olympic Park to avoid having an impact on the proposed uses there. It has good access and is located away from residential areas. Consequently the ELS recommends that Fish Island South should be retained, enhanced and promoted as SIL, with industrial uses consolidated and relocated from Fish Island North where appropriate. I recognise that there are some non industrial uses in Fish Island South, such as live work units, some B1 uses and a training centre with student accommodation. However I do not consider that the presence of these uses outweighs the clear strategic direction that the evidence base provides. I am therefore satisfied that the CS takes an appropriate approach to the managed release of SIL that is consistent with national guidance and justified by robust and up to date evidence.

Issue 7: Provision of public open space.

Does the CS address effectively the existing deficiency and declining provision of accessible public open space in the borough?

- 3.60 Providing access to nature and open space is one of the key principles of the *Community Plan* and one of the borough's major challenges, with impacts on health, quality of life and biodiversity. The Council's *Open Spaces Strategy 2006 – 2016* (OSS) identifies deficiencies in access to publicly accessible open space and sets out a development standard of 1.2 hectares per 1,000 of population. Annual monitoring reports over the past 5 years indicate that this has not been achieved, with provision of 1.14 per hectare achieved in 2007/8 and 1.12 per hectare in 2008/9.
- 3.61 This evidence of deficiency and declining provision and the physical constraints of a densely developed urban area, where further growth is planned, raise the question of whether the 2006 open space standard can ever be achieved. The Council acknowledges that the OSS is out of date and thus relies on the IDP Report to provide an up to date picture of the borough's open spaces.
- 3.62 The IDP Report provides a fine grain of information on current open space levels based on paired LAP areas. It uses the PPCG model to calculate an overall requirement of 99 hectares which is set out in the CS. The report acknowledges that achieving the quantitative requirement for open space is neither feasible nor practical. The CS therefore takes a pragmatic approach based on "Protect, Create, Enhance and Connect" with the 1.2 hectares per 1,000 as a monitoring standard.
- 3.63 CS Policy SP04 lists projects in the OSS which the PPCG model identifies as being required to support the scale of development in the borough to 2025. The IDP (in Appendix 2 of the CS) sets out timescales for these projects and recognises that their non delivery would have an impact on growth targets and trigger a review of the programme. Policy SP04 also refers to strategic projects which are outside the control of the Council, such as Lea River Park, FAT walk and Olympic Park. These projects, together with their delivery teams and timescales, are also listed in the *Programmes of Delivery* in CS Appendix 2.
- 3.64 Enhancing existing public open spaces and improving accessibility is also addressed in Policy SP04, with individual projects detailed in Appendix 2. A reference to improving access to Metropolitan Open Land needs to be added to ensure consistency with the *London Plan* and to present a complete picture of the strategically important open spaces available to residents of the borough [C9]. The Council's *Green Grid Strategy*, also listed in the *Programmes of Delivery*, takes a management approach to addressing the questions of deficiency and access to open spaces and to create a network of green walking routes to connect open spaces and waterways throughout the borough. This is at an early stage, with only a draft baseline report available to support the CS. However it is included in the *Delivery Programmes* as a key programme and will be taken forward through lower level DPDs.

- 3.65 I have considered the suggestion that additional references should be made to Lee Valley Park to highlight the contributions it will make to strengthening neighbourhood well being and enhancing biodiversity. However I do not consider that the absence of these references makes the CS unsound.
- 3.66 Subject to a minor correction to include reference to Metropolitan Open Land to ensure soundness I am satisfied that the CS takes a realistic approach to providing accessible open space which is justified by detailed research and can be implemented in co-ordination with delivery partners.

C9	Include reference Metropolitan Open Land
----	--

Issue 8: Infrastructure, delivery and monitoring.

Is there a clear strategy for delivering the key infrastructure requirements?

- 3.67 The CS places the *Programme of Delivery* at the beginning of the document, following on from the *Vision Statement and Key Principles*. This demonstrates recognition of the essential role that delivery and implementation will play in achieving the CS vision. However there is a confusing relationship between the five programmes in the *Programme of Delivery* and the IDP which is one of these programmes and is set out in detail at the end of the CS (Appendix 2). Furthermore the listing of some, but not all of the projects for each programme early in the CS is imprecise and inconsistent. Changes are needed to provide an accurate and internally consistent summary of the delivery programmes, the projects within them and by whom and when they will be delivered.
- 3.68 The Council has suggested changes to the way in which this information is presented. The *Programme of Delivery* adjacent to the vision statement will be amended to simply summarise the five delivery programmes [C10]. All of the programmes, their projects, key partners and timescale, will be set out in detail in Appendix 2 [C11] under the heading *Programme of Delivery*. The IDP will therefore become one of the five programmes set out in Appendix 2. However it will retain a greater level of detail than the other programmes, including costings, links to policy and risks/contingencies as in existing Appendix 2. These changes are necessary to ensure that the way in which the CS will be delivered is set out in a coherent and consistent way.
- 3.69 The delivery programme is informed by the PPCG Report, which identifies where new social infrastructure will be required to support growth and from the IDP Report which is a supporting document to the CS. The higher density option of the PPCG model, which is required to meet the housing target, is the base on which both reports identify future demand.

- 3.70 The IDP Report, dated September 2009, takes a methodical approach, addressing the questions of why, what, how, where and when for each piece of infrastructure required to deliver the CS. It has a corporate role, supporting and informing other borough strategies and decisions relating to the distribution of funding. Its governance arrangements, which include strategic partners, give it a high level role as a project planning tool. The Council intends to update the IDP annually alongside the AMR.
- 3.71 The IDP, set out in Appendix 2 of the CS, identifies the key pieces of infrastructure needed to support the CS. It categorises each project as critical, necessary or preferred and this informs the identification of risks and contingencies for each project. It identifies those areas where a failure to deliver or delay will trigger a review of the plan. Clearly the annual review of the IDP will provide a sensitive monitoring vehicle, enabling problems with funding, delays or the need for acceleration to be identified at a sufficiently early stage to manage delivery of the CS effectively.
- 3.72 In most cases the location and phasing or timing for each project is set out in the IDP. However some items such as the provision of health care schemes and idea stores have broad timescales or grouped provision and rely on the IDP Report to provide detailed information about phasing. I consider this is appropriate, keeping the IDP in the CS as a concise summary which is supported by more detailed information in the IDP Report which can be kept up to date by annual review.
- 3.73 In general the CS identifies broad areas for development and delegates the allocation of sites to lower level DPD's. However in some cases it is evident that particular sites will be necessary to deliver a particular element of infrastructure. It has been demonstrated that reliance on the Leven Road Gasworks to deliver a new primary school by 2017 and open space from 2010 - 2015 is unrealistic as the site will not be available in time to meet these timescales.
- 3.74 The Council has agreed that the IDP should be amended to reflect a realistic timescale and ensure soundness in this area, changing delivery of the primary school to 2020 and open space from 2015 - 2020 [IC4]. The risks/ contingency column of the IDP highlights that later provision of these facilities at Leven Road will lead to a requirement to review the programme of housing growth in this area. This is an area where a high level of housing growth is anticipated in the second five year period of the plan. In these circumstances I am satisfied that there is sufficient flexibility to address any necessary adjustment to the rate and location of growth in this particular area without undermining the overall rate of housing delivery in the second five year period of the plan.
- 3.75 The CS indicates that an SPD will outline the approach to securing developer contributions which it states will be pooled to meet

significant infrastructure requirements. The IDP and the IDP Report set out detailed and comprehensive information regarding the nature and location of the major infrastructure needed to support the planned growth in different parts of the borough. In this context I am satisfied that the methodology for securing pooled infrastructure can appropriately be dealt with in a future SPD. However in response to the CIL regulations the Council has suggested changes to the "Delivery and Implementation" section of the CS to include a policy hook to allow the option of applying the CIL charging schedule [C13/C14]. These changes will allow the Council flexibility to consider the most effective way to manage the pooling of developer contributions.

Does the CS set out clear targets and measurable outcomes for monitoring the delivery of the strategy?

- 3.76 The Monitoring Framework, set out in Appendix 3, is based on the strategy's 25 strategic objectives (SOs) which the CS policies will deliver. For each SO it sets out Core Output Indicators, Local Output Indicators or Significant Effect Indicators as appropriate and measurable outcomes. Subject to replacing references to N/A with "monitor trend" [C12] to ensure that all outcomes can be monitored I am satisfied that the monitoring framework is based on clear and measurable targets which relate to the delivery of the CS Policies.
- 3.77 Subject to changes C10 – C14 and IC4, which are required to ensure soundness, I am satisfied that the Programmes of Delivery and in particular the IDP identify the key infrastructure projects that are necessary to deliver the CS policies. They provide a clear and realistic framework setting out the responsibilities, funding sources, timing and critical dependencies for each project. The monitoring framework in Appendix 3 of the CS provides structured framework which will enable the progress of the spatial strategy to be monitored.

C10	Simplify list of delivery programmes to ensure consistency
C11	Extend Appendix 2 to include all programmes for delivery
C12	Add monitoring trend as a target for outcomes with no numerical target
C13	Add reference to CIL
C14	Add reference to CIL
IC4	Amend timescale for infrastructure dependant on Leven Road Gasworks site

Issue 9: Delivering placemaking.

Does the inclusion of a vision diagram and opportunities, priorities and principles for each of the borough's "places" contribute to the effectiveness of the CS?

- 3.78 Policy SP12 draws together the main themes of the CS that will contribute to improving the quality of the built and natural environment. It is effectively a summary which repeats the content of other policies. The adjacent Figure 36 sets out a strategic vision with a short statement for each of the borough's hamlets. This is a succinct, focused way of capturing the essential issues for each hamlet and it makes a useful contribution to the CS.
- 3.79 The pages that follow SP12 set out the vision, priorities and principles for each hamlet. Whilst PPS12 requires core strategies to set out the local challenges and opportunities for the future of its places, taking the strategy to a finer level of detail requires accuracy, consistency and completeness. I recognise that the Council has sought to be selective of what is important to each place. However this section of the CS raises more questions than it answers. Inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the level of detail provided and the decision to capture some but not all of the spatial issues from the overall strategy is not clearly explained or justified.
- 3.80 I set out below some examples of areas of concern:
- The diagrams for Millwall, Cubitt Town and other growth areas **do not acknowledge the high levels of planned growth** that are so well illustrated on Figure 23. Failure to reconcile this most significant change with the urban design and connectivity aspirations shown on diagrams 59 and 60, for example, means that this part of the CS does not address spatial planning in its true sense. Furthermore it results in a "mixed message" which leaves members of the local community uncertain about the intentions for their areas.
 - Town centres are recognised on the "place" diagrams, but absence of detail about the type of centre leaves **unanswered questions regarding the type and scale of commercial development planned**. For example neither the priorities nor the vision diagram (Fig 39) for Bethnal Green reflect its inclusion in Policy SP01.4 as one of the district town centres to which 16,600 square metres of comparison floorspace will be directed. This has leaves local residents feeling inadequately informed and anxious about the level of retail floorspace likely to take place in their areas.
 - The POL designations are shown on some of the vision diagrams, such as Aldgate (Figure 42) but not on others such as Canary Wharf (Figure 58) and there is no mention of the POL designation in the vision, priorities or principles for Canary Wharf. The City Fringe is not overlaid on the vision diagram for the "places" in the east of the borough or referred to in the priorities. This **failure to represent key spatial planning tools** on the diagrams contrasts with the decision to drill down in great detail, to specific street level, in some areas.

