

Meeting of the

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 1 November 2011 at 7.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

VENUE

Room TBC, Town Hall, Mulberry Place, 5 Clove
Crescent, London, E14 2BG

Members:	Deputies (if any):
<p>Chair: Councillor Ann Jackson Vice-Chair: Councillor Rachael Saunders, Scrutiny Lead, Adults Health & Wellbeing</p>	<p>Councillor Judith Gardiner, (Designated Deputy representing Sirajul Islam, Ann Jackson, Rachael Saunders, Zenith Rahman, Helal Uddin and Amy Whitelock) □ Councillor Peter Golds, (Designated Deputy representing Councillor Tim Archer) □ Councillor Ahmed Adam Omer, (Designated Deputy representing Ann Jackson, Sirajul Islam, Zenith Rahman, Helal Uddin and Amy Whitelock) □ Councillor Harun Miah, (Designated Deputy representing Councillor Fozol Miah) □ Councillor David Snowdon, (Designated Deputy representing Councillor Tim Archer) □ Councillor Bill Turner, (Designated Deputy representing Ann Jackson, Sirajul Islam, Zenith Rahman, Helal Uddin and Amy Whitelock)</p>
<p>Councillor Tim Archer, Scrutiny Lead, Chief Executive's Councillor Stephanie Eaton Councillor Sirajul Islam, Scrutiny Lead, Resources Councillor Fozol Miah Councillor Zenith Rahman, Scrutiny Lead, CLC Councillor Amy Whitelock, Scrutiny Lead, Children Schools & Families Councillor Helal Uddin, Scrutiny Lead, D & R</p>	
<p>[Note: The quorum for this body is 3 voting Members].</p>	

Co-opted Members:	
Memory Kampiyawo	– (Parent Governor Representative)
Jake Kemp	– (Parent Governor Representative)
Rev James Olanipekun	– (Parent Governor Representative)
Canon Michael Ainsworth	– (Church of England Diocese Representative)
Mr Mushfique Uddin	– (Muslim Community Representative)
1 Vacancy	– Roman Catholic Diocese of Westminster 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:

Antonella Burgio, Democratic Services,

Tel: 020 7364 4881, E-mail: antonella.burgio@towerhamlets.gov.uk

LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 1 November 2011

7.00 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 - 10

To confirm as a correct record of the proceedings the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 4th October 2011.

4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

To be notified at the meeting.

5. SECTION ONE REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

There were no Section One reports 'called in' from the meeting of Cabinet held on 5th October 2011.

6. REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Raising Attainment - Successes and Challenges

To receive a presentation led by representatives from Children Schools and Families with representatives from Development and Renewal.

6.2 Meeting Our Public Sector Equality Duty

To receive a presentation from the Service Head, one Tower Hamlets

6 .3 Scrutiny Review Tracking Report 11 - 28

To receive an update on progress in implementing the recommendations made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee through scrutiny reviews since 2007/08.

6 .4 Covert investigation under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 29 - 38

To update Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the Council's use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 ("RIPA").

7. VERBAL UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS

(Time allocated – 5 minutes each)

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

(Time allocated – 30 minutes).

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

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, 4 OCTOBER 2011

**ROOM M71, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE CRESCENT, LONDON,
E14 2BG**

Members Present:

Councillor Ann Jackson (Chair)
Councillor Tim Archer
Councillor Sirajul Islam
Councillor Amy Whitelock
Councillor Zenith Rahman
Councillor Helal Uddin

Councillor Judith Gardiner, substituting for Councillor Rachael Saunders

Mr Mushfique Uddin – (Muslim Community Representative)
Canon Michael Ainsworth – (Church of England Diocese Representative)
Memory Kampiyawo – Education Representative
Jake Kemp – (Parent Governor Representative)
Rev James Olanipekun – (Parent Governor Representative)

Guests Present:

Councillor Shahed Ali – (Cabinet Member for Environment)

Officers Present:

David Galpin – (Head of Legal Services (Community), Legal Services, Chief Executive's)
Isabella Freeman – (Assistant Chief Executive - Legal Services, Chief Executive's)
Michael Keating – (Service Head, One Tower Hamlets)
Sarah Barr – (Senior Strategy Policy and Performance Officer, Strategy Policy and Performance, One Tower Hamlets, Chief Executive's)
Antonella Burgio – (Democratic Services)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Co-opted Member Jake Kemp and Councillor Rachel Saunders. Councillor Saunders was represented at the meeting by Councillor Judith Gardner.

John Williams Service Head, Democratic Services apologised that he was unable to attend to present the report at agenda item 6.2.

Councillor Sirajul Islam gave apologies for leaving early.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of personal or prejudicial interests were made.

3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

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

RESOLVED

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 6th September 2 011 be approved and signed by the Chair has a correct record of proceedings.

4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

Nil items.

5. SECTION ONE REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

5.1 Call-In - Recording / Webcasting of Council Meetings

The Chair invited Councillor Joshua Peck, on behalf of the call-in Members, to present the reasons for the call-in requisition. Councillor Peck highlighted the following issues:

- Full Council had decided that residents should be able to view Council meetings, and officers were instructed to prepare options for how this could be done. He had been surprised when Cabinet decided not to go ahead with the webcasting.
- The costs of the proposal were not significant
- The Call-In had identified 2 options for finding the funds – not recruiting to the Mayoral Communications Advisor post and returning the Mayor's leased car.

In response to questions from the Committee, Councillor Peck provided the following information:

- Webcasting Council meetings would probably help improve make everyone's behaviour.

- Many other local authorities webcast meetings and this also provides a good record of Council meetings, which would be useful for the business of the Standards Committee.
- Councillor Peck was in favour of at least using the existing system and any measure which improved accountability and transparency.
- Option 3 would be the best one for people with hearing problems. This option also encouraged feedback from viewers. Councillor Peck had some concerns around the potential for improper usage of the material, but welcomed any development which improved accountability of what happens in the Council chamber.
- Webcasting might discourage some young people from engaging with politics, but also might engage others. At the very least it could help demystify the local democratic process -as evidenced by the broadcasting of Parliament.

The Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) responded to the matters raised advising the Committee that she was unable to comment on behalf of the Executive but was willing to discuss the options in more detail. In discussion the Committee received the following information:

- There were concerns about using the existing system (Option 1 in the report) because of its age. The quality of voice recording was poor and the cameras were fixed. Regarding audibility, the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) agreed to ask Democratic Services to look into improving the microphone system in the Chamber.

Action: Democratic Services

- Option 3 would cost £25K per annum, and would give the best results.
- Officer research suggested that 6 out of 32 London boroughs webcast meetings. Of other authorities questioned, viewing figures were 'low', with Kent having less than 100 live viewers, Thanet an average of 120, Braintree an average of 120.
- People could tamper or play with footage, although this would be harder to do with option 3.
- Members would need training in relation to ethical matters such as defamation.
- It was felt that that webcasting would likely improve behaviour in the chamber.