Developers participating in the examination expressed frustration at this lack of clarity and consistency.

- Policy SP01 describes the Tower Hamlets Activity Areas as requiring a distinctive policy response due to their location, characteristics, mix of uses and accessibility. This suggests they will have a key influence over the way in which hamlets such as Spitalfields or Aldgate will develop. However these **important designations are not acknowledged** on the vision diagrams, priorities or principles for these places.
- **Boundaries between the places diagrams are inconsistent.** For example diagrammatic links/ routes and green corridors do not connect on diagrams for adjacent places. Examples include Bow/ Victoria Park, Poplar/Poplar Riverside, Mile End/Bow Common and Bromley-by-Bow/ Bow Common. The interface between the vision diagrams for the adjoining places of Millwall and Cubitt Town is unclear. These matters are not crucial to the information that the diagrams seek to convey, but they raise local concerns and questions about the accuracy and utility of all of the vision diagrams.
- **Lack of sensitivity to local concerns** undermines the credibility of the vision diagrams. For example it was highlighted at the examination hearings that the new shopping centre indicated at Mile End (Figure 51) incorporates residential areas and listed terraced houses.
- **Inconsistencies between the vision diagrams** and text lead to confusion and leave the reader unsure about priorities. For example Figure 38 (Spitalfields) identifies "Regeneration of Bishopsgate Goods Yard" and the Bishopsgate Masterplan is identified as a critical priority in the IDP. However there is no reference to this in the vision, opportunities, priorities or principles for Spitalfields.
- In some cases text on the vision diagrams, for example the new green space referred to at Bromley by Bow (Figure 52) does not make it clear where aspirations are part of **wider comprehensive redevelopment schemes**.

3.81 The Council has suggested extensive changes to this section of the CS to deal with inaccuracies and inconsistencies identified during the examination. However these changes relate to just 6 of the borough's 24 hamlets and would only deal with matters raised at the examination by local residents, landowners and developers. Further work is required to ensure that there are no deficiencies in the placemaking pages for the remaining 18 hamlets.

3.82 Attempting to change the CS at this stage, as suggested by the Council, would be therefore be inequitable and would result in an uneven spread of detail and accuracy through the placemaking

pages. In their current form these pages provide a useful basis for work on lower level DPDs and SPDs. However a considerable amount of further work, including further engagement with the local community, is required to ensure that they are an effective spatial planning tool which will help deliver the overall strategy.

- 3.83 The Council has confirmed that the vision diagrams are not intended as site specific, detailed or technical drawings. To reflect this and to indicate that the placemaking pages complement rather than form an integral part of the strategy, I recommend that they are placed in an annex to the CS.

IC5	Place pages 90 – 114 of the CS in an Annex.
-----	---

4. CONSIDERATION OF OTHER MATTERS RELATING TO SOUNDNESS

- 4.1 **Flood risk.** The Council has carried out a *Strategic Flood Risk Assessment* (SFRA) which identifies the parts of the borough that are at risk of flooding. This includes some of the Opportunity Areas where development will be focused, particularly to the east of the borough. Leaside lies within flood zones 2 and 3 and the entire Isle of Dogs is in flood zone 3. To the west of the borough the southern part of the City Fringe lies within flood zones 2 and 3. The main risks to these areas are from fluvial flooding from the River Lea, tidal surge breaches of the Thames Tidal Defences and surface water flooding from impermeable surfaces.
- 4.2 Strategic Objective SO13 sets out the objective of reducing the risk and impact of flooding and the SFRA has informed a *General Sequential Test* which provides a basis for sequential and if necessary exceptions testing to inform the allocation of individual sites. Policy SP04 indicates how the sequential test will be used to determine the suitability of land for development. In the justification of the policy in “Why we have taken this approach” paragraph 4.20 needs to be amended to include an explanation of how the SFRA has informed the policy.

C15	Explain the way in which the SFRA has informed the strategy
-----	---

- 4.3 **Waste:** The borough operates as a single waste disposal authority and this is reflected in the CS. It is proposed to safeguard all existing waste management sites unless they can be replaced by more sustainable alternative sites which maintain capacity. In addition, informed by the *Waste Evidence Base Report* (WEB), the CS identifies a need for a land area of between 5 – 10 hectares to accommodate house waste facilities with sufficient capacity to meet *London Plan* targets for managing waste. Policy SP05 identifies 4 areas of search for new waste treatment facilities. These areas flow from the short list of suitable sites identified in the WEB report, where sufficient land is identified to allow flexibility in the case of some of the sites not coming forward. The timescale for delivery is

included in the IDP. On this basis I am satisfied that there is robust evidence to demonstrate that there is sufficient land to meet the *London Plan* targets during the plan period.

- 4.4 **Working towards a zero carbon borough** sets out the objective (SO24) of achieving a 60% reduction in carbon emissions by 2025. Policy SP11 sets out goals which are consistent with national guidance and the *London Plan* and provides a hook for more detailed guidance in lower level DPDs. I consider that these goals are justified in the *Climate Change and Mitigation Evidence Base* and the final report of *Sustainable Energy and Biodiversity Enhancement Opportunities in LBTH*. To ensure that the CS is sound minor changes are needed to allow for feasibility to be taken into account when considering requirements for on site renewable energy generation [C16], to ensure that the area based approach to carbon reduction is explained [C17] and to define Energy Opportunity Areas [C18].

C16	Add feasibility test to ensure flexibility and consistency with London Plan
C17	Explain area based approach to carbon emissions
C18	Define Energy Opportunity Areas

- 4.5 **Creating distinct and durable places** sets out in Policy SP10 the CS priorities for managing the historic environment and promoting a high standard of design. It includes the requirement for strategic and local views to be protected but there is no explanation of these designations and they are not identified on the accompanying Figure 34. To ensure effectiveness the "Why we have taken this approach" section which follows SP10 should explain that strategic views are designated in the *London Plan* and that local views will be defined and designated in forthcoming DPDs [C19].

- 4.6 Figure 34 includes shaded areas which refer to "areas of priority....." and "areas of established character and townscape." It is clear that these broad areas flow from the *Urban Structure and Characterisation Study (USCS)* and conservation area studies and appraisals. The Council has explained that they will be used to inform conservation of existing character in some areas and improvements to character and distinctiveness in others. However with no reference to this in the policy or the accompanying text they have no meaning. The Council has suggested additional wording which will explain their purpose [C20]. However to ensure that the CS is effective further explanation is needed to describe how these areas will be taken forward [IC6]. Both of these changes are required to ensure soundness.

C19	Confirm consistency of approach to strategic and local views with London Plan and explain vehicle for identification of views
C20	Explain map based identification of townscape character

	areas (on Figure 34)
IC6	Explain vehicle/s for defining and setting criteria for townscape areas

- 4.7 **Tall Buildings** are addressed in Policy SP11 which identifies the preferred locations and the criteria which they meet. The selection of these locations is supported by evidence in the USCS and has been developed in collaboration with English Heritage. Additional wording is required, as suggested by the Council, to confirm the consistency of this approach with the *London Plan* [C21]. It is clear that the policy does not preclude the identification of other areas or individual applications for tall buildings outside the preferred areas. To ensure that the CS is sound the Council has suggested an explanation to confirm the way in which such instances will be dealt with [C22].

C21	Clarify consistency with London Plan
C22	Explain vehicle for identifying sites/locations and criteria for tall buildings

- 4.8 **Historic heritage:** Whilst the CS sets out the need to protect, manage and enhance the Tower of London World Heritage Site (WHS) and its setting it does provide equal protection for the buffer zone and setting of the Maritime Greenwich WHS. I consider that the additional wording to Policy SP10 suggested by the Council is required to ensure soundness by addressing cross boundary issues [C23].

C23	Add reference to protection of the setting of Maritime Greenwich WHS
-----	--

5 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 I conclude that, with the amendments I recommend, the Tower Hamlets Core Strategy DPD satisfies the requirements of s20 (5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria of soundness in PPS12.

Sue Turner

INSPECTOR

Annex A

Annex B

Annex C

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex A – Council’s changes

No	Core Strategy section	Page	Description of recommended change	Text (if any)
C1	Diverse communities and distinct places	20/21	Insert Figures 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10 and accompanying text from Options and issues for places (CD158)	
C2	Setting the Scene	15	Further explanation of how the Core Strategy emerged from the Options and Alternatives Consultation Document, Options and Alternatives for Places Consultation Document and the Community Plan.	<p>New paragraph - 1.5</p> <p>1.5 The first round of consultation identified within the Options and Alternatives Consultation Document two potential overarching strategies. One strategy was looked to refocus on our town centres, and the other advocated for organic growth across the borough. This Consultation Document also looked at options for each of the borough wide policies coming forward.</p> <p>1.6 In selecting the overarching strategy, consultation findings and further evidence base suggested a combined approach which sought to refocus on town centres, while still recognising the organic nature of growth in the areas adjacent to the City Fringe and Canary Wharf. This preferred approach for the overarching strategy, along with the preferred approach for the borough-wide policies, was tested as part of the second consultation phase – Options and Alternatives for Places. This phase also tested options for how the borough-wide policies would affect the 24 identified individual places of Tower Hamlets. It also tested the vision for each place, which included engagement with the community and stakeholders about what each place would look like in the future and how that might be delivered.</p> <p>1.7 The preferred approach for the overarching strategy is stated within chapter 3 “Refocusing on our town centres”.</p> <p>Previous 1.5 now becomes 1.8</p>
C3	Refocusing on our town centres	39	Refer to the adopted London Plan (2008) as an initial basis for the town centre hierarchy.	Para 3.2 The boroughs’ town centres continue to evolve, they have changed in the way they look, the purposes they serve, the types of shops they have and the way they are accessed and used. With the London Plan as the starting point, the town centres of Tower Hamlets have been configured in a hierarchal

No	Core Strategy section	Page	Description of recommended change	Text (if any)
				manner ⁵² which has been made locally specific to Tower Hamlets through extensive spatial baseline research. The creation of new town centres is proposed over the lifetime of the plan, in order to support population growth or to reflect existing town centre activity in some areas.
C4	Refocusing on our town centres	39	Include explanation of Tower Hamlets Activity Areas	<p>Para 3.3 In addition two Activity Areas have been identified. The Tower Hamlets Activity Areas resulted from the Town Centre Spatial Strategy (2009) identifying specific areas bordering the Central Activities Zone and the major town centre of Canary Wharf where the scale, continuity and intensity of town centre activity and land use is different to that found across the rest of the borough. Specific challenges in policy terms of these areas required a new policy mechanism as a distinctive policy response to ensure these areas are successfully managed.</p> <p>Re-number paragraphs 3.3 – 3.6 to be 3.4-3.7</p>
C5	Refocusing on our town centres	37	Provide reference to Development Management DPD and Site and Place Making DPD in SP01.	SP01 – Further detailed policies relating to town centres will be provided within the Development Management DPD and Site and Place Making DPD. (NB. This will be similar text format to the blue text on page 35)
C6	Urban Living for Everyone	42	Amendment to Figure 21 to depict amended housing target bands.	<p>Low growth (1001 – 1500 units)</p> <p>Medium growth (1501 – 2500 units)</p> <p>High growth (2501 – 3500 units)</p> <p>Very high growth (3501 + units)</p>
C7	Urban Living for Everyone	44	Clarification of how locations for seeking larger family housing will be identified.	Identifying locations within the Site and Place Making DPD and Development Management DPD where larger family housing sizes (four-bed plus) will be sought.
C8	Urban Living for Everyone	45	Clarification of how 6. a-f will be delivered by identifying delivery mechanisms such as forthcoming DPDs.	<p>Ensuring all housing is appropriate, high-quality, well-designed and sustainable. This will be achieved by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Setting housing design standards. Working with housing partners to facilitate existing homes to be brought up to at least the Decent Homes standard. Requiring new developments to comply with accessibility standards, including “Lifetime Homes” requirements.

No	Core Strategy section	Page	Description of recommended change	Text (if any)
				<p>d. Requiring adequate provision of housing amenity space for new homes (including specialist homes where appropriate), including private amenity space in every development, and communal amenity space for developments providing 10 units or more.</p> <p>e. Requiring sites that are providing family homes to provide adequate space for play space for children.</p> <p>f. Requiring new homes to respond to climate change, including achieving a stepped-target for carbon emissions standards in-line with government guidance.</p> <p>Further detail will be developed through the Development Management DPD and other guidance, including Supplementary Planning guidance.</p>
C8A	Delivering successful employment hubs	60	Amendment of Figure 30 - Preferred Office Location blob to be more illustrative and less specific.	
C9	Creating a green and blue grid	52	Provision of reference to the protection of Metropolitan Open Land in accordance with the London Plan (2008).	SP04 (1f) Improving access to the strategically important publicly accessible open spaces, which currently include Metropolitan Open Land (East India Dock Basin and Brunswick Wharf, Island Gardens, Lee Valley Regional Park, Meath Gardens, Mile End Park, Mudchute Park and Millwall Park, Tower Hamlets Cemetery, Victoria Park) as well as the Olympic Park, Lea River Park and the FAT Walk.
C10	Programme of Delivery	26	Remove reference to some of the programmes and simplify to a list of headings	<p>Programme of Delivery</p> <p>Delivery of the spatial vision is an essential element of the Core Strategy; without which the vision will not be achieved. The council and its key partners are committed to ongoing delivery and pro-actively drive five transformational programmes that form a 'Programme of Delivery' to assist in the delivery of the spatial vision. The programmes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive regeneration areas • Infrastructure Delivery Plan

No	Core Strategy section	Page	Description of recommended change	Text (if any)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing investment programmes • Policy and strategy programmes • Tower Hamlets Green Grid <p>This Programme of Delivery (<i>refer to Appendix 2</i>) underpins the delivery and implementation of the Core Strategy and its spatial themes. This ensures that a clear, consistent and wide-ranging delivery approach is embedded throughout the Core Strategy.</p>
C11	Programme of Delivery	130	Extend to include all vehicles for delivery	Amended Programme for Delivery as set out in CD 161A – revised CS Appendix 2
C12	Appendix 3	142	Replace “N/A” with “Monitor trend”	“Monitor Trend”
C13	Delivery and Implementation	118-119	Updating of text in light of amended government guidance.	<p>Amend para 8.8</p> <p>The Council may pool contributions relating to significant infrastructure i.e. transport, education and health. The Council may chose to achieve this through adopting the Community Infrastructure Levy in the future and / or through the use of planning obligations.</p> <p>Any pooling of contributions, including the calculation of planning contribution requirements or a CIL levy will be determined through either a SPD on planning contributions or through a CIL charging schedule.</p>
C14	Delivery and Implementation	118-119	Updating of text in light of amended government guidance.	For further information see Circular 05/05: Planning Obligations, LBTH Planning Obligations SPD and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

No	Core Strategy section	Page	Description of recommended change	Text (if any)
C15	Creating a green and blue grid	54	Further explanation of how the SFRA has been carried through into the Core Strategy within "Why we have taken this approach" text (para 4.21).	4.20 The Blue Grid addresses the issues relating to the borough's water spaces and flood risk. The Strategic Flooding Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2009) identifies that parts of the borough are at potential risk of flooding within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3. It states that the current main risks of flooding in the borough are fluvial flooding in the Lower Lea catchment, breaches in the Thames Tidal Defences during tidal surge events and surface water flooding from impermeable surfaces. It also identifies areas which are subject to actual risk, including Poplar Riverside and Fish Island. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment was used to Sequentially Test the Core Strategy to ensure it addresses areas of potential risk to all types of flooding across the borough. However further sequential testing of sites will come forward as a part of the Site and Place making DPD.
C16	Working towards a zero-carbon borough	84	Review of SP11(7) in light of London Plan.	Require all new developments to provide 20% reduction of carbon dioxide emissions through on-site renewable energy generation where feasible.
C17	Working towards a zero-carbon borough	85	Further explanation of the area based approach stated within SP11(5) within the "Why we have taken this approach" text (para 6.26) with reference to figure 35.	6.26 Focusing higher proportions of carbon emissions reduction measures in specific areas will help to capture and maximise the cumulative benefits. The most appropriate areas are those with larger concentrations of identified development sites. Current identified clusters correspond with the low carbon areas on Fig 35.
C18	Appendix One	125	Definition of Energy Opportunity Areas	Areas of new development where more energy efficient solutions can be applied by considering potential sites together. It is in these areas that the principles of Mayor of London's Energy Action Areas will be best applied.
C19	Creating distinct and durable places	81	Add reference to strategic and local views to Why we have taken this approach text.	New Para 6.18 Strategic views guidance is provided within the London Plan (2008) with local views to be set out in the forthcoming Development Management DPD and Proposals Map.

No	Core Strategy section	Page	Description of recommended change	Text (if any)
C20	Creating distinct and durable places	81	Provision of clarification of linkages between Figure 35 and "Why we have taken this approach" text.	Addition to Para 6.15 (prior to change 1 above): Figure 34 identifies broad areas of different townscapes currently existing in the borough. These areas require different responses when managing growth and change.
C21	Creating distinct and durable places	78 / 80	To clarify linkages between the Core Strategy policies for tall buildings and those within the London Plan (2008) by referencing economic clusters.	Figure 34 key – Tall building locations for economic clusters of large floor plate offices. SP10 5.a. Be part of an existing economic cluster and respond to existing built character of the area. Para 6.17 As such, tall buildings are best suited to established economic clusters at Canary Wharf and Aldgate, where they complement the existing context.
C22	Creating distinct and durable places	80	Add reference to Site and Place Making DPD for allocating preferred sites for tall buildings.	b. Appropriate sites for tall buildings will be identified within the Site and Place Making DPD. All tall buildings including those outside of the above locations will be assessed against criteria set out in the Development Management DPD.
C23	Creating distinct and durable places	79	Add reference to protection of the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site.	Change 1 – amend text of SP10(1) to read: 1. Protect, manage and enhance the Tower of London World Heritage Site, its setting, and surrounding area, as well as the buffer zone and setting of the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site through: a. The respective World Heritage Site Management Plans and associated documents.

Annex B – Inspector’s changes

No	Core Strategy section	Page	Description of recommended change	Text (if any)
IC1	Delivering successful employment hubs	61	State that POLs will be defined and designated through future DPDs This change supports and is consistent with the Council’s change C9	Policy SP06.2 - after “in the following areas” insert “ which will be defined in the Site and Placemaking DPD:”
IC2	Delivering successful employment hubs	61	State that LOLs will be defined and designated through future DPDs This was agreed at the examination hearings	Policy SP06.3.a – after Designating locations” insert “through the Site and Placemaking DPD”
IC3	Glossary Appendix 1	127	Inclusion of reference to micro businesses in definition of SME This change avoids the need for more significant changes to SP06 which were suggested by the Council.	After 50 employees (small) add: “and including micro businesses”.
IC4	Infrastructure Delivery Plan	130 135	Amend to reflect the availability of Leven Road Gasworks. This change is based on agreed wording set out in Statement of Common Ground No 5 – LBTH/ National Grid.	P130 Up to 8FE of primary school provision – amend timescale to 2020 P135 Leven Road open space – amend timescale to 2015 - 2020
IC5	Placemaking			Place pages 90 – 114 of the Core Strategy in an Annex.
IC6	Creating distinct and durable places	81	Further explanation of townscape areas. This change supports and is consistent with the Council’s change C20.	Further addition to paragraph 6.15. These areas will be identified and detailed policies stated in the Development Management DPD and the Site and Placemaking DPD.