In response to the Committee's questions the Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) provided the following information:

- In clarification of the necessary finances, particularly for maintaining the current system and those for option 3, the Committee was informed that current costs were very low.
- Regarding the suggestion that switching on the present equipment (option 1) could improve behaviour immediately, the Committee was informed

that this outcome was not guaranteed as it was not always possible to see or hear who was talking.

- Regarding whether Council's resolution to record meetings should have already been implemented using current equipment, the Committee was informed that to undertake this still required an Executive decision.
- Regarding reasons for the omitting to mention in the Cabinet report the national trend amongst public bodies towards broadcasting of meetings and increasing transparency, accountability, openness and engagement with citizens, the Committee was informed that the report had been commissioned to look at equipment options only.

The Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) and Councillor Peck retired from the meeting. The Committee discussed the responses that had been given by them and concluded that the following concerns remained:

- All residents should be able to see Council meetings, improving transparency, accountability and citizen engagement with local decision-making.
- Further weight should be given to the equality impacts: webcasting of council meetings would increase access for disabled and elderly people unable to travel to the Town Hall, young people, and residents who are working when meetings are taking place.
- Full Council has already passed a resolution that meetings should be broadcast and this decision should be enacted. Cabinet was tasked to review this when Councillors from across the chamber agreed that Council should endeavour to have the meetings broadcast. The Committee was concerned that this decision has been ignored by the Executive, and also that it had taken so long to get to this point.
- The Committee also noted the lack of reference to the Government's view about the greater need to hold public bodies to account, which broadcasts would go some way towards satisfying. The political environment in Tower Hamlets would suggest that viewing figures for webcasts of meetings could be higher than other areas canvassed by officers. Benchmarking information from other local authorities was therefore not deemed to be relevant.
- The Committee were moved to ask that the sound recording equipment be used for the next meeting.
- A complete record of meetings would encourage Members to improve their behaviour in Council meetings, a matter which was of increasing concern to members of the Committee.
- As it would be his decision to spend £25k on Option 3; the Committee asked the Mayor to reduce non-essential costs by not recruiting to the communication post that he had recently created and returning the new Mayoral car. This was seen as a reasonable request set against the fact that more residents would be able to see and hear what goes on at Council.
- The Committee was concerned that the officers' report did not set out all the advantages and disadvantages of each option. While Option 4 (to not

do anything) was presented very positively, other options were described negatively.

Members of the Committee agreed to refer Cabinet's provisional decision back asking that further consideration to the views and concerns presented. These were that:

- Having considered the arguments, the Committee was of the view that Option 3 was therefore the best option – this would enable a good service, improving audibility and access to council meetings and maximising citizen engagement. The option could be funded by not recruiting to the Mayoral communications advisor and/or by the returning of the Mayor's car.
- In the meantime, the Committee wished to propose that the existing system be returned to use immediately.

RESOLVED

That the call-in of Cabinet report "Recording / Webcasting Council Meetings" be referred back to Cabinet for further consideration on the basis of the above concerns.

6. REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION

6.1 Disposal of Northumberland Wharf Waste Transfer Station

In accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Terms of Reference, Article 6.02 (ii) of the Council's Constitution, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee wished to consider key issues in relation to the report on Disposal of Northumberland Wharf Waste Transfer Station which was to be discussed by Cabinet on 5th October 2011.

Jamie Blake, Service Head, Public Realm, and Councillor Shahed Ali, Cabinet Member for Environment, presented the report circulated as agenda item 6.1. The Committee was informed that in the past, Northumberland Wharf had been used for the waterborne transit of the borough's waste to landfill sites. Usage had declined over the years as a result of Government directives on waste which required councils to move away from the use of landfill to other more environmentally friendly methods.

As part of its Waste Strategy, the Council was looking to develop long-term approaches to waste disposal and wanted the site to be used for long-term strategic planning. Options to save site maintenance costs were being explored, including a medium term lease. The Committee was asked to note that the continued operation of the recycling centre located at the site would form part of the terms of the lease.

In response to Members' questions, the Committee received the following information:

- Access to the recycling centre would remain free to borough residents.
- In the event that a tenant could not be found, the Council proposed to shut down the site. The recycling centre would continue and its operator, Veolia, would assist in any reconfiguration required.
- As waste wharves were rare and Northumberland wharf was a protected site, attracting potential tenants would be challenging. Although the Council was pursuing likely tenants who would continue to use the wharf should none be found, the facility could possibly be closed down in lieu of future use and the remainder of the site used for storage.
- Regarding the feasibility of retaining the site for waste removal purposes, even with reduced volumes, the Committee was informed that the Government had offered incentives for reducing landfill therefore usage of the wharf had reduced.
- To reduce its exposure to Government landfill escalators, the Council had negotiated with Veolia to dispose of waste through incineration and increased recycling. The borough's waste would be driven to two processing sites in South London to reduce the need for waste transfer and these costs.
- The Council operated weekly refuse and recycling collections. Therefore there were no local implications arising from the Government's recent announcement to support the reinstatement of weekly refuse collections.
- The report asked Cabinet for permission to go to market to realise some income from the site and avoid upkeep costs that would otherwise be incurred. However, should tenants from the waste industry not be found, the authority would be willing to look at other uses for the site.
- It was not the Council's intention to sell the site as after 2017 it would need to look at new waste disposal contracts and future trends in waste disposal might again render the site useful.
- Waste Management industry trends were away from landfill and towards investing in modern waste technology methods, building PFI and incineration facilities. Pilot plants were being trialled at present and it was the Service Head's view that these would be scaled up once technological developments permitted.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

6.2 Appointments to Inner North East London Standing Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

David Galpin, Head Of Legal Services-Community, presented the report on behalf of John Williams, Service Head Democratic Services.

The Council had established a Standing Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Health with neighbouring boroughs of Hackney and Newham and the City of London. The Committee was requested to appoint 3 members to represent Tower Hamlets on this body (2 from the majority Labour group and 1 from the minority Conservative group) drawn from the membership of

Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Health Scrutiny Panel. Nominations had been sought from the political groups.

The Chair advised that Councillor Rachel Saunders (Chair of Health Scrutiny Panel) and Lesley Pavitt of the Labour group and Councillor Dr Emma Jones of the Conservative group were nominated to serve. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Archer and there, being no objections it was

RESOLVED

That Councillors Rachael Saunders, Lesley Pavitt and Dr Emma Jones be appointed as the Council's representatives on the Inner North East London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Action

Democratic Services

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

Nil items.

8. VERBAL UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS

The following updates were given by Members of the Committee regarding their scrutiny lead areas:

Councillor Zenith Rahman informed the committee that events for Black History Month were being held at Whitechapel Idea Store. Committee Members were invited to support the events.

Councillor Sirajul Islam was looking at reviews on asset management and resources and was shortly to meet to the corporate director.

Councillor Sirajul Islam left the meeting at 8:13 p.m.