This page is intentionally left blank

Annex C – Council’s minor amendments

No	Core Strategy Section	Original Text	Amended Text	Page
0	Entire Document			
		Table of contents	Add Strategic objectives and Spatial Policies	6/7
		Tower of London & St Katharine’s	Tower of London and St Katharine Docks	42, 141
1	Setting the Scene			
1.1		Legacy Masterplan	Legacy Masterplan Framework	18
1.2		Site Allocations DPD	Site and Place Making DPD	14
1.3		Place and Site Making DPD	Site and Place Making DPD	15
1.4		Proposals Map DPD	Proposals Map	14
1.5		Community Plan 2020	Community Plan	14
1.6		Proposals Map DPD (Fig 2)	Proposals Map	15
1.7		CS Options Paper One July 2008	LBTH Options and Alternatives Consultation Document 2008	15
1.8		CS Options Paper Two Feb 2009	LBTH Options and Alternatives for Places Consultation Document 2009	15
1.9		Community Plan 2020	Community Plan	21
2	The Big Spatial Vision			
2.1		Legacy Masterplan	Legacy Masterplan Framework	29
2.2		Town Centre Implementation Programme	Town Centre Implementation Plans	26
2.3		Removed by Inspector - change to Programme of Delivery moved to Annex A		26
2.4		Sustainable Communities Plan 2003	Sustainable Communities Plan (Sustainable Communities: Building for the future), 2003	31
3	Refocusing on our Town Centres			
3.1		Proposal Map DPD	Proposals Map	38
3.2		St Paul’s Way Development Programme	St Pauls Way Transformation Project	38
3.3		Council Asset Management Programme	Council Asset Management Strategy	38
3.4			Addition of the following text to the end of para. 3.4 This has been reflected in the amendments to the town centre hierarchy, key examples of which have been the development of the Tower Hamlets Activity Areas and the establishment of a new town centre at Bromley-by-Bow.	39
3.5		See appendix four for detailed town centre hierarchy and see the Town Centre Spatial Strategy for further information.	See Appendix Four for the detailed town centre hierarchy and see Chapter 4 of the Town Centre Spatial Strategy (2009) for further information about each town centre.	35
3.6		See Retail Capacity Assessment 2009 for further details	See Retail and Leisure Capacity Study (2009) for further details	37
3.7		LBTH Town Centre Spatial Strategy Retail Capacity Assessment (2009)	LBTH Retail and Leisure Capacity Study (2009)	39
3.8		The council looked at the challenges facing the borough’s town centres to understand how to ensure they retain their vibrancy, competitiveness and strengths while respecting their different roles. According to the measures of town centres’ health ⁵⁶ , most town centres in Tower Hamlets are in reasonable health ⁵⁷ .	The council looked at the challenges facing the borough’s town centres to understand how to ensure they retain their vibrancy, competitiveness and strengths while respecting their different roles. According to the measures of town centres’ health ⁵⁶ (which do not reflect overtrading ⁵⁷), most town centres in Tower Hamlets are in reasonable health ⁵⁸ .	39
3.9			Addition of title “ Programme of Delivery” above text “This strategy will be implemented through a number of key projects including:”	38
3.10		Poplar Area Action Plan	Poplar Area Area Action Plan	38
4	Strengthening Neighbourhood Well-being			
4.1		Masterplans & Area Action Plans (All)	Masterplans and Area Action Plans (All)	45
4.2		Proposals Map DPD	Proposals Map	45
4.3		Proposals Map DPD	Proposals Map	53
4.4		Proposals Map DPD	Proposals Map	56
4.5		St Paul’s Way Development Programme	St Pauls Way Transformation Project	45
4.6		SP05.5	Delete SP05.5 it’s the same as SP08.4	56
4.7		Local Biodiversity Action Plan 2004	Local Biodiversity Action Plan 2009	54
4.8		Tower Hamlets Housing Investment Programme	Borough Investment Plan (Tower Hamlets Housing Investment Programme)	45
4.9		LBTH Housing Implementation Strategy	Remove text	45
4.10		Seek to deliver approximately 43,275 new homes (equating to 2,885 per year) from	Seek to deliver 43,275 new homes (equating to 2,885 per year) from 2010 to 2025 in line	43

		2010 to 2025 in line with the housing targets set out in the London Plan.	with the housing targets set out in the London Plan.	
4.11			Addition of title “ Programme of Delivery” above text “This strategy will be implemented through a number of key projects including:”	38, 45, 49, 53, 56
4.12		Ensure any new waste management facility is integrated into its surroundings, is modern, innovative and well designed to minimise negative impacts and robust enough to alter its operation and capacity as circumstances change. Further criteria will be set out in the Development Management DPD.	Ensure any new waste management facility is integrated into its surroundings, is modern, innovative and well designed. The facility should minimise negative environmental, transport and amenity impacts on the surrounding area (including within neighbouring boroughs). It should be flexible enough to alter its operation and capacity as circumstances change without materially increasing these impacts. Further criteria will be set out in the Development Management DPD.	56
4.13		Work with British Waterways to deliver a network of high-quality, usable and accessible waterspaces, through:	Change 1 – SPO04 (4) amend text to: “Work with British Waterways and the Port of London Authority to deliver a network of high quality, usable and accessible waterspaces, through:”	53
4.14		Place and Site Making DPD	Site and Place Making DPD	45
4.15		GLA London Plan 2008 & GLA Housing in London 2008	GLA London Plan 2008 and GLA Housing in London 2008	46
4.16		LBTH Planning for PC&G – Baseline Report 2009	LBTH Planning for Population Change and Growth Capacity Assessment - Baseline Report, 2009	46
4.17		LBTH Affordable Housing Viability – LDF Review	LBTH Affordable Housing Viability Assessment	46
4.18		LBTH Children’s Play Space Strategy	LBTH Play Space Strategy 2007	46
4.19		LBTH Planning and Play Design Principle for Playable Space in LB Tower Hamlets	LBTH Planning and Play Design Principle for Playable Space in LB Tower Hamlets 2008	45
4.20		Poplar Area Action Plan	Poplar Area Area Action Plan	49
4.21		Leisure Strategy x2	LBTH Leisure Facilities Strategy (Sporting Places)	49
4.22		Multi-faith burial ground	Criteria for Multi-Faith Burial Ground Report	49
4.23		Air Quality Management Framework	LBTH Air Quality Action Plan	49
4.24		Clear Zone	Clear Zone Partnership	49
4.25		NHS Tower Hamlets Health and well-being strategy (Draft) 2009	Improving Health and Well-being in Tower Hamlets 2006	50
4.26		NHS Tower Hamlets Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, 2008	NHS Tower Hamlets Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, 2008/09	50
4.27		Air Quality Management Plan 2004	Air Quality Action Plan 2004	50
4.28		LBTH Multi Faith Burial Site Report	Criteria for Multi-Faith Burial Ground Report 2009	50
4.29		LBTH Leisure Strategy 2009	LBTH Leisure Strategy (Sporting Places) 2009	50
4.30		LBTH Open Space Strategy	LBTH Open Space Strategy	53
4.31		Local Biodiversity Action Plan	LBTH Local Biodiversity Action Plan	53
4.32		European Union Water Framework Directive	European Union Waste Framework Directive	54
4.33		Thames Estuary 2100 Action Plan 2009	Thames Estuary Action Plan Consultation Document 2009	54
4.34		Poplar Area Action Plan	Poplar Area Action Plan	56
5	Enabling Prosperous Communities			
5.1		Proposals Map DPD	Proposals Map	62
5.2		St Paul’s Way Transformation project	St Pauls Way Transformation Project	66
5.3		LBTH Strategic Business Case (BSF), 2006	Remove bullet point	67
5.4		LBTH Strategy for Change Part One, 2008	Remove bullet point	67
5.5		LBTH Economic Strategy	Remove bullet point	62
5.6		MAA Worklessness	Remove bullet point	62
5.7			LBTH Regeneration Strategy	62
5.8			Employment Strategy	62
5.9			Addition of title “ Programme of Delivery” above text “This strategy will be implemented through a number of key projects including:”	62, 66
5.10		Poplar Area Action Plan	Poplar Area Area Action Plan	62
5.11		LBTH Economic Strategy	LBTH Regeneration Strategy	62
5.12		City Fringe Opportunity Area Planning Framework 2006	City Fringe Opportunity Area Planning Framework (draft) 2006	62
5.13		Poplar Area Action Plan	Poplar Area Area Action Plan	66
6	Designing a High Quality City			
6.1		Housing estate regeneration	Housing estate regeneration projects	84
6.2		Local Implementation Plan (transport)	Local Implementation Plan	72
6.3		Millennium Quarter	Millennium Quarter Masterplan	80
6.4		Proposal Map DPD	Proposals Map	80
6.5		Proposals Map DPD	Proposals Map	72
6.6		St Pauls Way Transformational Project	St Pauls Way Transformation Project	76
6.7		Town Centre Implementation Plan	Town Centre Implementation Plans	76

6.8		City Fringe Conservation Plan	Remove text	80
6.9		Energy Action Areas	Energy Opportunity Areas	84
6.10			Addition of title “ Programme of Delivery” above text “This strategy will be implemented through a number of key projects including:”	72, 76, 80, 84
6.11				
6.12		Poplar Area Action Plan	Poplar Area Area Action Plan	72
6.13		East London Line Extension	London Overground	72
6.14		Making Connections	Making Connections: Towards a Climate Friendly Transport Future	72
6.15		Mayor’s Transport Strategy	GLA Transport Strategy	72
6.16		“Making Connections” Transport Strategy	“Making Connections” strategy	72
6.17		, the East London Line Extension,	, the incorporation of the East London Line into the London Overground network,	73
6.18		Making Connections 2008	Making Connection: Towards a Climate Friendly Transport Future, 2008	73
6.19		LBTH Planning for PC&G – Baseline Report 2009	LBTH Planning for Population Change and Growth – Baseline Report 2009	73
6.20		secured by design	Secured by Design	77
6.21		Manual for Streets	DfT Manual for Streets	77
6.22		The World Heritage Site Management Plan and associated documents	The Tower of London World Heritage Site Management Plan and associated documents	79
6.23		Conservation Area Management Plans	Conservation Areas Character Appraisals and Management Guidelines	79
6.24		Conservation Area Character Statements and Management Plans	Conservation Areas Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines	80
6.25		Code for Sustainable Homes	Code for Sustainable Homes: Setting the standard in sustainability for new homes	80
6.26		Heritage Counts	English Heritage Heritage Count 2008	81
6.27		Urban Design Compendium 1&2	Urban Design Compendium 1&2 2007	81
6.28		Sustainable Energy & Biodiversity Enhancement Report 2008	Opportunities for Sustainable Energy and Biodiversity Enhancement 2008	84
6.29		Mayor’s Climate Change Action Plan	GLA Climate Change Action Plan	85
7		Delivering Place-making		
7.1		To promote a mix of uses that successfully reinforce the city fringe character of small shops and businesses, alongside residential.	Promote a mix of uses that successfully reinforce the city fringe character of small shops and businesses, alongside residential.	91
7.2		To structure and positively plan for development that will address the severance caused by the A12, the railway and the waterspace.	To structure and positively plan for development that will address the severance caused by the A12, the railway and waterspaces including the River Lea.	106
7.3			Addition of Northumberland Wharf on Vision Diagram with the following text “Safeguarding Northumberland Wharf”.	111
7.4			Add the following priority: “To continue to protect Northumberland Wharf for cargo-handling uses including the transport of waste. Development that prejudices the operation of the wharf for these purposes will not be supported”.	111
7.5			Add the following principle: “Effective buffers are needed to protect the amenity of surrounding uses and the future operation of Northumberland Wharf.”	111
7.6		PPS1: Local Spatial Planning	PPS12: Local Spatial Planning 2008	89
7.7		CLG World Class Places 2009	DCLG World Class Places 2009	89
8		Delivery and Implementation		
8.1A		Healthy Borough programme	Tower Hamlets Green Grid	118
8.1		Proposals Map DPD	Proposals Map	
9		Appendices		
		Appendix Two: Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)		
9.1A			Number items within Appendix 2	130
9.1		Aldgate Master Plan	Aldgate Masterplan	136
9.2		Aspen Way Master Plan	Aspen Way Masterplan	135
9.3		Bishopsgate Master Plan	Bishopsgate Goodsyrd Masterplan	136
9.4		Bromley-by-Bow Master Plan	Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan	133
9.5		Bromley-by-Bow Master Plan	Bromley-by-Bow Masterplan	136
9.6		Hackney Wick / Fish Island Master Plan	Fish Island Area Action Plan	133
9.7		Hackney Wick / Fish Island Masterplan	Fish Island Area Action Plan	132
9.8		Hackney Wick Fish Island Master Plan	Fish Island Area Action Plan	136
9.9		Idea Store Strategy (draft)	Idea Store Strategy	138
9.10		LMF	Legacy Masterplan Framework	133
9.11		Millennium Quarter Master Plan	Millennium Quarter Masterplan	134
9.12		Sporting Places – A Leisure Facilities Strategy for the LBTH (draft)	Sporting Places – A Leisure Facilities Strategy for the LBTH	137

9.13	Sporting Places – A Leisure Facilities Strategy for the LBTH (draft)	Sporting Places – A Leisure Facilities Strategy for the LBTH	138
9.14	Victoria Park Master Plan	Victoria Park Masterplan	136
9.15	Victoria Park Master Plan	Victoria Park Master Plan	137
9.16	Whitechapel Master Plan	Whitechapel Masterplan	133
9.17	Implementation (IDP 9th column, 4th row)	Implementation	133
9.18	Millenium (IDP 9th column, 3rd row)	Millennium	134
9.19	"(draft)" (IDP 9th column, 5th row)	remove "(draft)"	137
9.20	"(Draft)" (IDP 9th column, 3rd row)	remove "(Draft)"	138
9.21	"part two" 9th column / 3rd row	remove "part two"	131
9.22	Hackney Wick / Fish Island Masterplan / Forthcoming Feasibility Study	Hackney Wick and Fish Island Hub Study	132
9.23	Potentially part of TFL Sub Regional Plan for East London scheme	Remove text	132
9.24		Refer to appendix	130-142
9.25	St Paul's Way Transformational Projects	St Paul's Transformation Project	134
Appendix Five: Superseded Policies			
9.26	None	U1 - Retained	157
9.27	None	U2 – Retained	157
9.28	None	U3 – Removed – superseded by SP04	157
9.29	None	U10 - Retained	157
9.30	None	U12 - Retained	157
9.31	None	U13 - Retained	157
9.32	Place and Site Making DPD	Site and Place Making DPD	154
9.33	Proposals Map DPD	Proposals Map	154
Endnotes			
9.34	27. LBTH Strategic Housing Market Assessment (Draft), 2009. (p.107-108)	27. LBTH Strategic Housing Market Assessment, 2009. (p.107-108)	162
9.35		Amend all end notes beyond 56 end note (refer to 3.8 above)	All
9.36	LBTH Climate Change and Mitigation and Adaptation Report 2009 x3	LBTH Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Report 2009	162
9.37	WHO Health Cities and the City Planning Process	WHO Healthy Cities and the City Planning Process	162
9.38	PPS Planning and Climate Change 2007	PPS1 Supplement Planning and Climate Change	162
9.39	PPS1: Creating Sustainable Communities	PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development	162
9.40	Good Practice Note 5: Delivering Healthy Communities, Royal Town Planning Institute, 2009	RTPI Good Practice Note 5: Delivering Healthy Communities. 2009	162
9.41	PPS12, 2008	PPS12 Local Spatial Planning, 2008	162
9.42	London Plan 2008	GLA London Plan 2008	162
9.43	LBTH Community Plan 2020 x2	LBTH Community Plan 2008	162
9.44	Tower Hamlets Community Plan: 2020 Vision page 4	LBTH Community Plan 2008 – 2020 Vision (p. 4)	162
9.45	LBTH Space Syntax, Spatial Baseline Report 2009	LBTH Town Centre Spatial Strategy Spatial Baseline, 2009	162
9.46	LBTH Spatial Baseline Reports	LBTH Town Centre Spatial Strategy Spatial Baseline, 2009	162
9.47	Strategic Housing Market and Needs Assessment August 2009 x2	Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment 2009	162
9.48	LBTH Housing Strategy 2008-11	LBTH Housing Strategy 2009	162
9.49	LBTH Strategic Housing Market Assessment August 2009	LBTH Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2009	162
9.50	RTPI Good Practice Note 5 2009	RTPI Good Practice Note 5, Delivering Healthy Communities 2009	162
9.51	RTPI Good Practice Note 5 2009	RTPI Good Practice Note 5, Delivering Healthy Communities 2009	163
9.52	LBTH Industrial Study 2006	LBTH Industrial Land Study 2006	163
9.53	Manual for Streets 2007	DfT Manual for Streets 2007	163
9.54	LBTH Town Centre Spatial Strategy Spatial 2009 x2	LBTH Town Centre Spatial Strategy 2009	163
9.55	Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places 2008, & Moving Towards Excellence in Urban Design 2003	English Heritage Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places 2008, & English Heritage Moving Towards Excellence in Urban Design 2003	163
9.56	Opportunities for Sustainable Energy and Biodiversity Enhancement 2008	LBTH Opportunities for Sustainable Energy and Biodiversity Enhancement 2008	163
9.57	PPS12 2008	PPS12: Local Spatial Planning 2008	163

Agenda Item 9.1

Committee Overview and Scrutiny	Date 7 September 2010	Classification Unrestricted	Report No.	Agenda Item No. 9.1
Report of: Acting Service Head Scrutiny and Equalities Originating Officer(s): Mohammed Ahad, Scrutiny Policy Officer	Title Appointment of Co-opted Members Ward(s) affected: All			

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report requests the Overview & Scrutiny Committee (OSC) to note and agree the co-option of representatives in respect of education matters in accordance with statutory requirements and the Council's Constitution (as amended).

2. Recommendations

That the Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

- 2.2 Agree the co-option of representatives in respect of education matters, as set out at paragraphs 3.1 to 3.8 of this report

3. Co-option of Education Representatives to Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- 3.1 Section 21(10) of the Local Government Act 2000 provides that an overview and scrutiny committee of a local Council may include persons who are not members of the Council. This provision empowers, rather than obliges, local authorities to have co-opted members on their overview and scrutiny committees.
- 3.2 However Schedule 1 to the LGA 2000 also has effect in relation to the Council's executive arrangements. Paragraph 7 of Schedule 1 makes provision for overview and scrutiny committees to have church representatives. The Council must have a Church of England co-opted member on its overview and scrutiny committee if the committee's functions relate wholly or partly to education functions and if the Council maintains one or more Church of England Schools. Similarly, the Council must have a Roman Catholic representative on its overview and scrutiny committee if the committee's functions relate wholly or partly to education functions and if the Council maintains one or more Roman Catholic schools.
- 3.3 Paragraph 7 of Schedule 1 to the LGA 2000 also deals with appointment of the church representatives. The Church of England representative must be nominated by the Diocesan Board of Education for any Church of England diocese which falls wholly or partly in Tower Hamlets. The Roman Catholic representative must be nominated by the bishop of any Roman Catholic diocese which falls wholly or partly in Tower Hamlets.
- 3.4 Paragraph 9(4) of Schedule 1 to the LGA 2000 sets out power for the Secretary of State to make regulations requiring local authorities to have representatives of parent governors at maintained schools included on their overview and scrutiny committees. The Secretary of State has made the Parent Governor Representatives (England) Regulations 2001 in pursuit of these powers. Regulation 3 provides that a local education Council shall appoint at least two, but not more than five, parent governor representatives to any overview and scrutiny committee that has functions which relate wholly or partly to any education functions which are the responsibility of the Council's executive. The Regulations specify the process for electing representatives.
- 3.5 Consistent with the statutory provisions, the Council's Constitution provides in Part 3 "Responsibility for Functions", for the membership of the overview and scrutiny committee to include a Church of England representative, a Roman Catholic representative and two Parent Governor representatives. The Constitution also provides for the committee to have a non-voting Muslim faith representative, although this is not a statutory requirement.
- 3.6 At its meeting on 14th July 2010 full Council agreed to increase the number of Parent Governors co-opted onto the Overview and Scrutiny Committee from 2 to 3.
- 3.7 The Constitution as amended (Part 4 – "Rules of Procedure", Section 4.5 – "Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules", Paragraph 4 "Education Representatives" Rule 4.1 states that "The Overview and Scrutiny Committee must include in its membership the following voting representatives in respect of education matters:

4.1.1 One Church of England diocese representative;

4.1.2 One Roman Catholic diocese representative; and

- 4.1.3 Three parent governor representatives elected under the procedures contained in the Parent Governor Representatives (England) Regulations 2001.”

Rule 4.2 states that “The Committee may also include a Muslim representative in a non-voting capacity. “

Rule 4.3 states that “These members may speak but not vote on any other (i.e. non educational) matters. “

- 3.8 Elections were undertaken by Governor Services in liaison with the Scrutiny and Equalities Section. Governor Services received 7 nominations and hence an election took place. 350 ballot papers were sent out to Parent Governors with 81 responses. The two successful candidates detailed below were elected onto the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Parent Governor representative	Rev James Olanipekun
Parent Governor representative	Jake Kemp

4. Comments of the Chief Financial Officer

- 4.1 This report describes the co-option of representatives in respect of education matters in accordance with statutory requirements and the Council’s Constitution (as amended).
- 4.2 This report does not have any immediate financial implications.

5. Concurrent report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal)

- 5.1 The legal position is set out in the body of this report at paragraph 3. Co-option of Education Representatives to Overview and Scrutiny Committees is strictly regulated including dealing with who may have voting rights by the Local Government Act 2000 and the Parent Governor Representatives (England) Regulations 2001 . The proposals in this report comply with those requirements

6. One Tower Hamlets Considerations

The co-option of the two Parent Governors allows the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to seek greater first hand knowledge and experience of possible inequalities in education. Furthermore it also enhances the community leadership of local residents.