Councillor Amy Whitelock was investigating how the new model children's centres would operate and planned to meet with the corporate director on this matter. She intended that this would inform a scrutiny review. Regarding recent media attention on the matter of low adoption rates, Councillor Whitehouse had noted that the borough had amongst the lowest rates; she therefore intended to investigate this. The Committee was also informed that Children and Adolescents Mental Health Service had been invited to attend the Health Scrutiny Panel's meeting on 18th October.

Councillor Helal Uddin reported that he was exploring the development of housing forums, looking at matters involving section 106 agreements, and was involved in a joint Health Scrutiny meeting investigating housing policy for people with mental health problems.

Councillor Tim Archer informed the Committee that he was due to explore the publication costs of East End Life.

RESOLVED

That the verbal updates be noted.

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

Arising from issues of behaviour discussed earlier in the meeting as part of the Call-in report , the Chair raised her concerns on the matter of some Members' behaviour at Council meetings. The Chair requested that the following referral be made to the Council's Standards Committee:

The Chair stated that she had become increasingly unhappy with some Members' behaviour which she considered unacceptable. This had recently escalated to a level which was now a major concern and was affecting all Members' conduct at Council meetings and elsewhere. For this reason the Chair requested that the Council's Standards Committee compile and produce a plain English guide outlining acceptable behaviour of Council Members, to include what is unacceptable and how to proceed if they had been adversely affected by others' behaviour. The Chair requested, if possible, that this report be presented to the next meeting of the Council by the Chair of the Standards Committee.

RESOLVED

That the matter of Members' behaviour at Council meetings be referred to the Chair of Standards Committee.

Action: Democratic Services

The meeting ended at 8.19 p.m.

Chair, **Councillor Ann Jackson**
Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Agenda Item 6.3

Committee: Overview and Scrutiny	Date: 1 st November 2011	Classification: Unrestricted	Report No.	Agenda Item No.
Report of: Assistant Chief Executive		Title: Scrutiny Review Tracking Report		
Originating Officers: Sarah Barr, Senior Strategy Policy and Performance Officer Rob Driver, Strategy Policy and Performance Officer		Wards: All		

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report provides an update on progress in implementing the recommendations made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee through scrutiny reviews since 2007/08.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to note the progress outlined in this report and use this information to inform future work programme planning.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1972 (AS AMENDED) SECTION 100D

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

Background paper	Name and telephone number of and address where open to inspection
None	n/a

3. SCRUTINY REVIEW TRACKING REPORT

- 3.1 As part of its regular work programme, Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) receives a report every six months so as to monitor progress in implementing the recommendations made by committee. This report updates on all reviews and action plans undertaken since 2007/8. One of its key aims is to enable OSC consider any areas or issues which they may want to revisit as part of their current or future work programme.
- 3.2 The tracking report shows that services have already or are in the process of implementing the majority of the recommendations made by Overview and Scrutiny. The report also demonstrates that action plans have influenced key strategies and campaigns in a number of ways including actions being mainstreamed into ongoing service development through to specific initiatives.
- 3.3 However, since most of these recommendations were made there has been a change of Government, significant national policy change and a huge reduction in funding available to the local authority and its partners. This report therefore also tries to reflect this change and how it has impacted on the actions coming out of the scrutiny reviews.
- 3.4 This latest tracking report has a different format to previous versions, rather than reporting on each individual recommendation, it gives an overview of progress, highlighting successes or difficulties and how the review continues to influence the work of the services in question.
- 3.5 The report is organised according to Community Plan themes. For each report the date, working group Chair and current scrutiny lead is given.

4. CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL)

- 4.1 This is a noting report. It is appropriate for the Committee to receive information regarding the Council's progress in respect of past recommendations by the Committee.

5. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

- 5.1 There are no specific financial implications emanating from this report. However, where reviews have been previously reported to Overview and Scrutiny as part of the work programme, specific finance comments have been included in these reports.

6. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Tackling inequality and promoting community leadership are central themes in the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. A number

of the scrutiny reviews discussed below considered specific issues which relate to One Tower Hamlets including reducing child poverty, increasing educational attainment and reducing worklessness amongst young adults.

7. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

7.1 There are no implications arising from this report.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

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

9. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT

9.1 This report does not propose any expenditure directly, although many of the reviews discussed below do consider recommendations which may have resource implications for the Council.

A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE

Review: LICENSING OF STRIP CLUBS	
Chair of working group	Cllr Marc Francis
Date of original recommendations	5 November 2008
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Zenith Rahman (CLC)

The review investigated the impact of strip clubs in Tower Hamlets and considered approaches to regulation and licensing of clubs in the future, within an appropriate legal framework.

Eight recommendations of the review have been fully implemented with two currently being implemented. A number of the recommendations of the Review have been overtaken by the Policing and Crime Act 2009, which granted local authorities greater powers to control and regulate sex establishments in their area. A great success of the review has been its submission to central Government as evidence to support the development of this new legislation. In this regard it can be seen to have had some influence on national policy, helping to ensure that the new legislation is thorough and robust.

This Review has provided the Communities, Localities and Culture Directorate with a focus for this very important issue, and has enabled the service to allocate increased resources to tackle negative consequences of strip club licensing. A new sex establishments policy for Tower Hamlets is currently out for consultation.

Review: CHOICE BASED LETTINGS	
Chair of working group	Cllr Alex Heslop
Date of original recommendations	3 December 2008
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Helal Uddin (D&R)

This review looked into the Council's approach to Choice Based Lettings Scheme for the allocation of housing, with particular emphasis on overcrowding, homelessness, accessibility of the scheme for disabled and elderly residents and the medical assessment process.

Sixteen recommendations of the review have been completed and two are outstanding. These relate to best practice in terms of mutual exchanges – this will be looked at through the sub-regional lettings group – and a review of Key Worker Housing which will form part of the Lettings Plan, scheduled to come to Cabinet in December.

Furthermore there are two recommendations which are closed but incomplete due to changes in policy and reductions in funding. The Mayor of London has put the Capital Moves scheme on hold so the recommendation to reduce the proportion of lettings on new-build done through the scheme cannot be taken

forward. A reduction in funding means that resources cannot be allocated to expanding the Seaside and Country Homes Scheme.

One of the greatest successes of the review has been the development of a new, more transparent lettings policy which aims to better tackle one of the Council's main priorities, reducing overcrowding.

Review: AFFORDABLE HOME OWNERSHIP	
Chair of working group	Cllr Waiseul Islam
Date of original recommendations	2 December 2009
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Helal Uddin (D&R)

This review was established to consider the challenges residents face in accessing affordable housing and how the Council and partners can come together to overcome these.

Of the six recommendations, three have been fully implemented and two recommendations have been superseded by Coalition Government policy contained in the Localism Bill, namely the introduction of affordable rents and changes to tenure which along with reductions in funding have meant that recommendations in relation to Discount Market Sales models and negotiating on intermediate rents.