7. Sustainable Action for a Greener Environment

7.1 There are no specific SAGE implications arising from the recommendations in the report.

10. Risk Management Implications

10.1 Co option of representatives in respect of education matters is necessary for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to meet its statutory and constitutional obligations and in particular the functions conferred on the Council by section 102(3) of the Local Government Act 1972 and also section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000.

11. Crime and Disorder Reduction Implications

11.1 There are no specific Crime and Disorder Reduction implications arising from the recommendations in the report.

12. Appendices

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1972 SECTION 100D (AS AMENDED) LIST OF "BACKGROUND PAPERS" USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Brief description of "background paper"	If not supplied
	Name and telephone
	number of holder

n/a

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9.2

Committee	Date	Classification	Report No.	Agenda Item No.
Overview and Scrutiny	7th September 2010	Unrestricted		9.2
Report of: Acting Joint Service Head Scrutiny & Equalities Originating Officer(s): Afazul Hoque, Scrutiny Policy Manager		Title: Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2010/11 Ward(s) affected: All		

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report outlines the work programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the municipal year 2010/11.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and comment on the proposed work programme.
- 2.2 Authorise the Acting Joint Service Head of Scrutiny and Equalities after consultation with the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to finalise the work programme.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 2000 (SECTION 97)

LIST OF "BACKGROUND PAPERS" USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT

Background paper

N/A

Name and telephone number of and address where open to inspection

Afazul Hoque
020 7364 4636

3. Background

3.1 Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) plays an important role in making sure that the Council is effective and accountable and provides a unique perspective on how well public services are being delivered, and how they can be improved from the view of our local residents. Now more than ever, as the Council faces tough decisions and looks to transform the way in which services are delivered, O&S has a crucial role to play: strengthening accountability; ensuring fairness and transparency; facilitating dialogue with residents on difficult decisions; building links across partnerships and helping to increase value for money. Alongside this, the introduction of a new directly elected Mayor in October will also change the role that O&S has to play.

3.2 During the last administration the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) delivered an annual work programme, which helped to:

- Strengthen scrutiny's contribution to the Council's improvement agenda and achieve outcomes that benefit the community
- Improve the co-ordination, management and continuity of work both of the Committee itself and its reviews and investigations.

3.3 In 2009/10 OSC work programme included the following reviews/ challenge sessions:

Reviews

- Reducing Worklessness Amongst Young Adults 18-24
- Private Rented Sector
- Reducing Childhood Obesity, Increasing the availability of healthy choices
- Youth Offending – Supporting our Vulnerable Young People
- Strengthening Local Community Leadership

Challenge Sessions

- Dangerous Dogs
- English for Speaker of Other Languages (ESOL)
- Anti-Bullying Initiatives in Schools

3.4 The Committee also considered a number of issues at its monthly meeting and this included:

- Commenting on a number of performance monitoring reports including the Strategic Plan & Budget Quarterly Monitoring, Diversity and Equality Action Plan and Complaints report
- Commenting on number of budget and policy framework items including the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Gambling Policy
- Invited representatives from Transport for London to outline their Red Route Investment Plan for the borough
- Submitted pre-decision questions on 23 Cabinet reports
- Considered 5 call-ins with only 1 referred back to the Cabinet and four confirmed Cabinet's original decision after considerable discussion.

3.5 As both an evaluation of the work over the last four years and preparation for the new administration an external evaluation was undertaken of the Overview and Scrutiny process by the 2nd Clerk to the Treasury Select Committee at the House of Commons who was seconded to the Scrutiny Policy Team for a month in April 2010. This review

included interviewing a number of Officers from the Council as well as benchmarking with the London Boroughs of Haringey and Hounslow.

- 3.6 Overall the review found the scrutiny process to be 'well-managed and fit for purpose'. In particular it highlighted that the scrutiny review process worked well to address real local concern with substantial local evidence. It also acknowledged the willingness of Cabinet Members and Officers to engage with the scrutiny process ensuring it was fully integrated into the wider decision making process.
- 3.7 The report has highlighted a number of challenges for scrutiny to build on these foundations. In particular ensuring scrutiny provides greater challenge to the Cabinet through a more confident and dynamic approach to challenging the status quo. The report noted that this would deepen Member engagement, provide stronger recommendations and contribute to strengthening the Council's decision making process. In developing this year's work programme this is a very useful starting point and has been welcomed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as part of their Induction process. The Committee will be seeking to address the issues raised by this review through their implementation of this work programme.

4. Strengthening Community Leadership

- 4.1 In our aspiration to achieve One Tower Hamlets a number of pieces of work have been undertaken by scrutiny over the last year to strengthen community leadership. OSC have agreed a local model for implementing Councilor Call for Action (CCfA) and this was tested through last year's review on Strengthening Local Community Leadership. The Working Group tested a 'mock' Performance Digest report which brings together information from corporate complaints and members enquiries. They made a number of recommendations on ways to improve this and the first draft of the Performance Digest report will be considered by OSC in October 2010. The Working Group have also made a number of recommendations around developing local scrutiny which has set the foundations for delivering a far reaching and innovative work programme this year. In particular the Challenge Session on the Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers is being jointly delivered with LAP Steering Group Members to support the development of their capacity in taking forward the work on Localisation.
- 4.2 In considering the new powers to scrutinise the partnership it is worth reminding ourselves that there is already engagement from local partners in the scrutiny process in a number of ways. For instance, all of the reviews in last year's Work Programme involved partners and related to the partnership improvement agenda identified in the Community Plan. Discussion also took place with all the Community Plan Delivery Groups on how we could enhance the role of scrutiny within the Partnership. It was recognised that scrutiny had already been working with many of the partners over the last few years. There are opportunities to further strengthen this through developing the Scrutiny Leads role in the Delivery Groups, managing expectations of all stakeholders involved in scrutiny reviews and ensuring monitoring and follow up on review work is further developed to demonstrate the impact of scrutiny.
- 4.3 The changing role of community leaders with more emphasis on leadership of place rather than services highlights the potential for scrutiny in influencing and shaping the local area. With many services being jointly provided or commissioned scrutiny of partnership will be an area of growing interest for non-executive councillors looking to improve the overall quality of life for residents. Furthermore, with the demise of the Comprehensive Area Assessment the role of scrutiny could be crucial in monitoring and service improvement. The ongoing work to implement actions arising from the Local

Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 as well as the proposed review by the Scrutiny Lead for Excellent Public Services on the Citizen Engagement Strategy and the review on the role of scrutiny under the Mayoral Model will provide greater understanding around how we could further strengthen community leadership and ensure effective engagement and participation by local residents in the democratic process.

5. Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- 5.1 A draft 2010/11 “Forward Plan” for OSC is attached at Appendix 1. This is based on the schedule of reports and issues considered in 2009/10. Amongst the issues the Committee will consider are:
- Regular monitoring reports such as the Tower Hamlets Index and the quarterly Strategic Plan & Budget monitoring report;
 - Budget and policy framework items such as the Revenue Budget preparation and Local Implementation Plan
- 5.2 Call-ins and pre-decision scrutiny are dependent on Cabinet decisions and reports and these need to be programmed in when they arise. OSC also considers the reports arising from its investigations and reviews before they are passed through to Cabinet and again, these will be added when they arise. Twice a year the Committee will also monitor the recommendations arising from scrutiny reviews through their recommendation tracking report. This year the Scrutiny Leads have identified within their portfolio a review from a previous year to visit and consider the impact of the review. The following reviews from the municipal year 2007/08 will be considered:
- Licensing of Strip Clubs
 - Choice Based Lettings Scheme
 - Reducing Anti-Social Behaviour
 - Evaluation of Neighbourhood Renewal Funding
 - Young Peoples participation in Sports Leading Up to the Olympics
 - Tobacco Cessation
 - Use of Consultants
- 5.3 The Committee has a monthly Scrutiny Spotlight session for all Lead Members which was highlighted as an excellent way of holding the Cabinet to account in the evaluation sessions over the last few years. The relevant Cabinet Member and Directors attend to present the key performance challenges within their individual portfolios, focusing on issues arising from performance monitoring reports. This assists in meeting one of the key principles of scrutiny by holding the Executive to account but there remains further work to do in ensuring that the Scrutiny Leads are themselves proactive in understanding the performance issues within their own portfolio areas. The Committee has also remained mindful to ensure the forward plan is flexible to consider emerging issues as well as any CCfA that may be raised and as these arise the relevant Cabinet Member and Lead Officer will be notified.

6. Reviews and Challenge Sessions

- 6.1 To help develop this year’s work programme Members held an Away Day in June to discuss areas for scrutiny reviews. Seven Members of the Committee and two co-opted Members attended and considered the challenges facing scrutiny in light of new legislation, financial climate, new government and change to local decision making

structure. The Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive were also in attendance to highlight the challenges facing the organisation and how scrutiny could support by identifying solutions and facilitating discussion with residents.

- 6.2 In addition the Scrutiny Policy Team has held detailed discussion with each Scrutiny Lead on areas of their interest and how this relates to the Council's priorities. In particular how each review will contribute to efficiency saving and the value they can add to on-going work streams. Members were also provided with a list of key priorities based on analysis of external inspection reports, annual residents' survey, corporate complaints and performance reports.
- 6.3 Appendix 4 outlines the investigations, reviews and challenge sessions that Overview and Scrutiny could undertake this year. As last year, these will focus on the Council's improvement agenda and contribute to achieving outcomes that benefit the community. In addition, the topics will aspire to help address the Council's work on transformation through consideration of the three key goals of becoming more lean, flexible and citizen centred by using the community leadership role of non-executive councillors. Discussions have also taken place between the Scrutiny Leads and Directorates to explore challenges faced by services where OSC could add value to existing work. The outcome of these discussions and analysis is reflected in the proposed programme.
- 6.4 Research into effective scrutiny has highlighted the importance of members' commitment and enthusiasm to undertaking their work. They need to believe that their work will impact positively upon their constituents' lives and help solve the problems presented at their surgeries and other community forums. The Work Programme therefore aspires to address the objective criteria as described in Appendix 3 as well as reflecting the members' consideration of their respective OSC work areas.
- 6.5 It is envisaged that over the next year there will be up to six reviews and six challenge sessions with others added throughout the year, subject to resources. This represents a manageable work programme which allows all the OSC portfolio holders to be involved as well as ensuring there is joint working. It is worth stressing that there is some flexibility built into the programme. In all cases, once the issues are agreed, the scope of the work and timing will be developed in close consultation with the relevant services. This will also ensure that the investigations are focused and can deliver on their objectives.

7. Health Scrutiny Panel

- 7.1 The Health Scrutiny Panel has met once this year and is currently undertaking induction visits to all the local health trusts. Discussions are also underway with health colleagues to identify key issues which may be useful for the Panel to consider in developing a two year work programme for their consideration at their next meeting on 26th October 2010. This will build on the four year work programme undertaken in the last administration and also incorporate issues arising from the external evaluation of the Health Scrutiny Panel undertaken in February 2010. This acknowledged that much had been done to build the credibility and effectiveness of health scrutiny in the borough. However, the report highlighted some issues that have inhibited the effective delivery of a coherent and proportionate programme of health scrutiny. An action plan has been developed and agreed by the Panel to address the issues raised by this report.
- 7.2 The Chair of the Health Scrutiny Panel has agreed to undertake two challenge sessions this year focusing on the development of polysystems and its impact on residents and

the development of preventative services and early diagnosis of Cancer. This will help the Panel further develop their work this year. The Panel is also keen to look at Mental Health Service next year which will follow a comprehensive review by NHS Tower Hamlets of their commissioned service. As with previous work programmes it will include service visits, briefings on key issues, consultation on reviews and changes to services. The Panel will also be seeking to ensure their work programme aligns with the Tower Hamlets Involvement Network (THINK) work and develop collaborative work where possible. As in previous years two Members from THINK have been co-opted to the Panel. The Panel will also seek to develop a local expertise of non-executives focusing on the local health economy to improve information sharing and co-ordination.

8. Communication and Profile of Scrutiny

- 8.1 To maintain good communication about Overview and Scrutiny's work, it is proposed to circulate regular updates on the Work Programme considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee to Corporate Management Team and Cabinet. The update will cover all aspects of the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme including call-ins, performance monitoring and Budget and Policy Framework items. A short summary of the OSC and Health Scrutiny Panel meetings will also be placed in the Members Bulletin.
- 8.2 All Scrutiny Reviews will be publicised through East End Life and seek to engage and involve local residents in the process. In addition, scrutiny meetings will be held outside the Town Hall where appropriate to improve access for local residents.
- 8.3 As a number of the reviews cut across the work of the Tower Hamlets Partnership, discussions have taken place around presenting the review reports to the relevant Community Plan Delivery Groups. In the past this proved useful with last year's reviews on Reducing Youth Offending and Reducing Worklessness Amongst 18-24 year olds both being considered by the Prosperous Community and Safe and Supportive Community Plan Delivery Groups.

9. Comments of the Chief Financial Officer

- 9.1 This report describes the draft work programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) in 2010/11. However recent government announcements about funding reductions to the Council in 2010-11 and for the next four years will affect the scope and nature of the proposed work programme and its associated costs. OSC have already identified in their 2010-11 work programme scrutiny of 2010-11 budget monitoring reports and the 2011-12 revenue budget and capital programme.
- 9.2 There are no specific financial implications emanating from this report, and any additional costs that arise from implementing the Plan, must be contained within directorate revenue budgets. Also, if the Council agrees further action in response to this report's recommendations then officers will be obliged to seek the appropriate financial approval before further financial commitments are made.

10. Concurrent report of the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal)

- 10.1 Article 6 of the Council's Constitution specifies the functions of the OSC, in accordance with the requirements of section 21 of the Local Government Act 2000. The proposed work programme appears consistent with the OSC's terms of reference.

10.2 Pursuant to rule 8 of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, contained within the Constitution, it is for the OSC to agree the overview and scrutiny work programme each year. It is, however, consistent with effective overview and scrutiny for the OSC to keep other members informed of its proposed work.

11. One Tower Hamlets Considerations

11.1 Equalities and cohesion consideration are central to the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and this is reflected in the monitoring of the Council's progress on the Single Equality Framework twice a year. Furthermore, all scrutiny reviews will give specific consideration to One Tower Hamlets issues. In the particular the reviews on Holding the Mayor to Account and Citizen Engagement Strategy will focus on strengthening local community leadership. A number of reviews will also focus on key equalities groups for example the reviews Supporting New Communities, Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults and Post 16 Attainment & Participation.

12. Sustainable Action for Greener Environment

12.1 There are no direct implications arising from this report.

13. Risk Management Implications

13.1 There are no direct risk management implications arising from this report.

14. Crime and Disorder Implications

14.1 There are no direct crime and disorder implications arising from this report. However, the Scrutiny Challenge Session on the Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers (THEOs) will explore how crime and disorder in the borough can be reduced through better use of THEOs.

**Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2010/11
Forward Plan**

8 th June 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of reference and Protocol (OSMM) • Membership / Appointment of Scrutiny Leads (OSMM)
6 th July 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity and Equality Action Plan – End of Year Monitoring Report (PM) • OSC Work Programme (OSMM)
3 rd Aug 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Complaints Report (PM) • Annual Report 2009/10 – Joint Performance and Financial End of Year Report (PM) • Budget 2011/12 – 2013/14 Resource Allocation & Budget Review (BPF) • Scrutiny Spotlight – Lead Member Resources
7 th Sep 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of the Tower Hamlets Core Strategy (BPF) • Scrutiny Spotlight – Deputy Leader of the Council • OSC Work Programme (OSMM) • Appointment of Co-Opted Members (OSMM)
5 th Oct 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Plan and Corporate Revenue Budget Monitoring (Quarter 1) (PM) • Joint Performance Digest Report- (PM) • Contracting Programme • Scrutiny Spotlight –Lead Member Housing, Heritage and Planning • OSC Recommendation Tracking Report Update (OSMM)
2 nd Nov 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Implementation Plan (Transport Plan) (BPF) • Scrutiny Spotlight – Chief Executive • Scrutiny Spotlight – Lead Member Regeneration and Employment • OSC Work Programme Update (OSMM)
30 Nov 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Single Equality Framework - six month report (PM) • Car Free Development Update • Scrutiny Spotlight – Lead Member Environment
11 th Jan 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Plan and Corporate Revenue Budget (Quarter 2) (PM) • Scrutiny Spotlight – Lead Member Adult, Health and Wellbeing • Childhood Obesity Review Update – BSF & Healthy Borough Programme Update • OSC Work Programme Update (OSMM)
8 th Feb 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue Budget and Capital Programme (BPF) • Budget Requirement and Council Tax (BPF) • Scrutiny Spotlight – Lead Member Children’s Services
8 th Mar 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Plan Refresh (BPF) • Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy (BPF) • Scrutiny Spotlight – Lead Member Community Safety • OSC Recommendation Tracking Report Update (OSMM) • OSC Work Programme Update (OSMM)
5 th April 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Plan and Corporate Revenue Budget (Quarter 3) (PM) • Joint Performance Digest Report- (PM) • Scrutiny Spotlight – Lead Member Culture and Creative Industries
10 th May 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutiny Spotlight – Leader of the Council • Annual Report (OSMM)

BPF - Budget and Policy Framework PM - Performance Management OSMM - Overview and Scrutiny Monitoring and Management

Call-ins will be added where accepted. Pre-decision questions are a standing item on the agenda

The Committee will also consider reports arising from the investigations and reviews conducted by the Scrutiny Leads

Criteria and types of review

Against each item on the draft Work Programme, objectives and areas for analysis are indicated and include:

- Methodology – the approach used for the scrutiny investigation
- Performance and Improvement - the links to performance improvement issues and Value For Money (VFM)
- Planned Work – work either currently underway or scheduled, which the scrutiny review may feed into.
- OSC Criteria – how the topic and Members' contribution could improve services

Scrutiny topics are prioritised against defined criteria to ensure that the work:

- would assist in tackling an area of poor or challenging performance (bottom quartile or equivalent) that has priority within the Strategic Plan
- would assist with sustaining high performance that has priority within the Strategic Plan
- would assist in addressing an area of national policy development that has significant implications for the Council and where member input would be valuable
- relates to a planned service inspection and member input would be valuable in providing a robustness test before inspection (or submission of self-assessment)
- would help address a gap between community perception or concern and objective performance by utilising the members' leadership role
- would contribute particularly toward improving VFM

The work will follow one of three different approaches, as follows:

- **Scrutiny Challenge Sessions**
These are one-off sessions chaired by Scrutiny Leads which have to date have proved useful for improving members' understanding of new policies or guidelines or as part of the preparation for an inspection or report. There is potential for these to develop aspects of a particular policy on the subject for future service development work.
- **Reviews**
These are more extensive pieces of work spanning several months. They enable more in-depth research to be undertaken, visits to see practice elsewhere, participation of external experts, etc.
- **Developing the Scrutiny Lead champion role**
In addition to the more formal settings above, it is important for the Scrutiny Leads to develop expertise in championing issues within the work of OSC and with fellow frontline councillors. This would be particularly useful for topics where it is more challenging to engage councillors, such as VFM/ efficiency. Potentially each Scrutiny Lead would undertake this role within their portfolio. It is probably better decided on a topic base rather than a matter of course.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Lead Cllr Ann Jackson)

Issue	Holding the Mayor to Account – Role of Scrutiny	Method	Review
Lead officer	Hafsha Ali – Joint Acting Service Head Scrutiny & Equalities & John Williams – Service Head Democratic Services		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyse implications for scrutiny of an elected Mayor • Consider areas for strengthening accountability of elected Mayor • Consider scrutiny arrangements in boroughs with an elected Mayor • Examine how scrutiny could usefully contribute to key local changes 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of performance targets around local peoples involvement in decision making and ability to influence decision making 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members Suggestion • Provide a platform for Members to discuss role of non-executive councillors in a Mayoral System • Provide a check and balance on fitness of current scrutiny arrangement under an Executive Mayor 		
OSC Criteria	<p>Meets criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would assist in addressing an area of local policy development that has significant implications for the Council and where member input would be valuable. 		

One Tower Hamlets (Lead: Cllr Ahmed Omer)

Issue	Supporting new communities in Tower Hamlets - Case Study Somali Community	Method	Review
Lead officer	Hafsha Ali – Acting Joint Head of Scrutiny and Equalities		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To review the borough’s approach to engaging with new communities • To review and evaluate access to service provision for new communities • To identify avenues to increase community participation and community leadership within new communities 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the Equality Framework for Local Government Assessment and the Council’s refreshed Race Equality Scheme stress the need for the Council to pay attention to how it is able to effectively respond to the needs of smaller minority communities 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member suggestion • Experience of inequality is significant including levels of high unemployment and worklessness, educational underachievement, health inequality alongside poor levels of participation and engagement; 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current financial climate could adversely affect minority communities and additional support and programmes that have been available to address the gaps could be at risk. • The minority communities are under represented in key local organisations, positions of influence and the political process 		
OSC Criteria	<p>Meets criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would assist in tackling an area of poor or challenging performance that has priority within the Council. • Would contribute to increasing community leadership amongst minority community 		

Safe and Supportive Community (Lead: Cllr Lesley Pavitt)

Issue	Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults	Method	Review
Lead officer	Helen Taylor – Corporate Director Adults Health and Wellbeing		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To raise awareness, understanding and access to the provisions available for vulnerable adults in the borough To review and evaluate our current provisions for safeguarding vulnerable adults Improve mechanisms of support, training and development for staff engaged with service delivery to vulnerable adults Examine links with Safeguarding Vulnerable Adults and that of Community Safety and Domestic violence 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Tower Hamlets Community Plan priority is to provide responsive and appropriate services for adults which promote independence, choice, security and community Care Quality Commission Inspection found Council to performing adequately on safeguarding adults. 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Member Suggestion Acts of domestic violence against older people and people with learning were thought to be under reported 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider recommendations from the recent Care Quality Commission inspection 		
OSC Criteria	Meets criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would assist in tackling an area of challenging performance that has priority within the Strategic Plan. 		