The greatest success of the review has been the Development Management Policies considering local lifestyle in relation to housing design standards. The Development Management Development Plan Document – Engagement document (May 2011) went out for public consultation on the proposed policy *approach* for the Council's development management (planning) policies. The extensive public consultation (where 26 events were held across the borough) was well received. The final Development Plan Document will contain approximately 30 policies which will aim to address and reflect a number of the borough's local issues, including those for affordable homes provision, such as design standards.

The review recommendations have also led to more detailed consideration of intermediate housing, with briefings going to executive members on the following, the effects of these will emerge in 2011/12:

- The range of intermediate housing schemes currently available, including for sale and for rent. Most schemes are now packaged under the Government's First Steps programme.
- The key issues affecting Tower Hamlets residents access to intermediate housing, such as low incomes, high levels of unemployment, high house prices in the borough, residents perception and the quality and range of information available
- Which Tower Hamlets residents are accessing intermediate housing products - low take up from the Bangladeshi community is a key issue
- How intermediate products can be used to better effect to meeting local housing need.
- What options are available to allow Intermediate Housing to be better targeted to TH residents, such as making it more user friendly and

targeting those groups identified as under represented in the original report

- How best could Intermediate Housing be used to reduce the level of overcrowding in the borough
- How can we improve publicity
- Considering what (if anything) registered housing providers can offer; some RPs may be able to offer tailor made schemes suitable to TH needs
- Consider what partnerships need to be developed to achieve this

Review: PRIVATE RENTED SECTOR	
Chair of working group	Cllr Alex Heslop
Date of original recommendations	2 December 2009
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Helal Uddin (D&R)

This review looked to identify key gaps and issues that exist within the private rented sector in Tower Hamlets and recommend potential initiatives which would improve service delivery and in particular consider systems, procedures and initiatives which are currently in place to support landlords and tenants within the sector.

Of the 14 recommendations of the review, six have been fully implemented. A number of the recommendations have been overtaken by policy changes. For example, changes in statutory homeless duty and the general economic downturn have made the sector more expensive. In addition, the new coalition Government's decision to abandon the Rugg Review recommendations on regulating the sector has a profound influence on matters where the review might otherwise have investigated, although the Housing Options Service is keen to see a Local Accreditation Scheme developed.

The greatest success of the review has been the appreciation that the private sector is a key resource in the borough and that it needs, and will receive, more attention. This will be addressed through a new Private Sector Housing Strategy which is soon to be developed, informed by a full stock condition survey.

A SAFE AND COHESIVE COMMUNITY

Review: EARLY INTERVENTION, CHILD PROTECTION	
Chair of working group	Cllr Bill Turner
Date of original recommendations	2 December 2009
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Amy Whitelock (CSF)

This review was established to examine the Council's existing early intervention services in relation to child protection and explore the case for extending services from a value for money and customer service perspective.

Of the thirteen recommendations, nine have been fully implemented. The remaining 4 recommendations are largely implemented but curtailed due to other events. A number of the recommendations have been largely affected

due to reduced budgets or restructuring. These are recommendations four, five, seven, eight and ten.

Recommendation four was affected due to a Domestic Violence post and overall reduction of the Domestic Violence team impacting on the conclusion of the Domestic Violence Services Mapping Exercise. This will be re-addressed by the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) Children and Domestic Violence sub-group to ensure this is completed.

Recommendations five and seven have been impacted due to a 50% funding reduction for the CHAMP service, reduced by the PCT for 2011/12. However, the shortfall has been met by Children's Social Care (CSC) utilising the Social Work Improvement Fund to ensure children's needs continue to be supported. Also, joint protocol between CSC and Adult Mental Health has been revised by the LSCB but dissemination is on hold until clarity of the overall Adult Mental Health Service restructure is known.

Recommendation eight has been impacted due to the withdrawal of the Working Neighbourhood Fund. Furthermore, the withdrawal of Government grant funding for the Family Intervention Programme has stalled the ongoing MPACT delivery in the borough. Staff time has been re-focused to funding search whilst demand for family work with drug users and their children/extended family remains. The Hidden Harm Coordinator's hours have been reduced from full to part-time.

Recommendation ten has been impacted following budget review and restricting, CSC no longer provides the Extended Schools Service which is now the responsibility of individual schools. However, implementation of the Family Wellbeing Model includes school establishments who act as one of the main referral pathway points.

The Early Intervention, Child Protection review has made significant progress in all areas. External factors, in particular, funding cuts or restructuring has had an impact on the time taken to implement some of the plans but not on its viability. In some cases, follow on developments have been implemented as a result of successful engagement and good working practices and partnerships.

Review: DANGEROUS DOGS Challenge Session	
Chair of working group	Cllr Bill Turner
Date of original recommendations	2 December 2009
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Zenith Rahman (CLC)

This challenge session was an opportunity for Members and residents to hear about work undertaken locally and regionally on tackling dangerous dogs. This was also an opportunity for residents to highlight their main concerns.

All six of the recommendations made have been significantly implemented into service delivery. However, after the implementation of the recommendations dedicated external funding was terminated, in March 2011,

and the Service's workforce was reduced. Although this made work more challenging, the Service's continued effort has covered this setback by further improving its effectiveness and efficiency through partnership working.

A great success of the review resulted from Recommendation 5. A partnership was established which enables all stakeholders to share information, identify issues and develop a way forward. A further success was greater information sharing with the community through a number of successful events on responsible pet ownership (Recommendation 2).

The biggest impact of the review was to strengthen our partnership work, including with Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the Status Dogs Unit. This enables the Service to deal with dangerous dogs even more effectively and efficiently.

Review: ANTI-BULLYING CHALLENGE SESSION	
Chair of working group	Cllr Denise Jones
Date of original recommendations	6 April 2010
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Amy Whitelock (CSF)

This challenge session was to consider bullying related issues at schools and to examine the effectiveness of the borough's anti-bullying initiatives.

The fluid staffing situation from late 2010 and staff's focus on dealing with issues connected with service restructuring had some impact on meeting the Review's recommendations. There was some difficulty in ensuring continuity of contact with organisations and sustaining a multi-agency approach in both developing policy and sharing practice. This particularly affected Recommendation 2, as changes to staffing in youth services have meant it has not been practical to work with youth clubs on cyber bullying.

There is a very significant overlap between the review's recommendations and the main priorities of the anti-bullying strand of the Stay Safe theme in the CYPP. As a result these activities are monitored in the Behaviour Team's ongoing review process and there is quarterly reporting to the CYPP.

Of the six recommendations, three have been fully implemented, and two have been partly implemented. Many successes have come out of the recommendations including 'Support schools to respond to homophobia'. This has been demonstrated by Tower Hamlets being ranked 3rd in London and 11th nationally in Stonewall's Education Champions programme. Overall, the review contributed significantly to ensuring that work to reduce bullying in local schools was widely seen as integral to ensuring that children have a positive educational experience free from fear and harassment.

The review was an effective support to this area of work that was already being undertaken. It endorsed the priorities that had already been identified and pointed to areas in need of enhancement.

Review: YOUTH OFFENDERS: SUPPORTING VULNERABLE YOUNG PEOPLE	
Chair of working group	Cllr Denise Jones
Date of original recommendations	8 September 2010
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Amy Whitelock (CSF)

The Review examined the causes of youth crime; looking at what interventions are already in place to combat youth crime and what further work the Partnership could do to reduce youth crime and lower youth re-offending rates.

Of the seventeen recommendations, thirteen have been fully implemented. However, a number of challenges have arisen due to recent resource reductions. Our ability to benchmark against top performing innovative national and international offending services is curtailed by our financial position. Our Early Intervention and Prevention service is under threat due to grant cuts. No funding is identified beyond March 2012.

It is with regret that the review did not influence the health agenda for young offenders. Youth Offending Services in other boroughs have more enhanced health resources provided by health partners.

The review raised awareness of the existing need to create education, work and housing opportunities for young offenders and this was one of the most successful outcomes of the review. It also encouraged the Youth Offending Service to become more joined up with other Council services.

Regarding future monitoring, the Head of Youth Offending Service will review the Action plan, removing completed actions and setting new targets and milestones to the recommendations by the end of October 2011.

Review: TOWER HAMLETS ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS (THEOs) Challenge Session	
Chair of working group	Cllr Lesley Pavitt
Date of original recommendations	8 September 2010
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Zenith Rahman (CLC)

This challenge session aimed to increase Members and residents understanding of the work of the THEOs.

Of the eight recommendations, seven have been fully implemented and one is ongoing. The diversity of officers continues to represent the make-up of the local community and will continue to be addressed through future recruitment.

One of the key successes of the review was in generating greater publicity of THEOs to a range of stakeholders including residents and external agencies. This raised the profile of the service and fostered greater understanding of the varied role THEOs play in the community.

A PROSPEROUS COMMUNITY

Review: PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT IN SECONDARY EDUCATION	
Chair of working group	Cllr Abdul Aziz Sarda
Date of original recommendations	4 November 2009
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Amy Whitelock (CSF)

This review was established to examine the current policy and practices and suggest improvements in supporting and encouraging parental engagement in secondary schools.

Of the review's eight recommendations, four have been fully implemented. In addition, two recommendations were implemented, but now reduced budgets and the changing relationship between the Council and schools mean that the approach has had to change. These are:

Recommendation 3: This was completed via schools participation in the Transition Programme for Year 7 Parents and through extended Parent Information Point sessions. The Council also supported all Transition Borough Days. However, transition support from primary to secondary has been affected by reduced capacity and changing priorities within schools. To help mitigate this, a DVD is being produced for parents in partnership with the Pupil Admissions Team, to support parents through the transition process. The DVD will be available in community languages.

Recommendation five: This was completed through the Building Schools for the Future programme. However some schools have experienced a reduction in staff capacity, reduced parent workshop and course delivery as the Council moves to a traded service model. Schools are now exploring new ways to use their spaces for the community, for example through partnership with the voluntary sector, health and wellbeing programmes and community events, which parents should benefit from.

One of the issues identified during the review was supporting parents who are often hard to engage with. As a result of this a Parent Forum for Somali parents was established at Swanlea School. This is continuing as part of the wider E1 Partnership work which we are supporting through an SLA. In addition to the above success, the review supported cross-partnership working and added value to work in other areas, such as work to reduce the numbers of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET). These initiatives included Passport to Learning, supporting parents take steps towards further learning, volunteering and employment and the launch of Speakeasy SRE course for parents.

The review process highlighted that there is still more work to be done in secondary schools to ensure parents receive the information and practical support they need to support their child's learning. This is particularly crucial at key points of transition such as Years 7, 9 and 11 when parents often find it difficult to engage and contribute to the process.

Review: REDUCING WORKLESSNESS AMONGST YOUNG ADULTS	
Chair of working group	
Date of original recommendations	4 November 2009
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Helal Uddin (D&R)

This review was established to look at how the Council can support young adults in improving their chances of securing employment.

A number of recommendations have been affected by directorate restructures, budget reductions and changes in national policy. For example some of the Total Place work to map and organise employment services, and initiatives to support young people into adult unemployment services has been taken over by the Work Programme, launched in June 2011.

An Enterprise Strategy is in development and work to build capacity in the third sector is ongoing. The Employment Task Group has not met since earlier this year, with its work on hold until new funding streams are identified. A new Employment and Skills Board is to be established.

There have been a range of job fairs in the borough since the review, including monthly job fairs to promote Olympics job opportunities, events in partnership with JobcentrePlus and local RSLs. A borough wide jobs fair is planned for 4th November this year, with 10 national employers already confirmed.

Review: RAISING PARTICIPATION IN POST-16 LEARNING CHALLENGE SESSION	
Chair of working group	Cllr Rabina Khan
Date of original recommendations	9 November 2010
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Amy Whitelock (CSF)

This challenge session was undertaken to increase understanding of the national and local post 16 participation policies and to develop understanding of barriers to certain 16-18 year olds remaining at education.

Of the six recommendations, four are complete. Service restructures and the disbanding of the HUB Board mean that recommendations five and six have been overtaken by events, although the Employment Task Group has now been re-formed and may take these forward. All restructures and refocusing of resources are aiming to shift resources to where we can provide long-term impact, and we are looking to develop, and use, a stronger evidence-base of what works.

The main successes of the Review have been:

- Through the East Collaborative, we have started additional post-16 provision at St. Paul's Way Trust School and we have published plans for further sixth form provision in conjunction with three other schools;
- We have developed more than 200 new Apprenticeship opportunities in the last year and three local work-based learning providers have trialled L3 Advanced Apprenticeships;

- Additional specialist provision has been successfully developed for young people with learning difficulties, young offenders and young mothers, starting to close the gap in progression outcomes for these groups of more vulnerable learners; and
- Improved links between Connexions and Job Centre Plus means that the transition has been eased for 18 year olds moving from youth to adult employment services.

As a result:

- The attainment of young people at Key Stage 4 continues to rise, with our highest ever GCSE results placing the borough well above the national average;
- The number of young people not in education, employment or training continues to fall, with an all-time low of 5.3% of 16-18 year olds in January 2011; and over 500 young residents started Apprenticeships during 2010/11, more than ever before and the fastest growth rate of any London borough.
- Ongoing mentoring is taking place through the Apprenticeship Task Group and Employment Task Group, as well as monitoring of improving post-16 attainment through the Enjoy and Achieve/ Achieve Economic Wellbeing Commissioning and Delivery Group of the Children and Families Partnership.

HEALTHY AND SUPPORTIVE

Review: END OF LIFE CARE	
Chair of working group	Cllr Stephanie Eaton
Date of original recommendations	7 April 2010
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Rachael Saunders (AHWB)

The aim of the review was to look at how social care provision of end of life services meets the needs of local people and examine the co-ordination of health and social care at end of life and identify solutions to the barriers faced by local people in accessing end of life care.