Issue	Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers (THEOs)	Method	Challenge Session
Lead officer	Stephen Halsey - Corporate Director Communities, Localities and Culture		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To review and evaluate the impact of the THEOs since their introduction To raise awareness of the THEOs and how they differentiate from other enforcement provisions Further develop the role of the THEOs in the borough 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity to review the effectiveness and impact of the THEOs programme Anti Social Behaviour and the fear of crime is still a key community concern Crime remains the main area of concern for local people in the 2009/10 Residents' Survey 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Member suggestion The boroughs crime rates generally have fallen but are still higher then the national average 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tower Hamlets is one of the most deprived communities in the country. Deprivation has constantly been linked to high levels of crime and ASB The borough has one of the youngest populations in London, ASB amongst this group is a key concern 		
OSC Criteria	Meets criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would assist in tackling an area of poor or challenging performance that has priority within the council. Would contribute particularly towards improving VFM 		

Prosperous Community (Lead: Cllr Rabina Khan)

Issue	Support to Small Businesses	Method	Review
Lead officer	Aman Dalvi - Corporate Director Development & Renewal		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To consider how small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the Borough are supported by the Council in partnership with governmental and non governmental agencies operating in the borough. • To consider issues arising from the Local Economic Assessment particularly the economic structure assessment aspect of this to identify specific needs for businesses • To consider how the Local Development Framework and the Council's regeneration strategies contribute to the development and support to small businesses. • To consider how to increase support provided to small businesses being led by vulnerable groups such as women and ethnic minorities. 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fostering enterprise a key Community Plan and Strategic Plan target 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to the development of the Enterprise Strategy • Member suggestion • The economic downturn effect on small businesses • High rate of worklessness in the borough and SMEs provide easy access to work for local residents 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Olympics offers opportunity to increase trade for local businesses • Continuous development of the Canary Wharf estate and other local businesses districts 		
OSC Criteria	Meets criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would assist in tackling an area of poor or challenging performance that has priority within the council. • Would contribute particularly towards improving VFM 		

Issue	Post 16 Participation & Attainment	Method	Scrutiny Challenge Session
Lead officer	Wendy Forrest – Director of The Hub		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop understanding around educational participation by young people aged 16-18 years old. • Examine policies in place at national and local level aimed at post 16 attainment and participation • Develop understanding of barriers to certain 16-18 year olds remaining at education. • Examine how various partners work to address the issue. 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of performance targets relating to post 16 attainment not met • Improved performance on number of 16 to 18 year olds who are NEET • Percentage of 16-24 year olds in Tower Hamlets who are unemployed are higher than neighbouring boroughs and considerably higher than London Average 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2009 participation rate of 92.7% compares well nationally but is slightly below the London average. • There are groups whose participation is of greater concern. They include white, vulnerable people such as those with learning difficulties, with caring responsibilities and involvement with the youth justice system. • Contribute to the young peoples future success and employability. 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in national participation age: By 2013 all young people in England required to continue education or training until 17 year of age and by 2015 this will be raised to 18 year olds. • Tower Hamlets has one of the youngest populations in London. 		
OSC Criteria	<p>Meets criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would assist in tackling an area of poor or challenging performance that has priority within the Strategic Plan. 		

A Great Place to Live (Lead: Cllr Zenith Rahman)

Issue	Parking Services – The Public Perception	Method	Review
Lead officer	Bryan Jones – Service Head Environmental Control, John Chilton – Head of Parking		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider parking facilities near key areas, including: schools, hospitals, places of worship, and markets. • Develop more sophisticated understanding of residents concerns about Parking Service • Support residents understanding of the borough’s Parking Policy • Develop recommendations that help change the image of Parking Service in the borough 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking has the lowest satisfaction rate amongst local residents. There has also been an increase in the 2009/2010 stage 1 complaints relating to parking in the last year. • Councillors raised parking as one of the most prominent issues raised by residents in their 2010 campaign. • The object of a scrutiny review focussing on resident perceptions would be to reduce the number of complaints received by the Council in relation to parking issues. 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking Services are currently drafting the 2010 Local Improvement Plan. There will then be a consultation period before the report has to be approved by Full Council and the Mayor of London by December 2010. • It would be timely for Scrutiny to conduct a review and add value to the consultation process carried out by Parking Services. 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutiny review offers opportunity to change image of parking by providing a platform for Parking Services to show positive impacts and provide residents with an understanding of parking enforcement policy in the Borough. 		
OSC Criteria	<p>Meets criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would assist in tackling an area of poor or challenging performance that has priority for residents. 		

Issue	Housing Repairs - Customer Care and Communication	Method	Challenge Session
Lead officer	Sayeed Kadir - Director of Asset Management, Bob Moorcraft Head of Repairs – Tower Hamlets Homes		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To review the approach towards housing repairs taken by Tower Hamlets Homes (THH) and other Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) in the Borough. • To consider customer care provided by THH and RSLs when dealing with housing repairs. • To help facilitate better communication between THH, RSLs, Leaseholders and Tenants around housing repairs. 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the <i>Corporate Complaints Half Year Report 09/10</i>, Housing Repairs was the issue most complained about for THH, with a total of 267 complaints. • THH satisfaction indicators have also been just off target. 81.62% of respondents (from a survey of 400) rated the service they received as excellent or good against a target of 83%. • This year THH have completed 98% of Housing Repairs within its target timeframes. These are good figures, 88.98% of these repairs were also completed in the first visit. However the complaints figures would suggest that resident's experiences do not correlate with this improved service. It is possible that this is due to poor communication between stakeholders and bad customer care from contractors. 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • THH will be inspected by the Audit Commission in November 2010. The outcome of this inspection will establish whether THH achieves the 2 star it needs to release the funding to reach Decent Homes Standard. • This session would both help to identify the gaps in the Housing Repairs service and contribute to the inspection 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • THH has done a lot of work to improve its housing repairs service and this session can evaluate if this has been successful. • In this time of public sector cuts, this session will be able make recommendations to THH to ensure excellent services are continually provided with reduced resources. 		
OSC Criteria	<p>Meets criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would assist in tackling an area of poor or challenging performance that has priority for residents. • Relates to a planned service inspection and member input would be valuable in providing a robustness test before inspection (or submission of self-assessment) • 		

Excellent Public Services (Lead: Rajib Ahmed)

Issue	Citizen Engagement Strategy	Method	Review
Lead officer	Louise Russell – Service Head Strategy and Performance		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine national policies aimed at developing Citizen engagement Review and provide challenge to outcomes from work undertaken on 5 key priority areas identified in development of the strategy Undertake focused work with local residents around developing community champions. 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Flag from CAA on community engagement Remains a key priority for improvement amongst Members. Effective engagement results in savings, improved services, better user experience and trust 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new government initiatives such as Big Society. The current financial climate and the role of residents in service development and delivery Identified as an area for development in last year's scrutiny review on Strengthening Local Community Leadership 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An opportunity to develop a partnership engagement strategy utilising Members Community Leadership 		
OSC Criteria	Meets criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would assist in addressing an area of local policy development that has significant implications for the Partnership and where member input would be valuable. 		

Issue	Developing Efficient customer services	Method	Scrutiny Challenge Session
Lead officer	Claire Symonds – Service Head Customer Access		
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and develop understanding of the Channel Strategy Examine the efficiency of customer services through various channels. Further develop understanding of complaint management and its contribution to improvement of service delivery. 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve customer satisfaction. Enhance more efficient service delivery. 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further use of the Council website for customer services can create substantial savings. 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues around deprivation and how its impact on residents ability to access services through various channels 		
OSC Criteria	Meets criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would contribute particularly toward improving VFM Would help address an area of local concern 		

Healthy Communities (Lead: Cllr Tim Archer)

Issue	Polysystems – Reconfiguration of Local Services – what does this mean for local residents?	Method	Challenge Session
Lead officer			
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To scrutinise public engagement in the reconfiguration of health services in Tower Hamlets To provide residents with the correct information on how they will be affected by the reconfiguration of health services in the Borough. 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will assist in addressing the challenges outlined in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment around service delivery, access, variation in outcomes, low uptake of screen services and the need to integrate services by engaging residents and providing necessary information. 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It will add value to the work already carried by Health4nel in 2009/2010 and help to assess the success of their consultation process as well as act on the recommendations included in the INEL JOSOC report from April 2010. 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although there has been a large clinical focus on polysystems and reconfiguration of health services there is still work to be done to engage residents. THINK have also expressed concern around this area. 		
OSC Criteria	<p>Meets criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would assist in tackling an area of challenge that has priority for residents. 		

Issue	Cancer – Development of preventative Services - early diagnosis and rapid referral	Method	Challenge Session
Lead officer			
Objective/outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider current preventative and diagnosis services • Examine how risk of cancer can be reduced in Tower Hamlets • To improve Members and residents understanding and knowledge around this issue 		
Performance Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would address the gaps identified by the 2008-09 report from Joint Director of Public Health and Joint Strategic Needs Assessment 2009 surrounding the low uptake of screening services. 		
Other Drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were 614 new cases of cancer in 2006. Tower Hamlets has higher rates of new diagnoses of lung, cervical, bowel and stomach cancers compared to London and national figures. There is a consistent pattern of poorer survival which may be linked to later diagnosis. • In 2005 life expectancy in Tower Hamlets was 75.2 in males and 80.2 in females. This is 2.1 years shorter in males and 1.3 years shorter in females compared to England and ranks Tower Hamlets in the bottom 20% of all local authority areas. 		
Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cancer is a major concern that Tower Hamlets continues to be significantly off target. It is a hard trend to shift and whilst improving screening uptake may have a small impact on mortality initially, intensified efforts to improve early detection would be welcomed by the Tower Hamlets Partnership. 		
OSC Criteria	Meets criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would assist in tackling a challenging priority for the health and well being of residents. 		

This page is intentionally left blank