Of the review's eleven recommendations, six are complete and three are ongoing. Although reduced budgets haven't affected the main work of this review both the Council and the NHS have been through significant restructures and recommendation lead officers maybe in different posts as a result.

The ethos of the Delivering Choice Programme around enabling people to have a choice about where to die has been the biggest success of this review. We are seeing a change in the place of death for Tower Hamlets patients which is slow, but steady. In 2004, 17% of people died at home, dropping to 15% in 2008 and increasing to 22% in 2010. There is a corresponding drop in hospital deaths from 71% in 2004 to 63% in 2010 and an increase in deaths in nursing homes (viewed as positive as they historically sent patients to an acute setting when they were dying). Furthermore, the review has facilitated improved fast track procedures for people who are at the end of life (e.g.

procedures to approve placements outside of the weekly panel process) to help meet the person's wishes.

Review: REDUCING CHILDHOOD OBESITY	
Chair of working group	Cllr Tim Archer
Date of original recommendations	May 2010
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Amy Whitelock (CSF)

This review investigated the steps that health partners and the Council needed to take to reduce childhood obesity. However given the seriousness of the childhood obesity problem in the borough, the challenge of this review was to identify ways in which we can reverse the tide of children eating fast food and accelerate the number of children eating healthy food.

Childhood obesity remains a priority for Public Health and Children Schools and Families and many of the recommendations are being implemented, although budget reductions are having an impact.

Regarding closed gate policies in schools at lunchtimes, this is something that the Healthy Schools team are monitoring and encouraging. Currently, they are aware of two secondary schools without a closed gate policy – this is usually due to lack of space in the school canteen. The recommendation to give all children free school meals is still unaffordable in the current financial climate.

An audit of vending machines on NHS premises has been completed, and early work has begun on a Food Policy. Tower Hamlets continues to share good practice with other local areas, participating in London wide workshops, particularly in relation to the Healthy Borough Programme. Since the Healthy Borough Programme funding came to an end in March 2011, most interventions are still running in some form, with many activities incorporated into mainstream service provision. They are dependent on external sources of funding though – from TfL, the National Lottery and the Barts and The London Charity. Reductions in staffing in Children Schools and Families, and funding reductions for Public Health have impacted on the effectiveness of the Healthy Borough Programme. More cuts and changes to Public Health nationally could have further impact on commissioned interventions.

One of the successes of the review was the way in which it identified the different Council services which can have the most impact in tackling obesity, allowing Public Health officers to build working relationships with lead officers from different services. However, reductions in funding and changes in staff have weakened these links again.

The Healthy Borough Programme Board remains the key body which oversees all efforts to tackle obesity.

Review: ALCOHOL MISUSE AMONGST YOUNG PEOPLE	
Chair of working group	Cllr Shiria Khatun
Date of original recommendations	April 2009
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Amy Whitelock (CSF)

This review was established to explore the problem of alcohol misuse amongst young people.

Since the review, a needs assessment related to alcohol and young people has been carried out, part of which was a series of focus groups with local young people – including one BME group, a girls group and an LGBT group. This work has been used to inform the Young People’s Substance Misuse Treatment Plan and forms part of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for 2011. A new treatment model has been identified which incorporates the youth service as having a key role in providing targeted support to young people. AMP, Tower Hamlets’ website for young people, now features a link to *Alcohol and Me*, a short film made during Alcohol Awareness Week 2010 by Langdon Park School and Bethnal Green Technology College.

The needs assessment has also informed a borough wide Substance Misuse Strategy which has two distinct workstreams – alcohol and drugs – ensuring alcohol issues are addressed with as much vigour as drugs.

A Healthy Schools Advisor on Drugs and Alcohol Education was appointed in June 2011. The Healthy Schools Team has just begun to develop a ‘Healthy Youth Club’ framework, based on the Healthy Schools model, and intends to pilot this with 5 youth clubs.

Unfortunately, the provision of culturally specific services has been impeded by a significant reduction in the National Treatment Agency Pooled Treatment Budget. However, analysis of local data shows that BME young people are not disproportionately represented in the numbers receiving treatment. In fact, the needs assessment consultation indicated that, in relation to culturally sensitive services, young people were more likely to engage in treatment services provided outside of their immediate community to maintain anonymity.

Trading Standards ensured recommendations were met to address the issue of alcohol misuse by young people. Licensing Reviews are undertaken by Trading Standards and quantities of fake alcohol continue to be seized through working in partnership with HMRC and the Police. The results have been positive and, for example, since 1st April 2011 48 test purchases have been undertaken – with only one premises selling alcohol to the under-age test purchaser which represents a significant improvement compared with figures from 2010.

Review: TOBACCO CESSATION	
Chair of working group	Cllr Stephanie Eaton
Date of original recommendations	30 July 2008
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Rachael Saunders (AHWB)

This review was conducted by the Health Scrutiny Panel and examined the provision and impact of tobacco cessation services in Tower Hamlets. A total of 9 recommendations arose from the review, for both the PCT and LBTH.

All of the recommendations have been fully implemented. However, although elected Members have been repeatedly invited to attend the Tobacco Control Alliance, none have yet attended. Officers working on this issue found the scrutiny review process very useful and would welcome more involvement with Councillors.

This review successfully influenced the development and implementation of the Tower Hamlets' Tobacco Control Strategy, which in turn has contributed to the borough achieving the highest number of 'smoking quits' per 100,000 of the population in the country in 2010/11 and the programme being highly commended for an IDEA award in 2010.

ONE TOWER HAMLETS

Review: CHILD POVERTY	
Chair of working group	Cllr Ann Jackson
Date of original recommendations	7 October 2009
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Amy Whitelock (CSF)

This Review was established to consider a community leadership model which contributes to creating One Tower Hamlets using child poverty as a case study. Of the Review's eighteen recommendations seven have been completed, ten are in progress and one has been superseded by events.

The main successes of the Review have been:

- Staff attending training sessions on Working Benefits, Money Mentoring and Debt Management which will disseminate learning across the community on good money management.
- 'Life Chances and Life Choices: Exploring patterns of work and worklessness among Bangladeshi and Somali women in Tower Hamlets' is a qualitative study that was commissioned in 2010 in response to rising concerns around the issue of women and worklessness locally. The research presented a detailed narrative on the experiences of local Somali and Bangladeshi women in the labour market and their perspective of their own life chances and choices. It presented a number of different factors as well as possible solutions, which have been used to develop an intervention programme, for Bangladeshi and Somali women struggling to access the labour market, as part of the Council's Employment Strategy, which is currently being finalised. The Executive Summary was published in July 2011 and further work is taking place to embed and utilise the findings into other related areas such as child poverty. A close working relationship with the Employment Team has also been maintained in order to ensure that we continue to find practical and workable solutions to the issues faced by these women, both through the recently planned intervention, and future work, building on this research and ensuring we continue to have a good understanding of the issue.

- Wide promotion both locally and nationally was accomplished because of the Review. An example of this was through Tower Hamlets Council signing up to the London Child Poverty Pledge and promoting the work that is undertaken in this area.

Work continues to be undertaken on many of the Review's recommendations which will be incorporated in to new projects being undertaken by the Council where possible. For example, the Council continues to explore new ways of increasing the participation of all sections of the community in the democratic process such as the Mayor's Budget Road show.

Review: STRENGTHENING LOCAL COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP	
Chair of working group	Cllr Ann Jackson
Date of original recommendations	April 2010
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Ann Jackson

This review considered how Members could increase their community leadership role, with a focus on new guidance from central Government.

A number of the recommendations have only been partially implemented as the Council has been reviewing its partnership structures to ensure they are fit for purpose. Some recommendations have been overtaken by budget reductions and structural reviews. For example, the end of the Working Neighbourhood Fund has resulted in the abolition of LAP Steering Groups.

Recommendation 5 was fully implemented, with a new programme on community leadership being introduced for 2011-12. The 2010-11 Community Leadership Programme, delivered by School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, supported a number of individuals through a bespoke and accredited postgraduate programme aimed at strengthening their community leadership role. Furthermore, all new Councillors were supported through a comprehensive induction programme to support them in understanding their role and responsibilities.

In the current climate, the review raised a number of important questions in relation to community leadership and will inform the way in which we meet our legal duties and develop more responsive services. The Council is continuing to review the way in which we involve residents in decision making and this will be set out in the Citizen Engagement Strategy currently being developed. The change in governance arrangements locally, along with the new arrangements proposed in the Localism Bill provide new opportunities through which we can strengthen community leadership.

Review: ENGLISH FOR SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES (ESOL) CHALLENGE SESSION	
Chair of working group	Cllr Bill Turner
Date of original recommendations	5 January 2010
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Ann Jackson

This session was to consider ESOL provision in the borough with a focus on Tower Hamlets College, providing Members with an opportunity to consider the impact of reduced ESOL class places on residents.

All recommendations have been implemented, although recommendation 5 is no longer relevant as abolished the 'New Approach to ESOL' agenda with no replacement programme as yet.

The External Partners Advisory Group (EPAG) has worked tirelessly to ensure that some of the most hard to reach learners are given opportunities to progress onto appropriate ESOL qualifications, despite the budget constraints experienced by ESOL providers in the borough and the dearth of funding for ESOL nationally. The group has eliminated duplication through effective strategic planning, meeting regularly to discuss ESOL provision in the borough.

The review has been a useful tool for EPAG in setting its priorities with local partners in the voluntary and community sector.

Review: DEVELOPING EFFICIENT CUSTOMER SERVICES CHALLENGE SESSION	
Chair of working group	Cllr Rajib Ahmed
Date of original recommendations	25 November 2010
Current Scrutiny Lead	Cllr Sirajul Islam (Resources)

This session considered how the Council can ensure efficient and effective access to customer services for all residents.

All recommendations were of a continuing rather than a one-off nature and work continues on all strands.

The current Future Sourcing procurement project will have an impact on service development within the Customer Access service, particularly the development of new website functionality, and hopefully the development of a new or improved CRM solution (the system used in the Contact Centre).

In terms of successes of the review, moving parking permit renewals online has had a major impact on reducing visitors to One Stop Shops, allowing savings to be made. More broadly, the review confirmed the direction of travel for Customer Access and provided validation and support for many of the major service development projects already underway.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 6.4

Committee	Date	Classification	Report No.	Agenda Item No.
Overview and Scrutiny	1st November 2011	Unrestricted		
Report of: Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) Originating Officer(s): David Galpin Head of Legal Services – Community		Title: Covert investigation under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 Ward(s) affected: All		

1. Summary

- 1.1 This report updates the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the Council's use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 ("RIPA").

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee is asked to consider and comment on the information contained in Appendix 1.

3. Background

- 3.1. The report to the Standards Committee of 11 October 2011 is contained in Appendix 1.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 2000 (SECTION 97)

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

Background papers

Name and telephone number of and address where open to inspection

None

N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: Standards	Date: 11 October 2011	Classification: Unrestricted	Report No:	Agenda Item:
Report of: Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) Originating officer(s) David Galpin, Head of Legal Services - Community		Title: Covert investigation under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 Wards Affected: All		

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1. The codes of practice issued by the Home Office in relation to Part 2 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (“RIPA”) recommend that elected members have oversight of the Council’s use of these provisions. The Standards Committee’s terms of reference enable the committee to receive reports on the Council’s authorisation of covert investigations under RIPA.

2. DECISIONS REQUIRED

Standards Committee is recommended to:-

- 2.1. Consider and comment upon the information provided in the report, particularly the authorisation information in Appendix 1

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Covert investigation and RIPA

- 3.2. The Council has broad statutory functions and takes targeted enforcement action in relation to those functions, having regard to the Tower Hamlets Community Plan, the local area agreement, the Council’s Local Development Framework, any external targets or requirements imposed under relevant legislation and the Council’s enforcement policy. There may be circumstances in the discharge of its statutory functions in which it is necessary for the Council to conduct directed surveillance or use a covert human intelligence source for the purpose of preventing crime or disorder.

- 3.3. RIPA was enacted to provide a framework within which a public authority may use covert investigation for the purpose of preventing or detecting crime or of preventing disorder. It is designed to ensure that public authorities do not contravene the obligation in section 6(1) of the Human Rights Act 1998 not to act in a way which is incompatible with an individual’s rights under the European

Convention on Human Rights (“ECHR”). It is particularly concerned to prevent contravention of the qualified right in Article 8 of the ECHR to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence.

3.4. The Council’s use of RIPA

3.5. The Assistant Chief Executive (Legal Services) (“ACE”) is the Senior Responsible Officer for ensuring the Council complies with RIPA. The Head of Legal Services (Community) (“HLS”) is her deputy.

3.6. The Council has policies on the use of directed surveillance or covert human intelligence sources. The current versions of these policies were approved by Cabinet on 8 September 2010, as appendices to the Council’s enforcement policy. The Council also has in place guidance manuals to assist officers in the authorisation process. The policies and guidance are designed to help the Council comply with RIPA and the Codes of Practice issued by the Home Office in relation to directed surveillance and the use of covert human intelligence sources.

3.7. The Council's priorities for using RIPA, as specified in its policies are -

- Anti-social behaviour
- Fly-tipping
- Unlawful street vending of DVDs and tobacco
- Underage sales of knives, tobacco, alcohol and fireworks
- Fraud, including misuse of disabled parking badges and claims for housing benefit
- Illegal money-lending and related offending
- Breach of licences.

3.8. In accordance with the Council's policies and manuals, a central record is maintained in Legal Services of all authorisations granted to carry out either directed surveillance or to use covert human intelligence sources (authorisations under Part 2 of RIPA). To date this year, all applications for authorisation have been received from the Council’s Communities Localities and Culture directorate (“CLC”). The Council provides an annual return to the Office of Surveillance Commissioners (“OSC”), based on the central record.

3.9. In order to ensure that applications for RIPA authorisation are of an appropriate standard, the Council's policies and manuals provide that all applications for authorisation to conduct directed surveillance or to use covert human intelligence sources should be considered by a gatekeeper before being passed on to the authorising officer. The Council has a single gatekeeper (the Head of Enforcement & Support Intervention within the Community Safety Service). In the absence of the Head of Enforcement & Support Intervention, the HLS may act as gatekeeper. The gatekeeper must work with applicant officers to ensure

an appropriate standard of applications, including that applications use the current template, correctly identify known targets and properly address issues of necessity, proportionality and collateral intrusion.

- 3.10. The Council has a single authorising officer (Service Head - Community Safety), who has responsibility for considering applications to use directed surveillance or covert human intelligence sources. The policies provide that the Head of Internal Audit may stand in for the Service Head - Community Safety where the ACE or HLS consider it necessary.
- 3.11. The Council's policies and manuals require officers who apply for RIPA authorisations to expeditiously forward copies of authorisations, reviews and cancellations to Legal Services for the central record. The HLS attends fortnightly at CLC's internal deployment meetings to ensure the central record is being kept up to date. Representatives of each service area in CLC attend these meetings. The Council's authorising officer and gatekeeper attend. The meetings provide an opportunity to check the status of applications and authorisations under RIPA and a forum at which officers may present any operations plans where covert investigation may be required and seek a steer from those at the meeting.

3.12. The Council's RIPA applications

3.13. Quarter 1 of 2011/2012

- 3.14. In the first quarter of 2011/2012, Legal Services granted 1 unique reference number for a proposed RIPA application: CS0001. An authorisation was granted in respect of CS0001 on 4 July 2011. The authorisation is due to expire on 3 October 2011. As the investigation will be ongoing at the time of publication of this report, it is proposed to provide a summary of the authorisation in the next regular report on RIPA.

3.15. Quarter 2 of 2011/2012

- 3.16. In the second quarter of 2011/2012, Legal Services granted 1 unique reference number for a proposed RIPA application: CS0002. An authorisation was granted in respect of CS0002 on 29 July 2011. A summary of the authorisation is contained in Appendix 1 to this report.

4. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

- 4.1 This is a report of the Council's use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 ("RIPA") to the Standards Committee. There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

5. **CONCURRENT REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF EXECUTIVE (LEGAL)**

5.1. Legal implications are addressed in the body of the report.

6. **ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1. Enforcement action that complies with the five principles expressed in the Council's enforcement policy should help to achieve the objectives of equality and personal responsibility inherent in One Tower Hamlets.

6.2. The enforcement policy should enhance Council efforts to align its enforcement action with its overall objectives disclosed in the Community Plan and other key documents such as the local area agreement and the Local Development Framework. For example, one of the key Community Plan themes is A Great Place to Live. Within this theme there are objectives such as reducing graffiti and litter. The enforcement policy makes clear the need to target enforcement action towards such perceived problems. At the same time, the enforcement policy should discourage enforcement action that is inconsistent with the Council's objectives.

6.3. The exercise of the Council's various enforcement functions consistent with the enforcement policy and its principles should also help achieve the following key Community Plan themes –

- A Safe and Supportive Community. This means a place where crime is rare and tackled effectively and where communities live in peace together.
- A Great Place to Live. This reflects the aspiration that Tower Hamlets should be a place where people enjoy living, working and studying and take pride in belonging.
- A Prosperous Community. This encompasses the objectives of reducing worklessness, supporting learning opportunities and fostering enterprise.

6.4. An Equality Impact Assessment was prepared prior to approval of the enforcement policy by Cabinet on 8 September 2010. Enforcement action may lead to indirect discrimination in limited circumstances, but this will be justified where the action is necessary and proportionate. Necessity and proportionality are key considerations in respect of every application for authorisation under RIPA.

7. **SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT**

7.1. The enforcement policy seeks to target the Council's enforcement action in accordance with the Community Plan. The Community Plan contains the Council's sustainable community strategy for promoting or improving the economic, social and environmental well-being of Tower Hamlets and contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in the United

Kingdom. To the extent that the enforcement policy aligns enforcement action with the Community Plan it will tend to promote sustainable action for a greener environment.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

8.1. Enforcement action carries with it a variety of inherent risks, including the potential for allegations of over- or under-enforcement, discrimination, adverse costs orders and damage to the Council’s reputation. It is considered that proper adherence to RIPA, the codes of practice, the Council’s policies and guidance will ensure that risks are properly managed. Oversight by the Standards Committee should also provide a useful check that risks are being appropriately managed.

9. EFFICIENCY STATEMENT

9.1. The report does not propose any direct expenditure. Rather, it is concerned with regularising decision-making in areas in which the Council is already active. The enforcement policy seeks to ensure that enforcement action is targeted to the Council’s policy objectives. This is more likely to lead to efficient enforcement action than a less-controlled enforcement effort. It is also proposed that members will have an oversight role through the Standards Committee. This will provide an opportunity to judge whether the Council’s enforcement action is being conducted efficiently.

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

Brief description of “back ground papers”	Name and telephone number of holder and address where open to inspection.
None	N/A

12. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Summary of Quarter 2 RIPA authorisations

APPENDIX 1 - SUMMARY OF QUARTER 2 RIPA AUTHORISATIONS

CS0002	Summary information
Service area:	Community Safety
URN granted:	27 July 2011
Application on correct form?	Yes
Date of gatekeeper clearance:	This matter went direct to the authorising officer
Date of authorisation:	29 July 2011
Expiry date and time:	28 October 2011
Scheduled review date(s):	26 August 2011
Dates of reviews:	26 August 2011
Cancellation:	13 September 2011 (However, the authorising officer instructed orally that the surveillance should cease on 12 September 2011 at 1700)
Total time open:	46 Days
Type of covert investigation:	Directed surveillance
Subject matter of investigation:	Homophobic hate crime and criminal damage in a housing property
Necessity:	Less intrusive investigation failed to identify the perpetrator. Homophobic graffiti causing harassment, alarm and distress to residents and visitors at the property. One resident felt targeted and notified a desire to move.
Proportionality:	There were potential offences under: section 1 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971 (graffiti); and section 4 of the Public Order Act 1986 (causing harassment, alarm or distress). Other less intrusive investigative means were tried, including: a letter to the block requesting information; a request for extra police patrols; a block "door knock" requesting information. Residents reported feeling intimidated, vulnerable and fearful. There was a threat to community cohesion as some residents felt they might be blamed. There were concerns about escalation of the situation.
Collateral intrusion:	The cameras were sited in communal areas and there was thus a risk of collateral intrusion. The cameras were placed so as not to view inside any private dwelling. The investigating officer undertook to delete any recording unrelated to the offences.

Outcome:	The perpetrator was identified and information provided to the police.
----------	--