

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**  
**Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 March, 2018 – Questions to be raised at 20 March, 2018 Cabinet**

<b>Agenda Item – 6.2 Securing the future of Early Years services - phased closure of the three local authority childcare day nurseries</b>																		
<b>Questions</b>				<b>Response</b>														
Has any consideration been given to running the LADN as one facility co-located with other services in order to achieve greater economies of scale?				<p>Two of the LADNs, John Smith and Overland, are co-located with Children’s Centres, which is an arrangement that works well. However, within each site the two functions are separate and do not share any facilities, and this arrangement would be necessary if the LADNs were co-located with any other council service.</p> <p>The LADN requirements in brief are for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building to be open from 8am to 6pm</li> <li>• Separate controlled access</li> <li>• A number of rooms so that children can be cared for and play with others according to their age or any additional needs</li> <li>• Child-size toilets and furniture for activities, sleeping and eating</li> <li>• Outdoor play-space</li> </ul> <p>These facilities aren’t available (or necessary) at any other council site, so an LADN would always need to occupy its own distinct space. Any move to another site to co-locate with another service would involve a cost to provide these facilities.</p>														
What is your current fiscal budget for this year for children services compared to the last five fiscal years?				<p><b>Children’s Services revised budgets</b>      £ per year</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 16.6%;">2013-14</th> <th style="width: 16.6%;">2014-15</th> <th style="width: 16.6%;">2015-16</th> <th style="width: 16.6%;">2016-17</th> <th style="width: 16.6%;">2017-18</th> <th style="width: 16.6%;">2018-19</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">100,036,566</td> <td style="text-align: right;">103,548,918</td> <td style="text-align: right;">97,735,083</td> <td style="text-align: right;">93,031,959</td> <td style="text-align: right;">86,928,504</td> <td style="text-align: right;">90,052,090</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	100,036,566	103,548,918	97,735,083	93,031,959	86,928,504	90,052,090
2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19													
100,036,566	103,548,918	97,735,083	93,031,959	86,928,504	90,052,090													
<b>Agenda Item - 6.3n Appendix 12 - Temporary Relocation Plan for Market Traders and Lock Ups (FINAL)</b>																		
<b>Questions</b>				<b>Response</b>														
Did the planning application include the information about the traders moving elsewhere temporarily, I do not remember it being raised specifically?				The Retail Management Strategy (June 2016) submitted as part of the planning application did include the moving of the market on a temporary basis as illustrated in Appendix 12 of the Cabinet Report. This was reiterated in the Market Stalls Offer (June 2018) document provided to all market traders prior to the Strategic Development Committee meeting held on 24 July 2018. The market traders will remain onsite without any break in trading during the construction and delivery of the scheme.														
Can the council ensure that the market traders will have an affordable space to return to; post regen completion?				The Council will continue to own, maintain, and control the land on which the Street Market is located. Consequently, the Council issue licences and set the pitch fees for market traders. Therefore the Council remains the market’s landlord and will retain the power to set licence fee levels, not Poplar HARCA (PH) / Chrisp Street Developments Limited (CSDL). There will be no change in fees charged during the temporary relocation expected to begin in 2020. The existing approach to issuing licences and collecting fees will remain valid.														
Para 4.3: other than the council and HARCA/CSDL who are the other landowners who will be impacted by the CPO? What, in a worst-case scenario, would be the impact to these landowners?				<p>All freehold ownership of the site is now either in the hands of LBTH or PH/CSDL. CSDL have reached voluntary agreements and purchased the previous freehold interests (namely the Co-op car park, Co-op store and Iceland store).</p> <p>All other land/property owners are leasehold interest and are either covered in the retail management strategy or by our residential buy back policy. Again all offer documents to residential tenants; residential leaseholders; market stall traders; lock up occupiers; and retail leaseholders were distributed in June 2018 which set out in</p>														

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**  
**Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 March, 2018 – Questions to be raised at 20 March, 2018 Cabinet**

	<p>detail the various options available to them. This information remains available from the Management Office at No 19 Market Square.</p> <p>To date 18 residential leasehold interests have been acquired, with a further 3 who have agreed terms for the voluntary back buy of their property/interest, with a further 24 remaining (with the large majority of this number in Phase 2). Of the commercial leasehold interests that need to be acquired (or need to have their leases varied) 41 leaseholders have agreed terms with a further 10 leaseholders yet to agree terms. HARCA/CSDL are confident that voluntary settlements will be reached without needing to implement the CPO powers, however the CPO process is still required in order to facilitate the land assembly, cleanse the title if necessary, and bring land interests into negotiations.</p> <p>Council officers from the Housing Regeneration team and Asset management will meet with the developer on a monthly basis to review negotiation to ensure they are in accordance with the offer documents, that they are fair and reasonable and in line with both market values and our Best Consideration duties.</p> <p>Adjoining freehold and long leasehold property owners' Rights to Light are detailed in Section 12.9 of the Cabinet Report. These interests may potentially be impacted once the CPO powers are implemented. However these interests have their rights protected by statutory compensation and if necessary can be caught by the title cleanse as a last resort. HARCA/CSDL have provided a desktop study to identify the potential impacted properties, which will be assessed in further detail to analysis the level of impact to their property on a phase by phase basis.</p> <p>The developer is required to provide the council evidence of its correspondence and negotiations to reach voluntary settlements with these interests prior to the council vesting land on a phased basis.</p>
<p>Para 6.4: what precautions are being taken to protect the health and wellbeing of the 43 Festival of Britain households, during the demolition and construction stages?</p>	<p>The planning approval is subject to a number of conditions which will need to be discharged by the local authority prior to the commencement of works. Amongst these include submission of details of a considerate construction plan and environmental impact plan with hours of operation for works which can be controlled by the local planning and enforcement department. HARCA/CSDL has provided assurances care will be taken to ensure the wellbeing of the residents during this phased period of construction to minimise disruption to the surrounding community and local resident and businesses. PH/CSDL will engage with each household on a 1 to 1 basis to assess their needs during construction. In certain circumstances PH/CSDL would consider temporary relocation on health grounds. The Council will seek a method statement from PH/CSDL on how such assurances will be met.</p>
<p>Para 6.14: how has the figure of £10.2m additional annual spend of workers and residents been calculated and how does this compare to current expenditure? What confidence levels are there around this number given the economic uncertainty surrounding Brexit?</p>	<p>This figure was provided by Savills as part of the retail assessment submitted as part of the application. This was validated by the Council's consultant Chase and Partners as part of the planning process. We are not able to confirm what the current spend is in the locality. Officers are in the process of clarifying the figure provided and seeking an update from the developer on the £10.2m figure, specifically clarifying whether this is a gross figure (i.e., including both existing and new expenditure) or a net increase, (i.e., new expenditure only) and contingency approach to the uncertainty caused by Brexit.</p>

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**  
**Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 March, 2018 – Questions to be raised at 20 March, 2018 Cabinet**

	<p>PH/CSDL are aware of the current uncertainty in the economic market with Brexit as a key factor and the risks associated however they have advised that they consider this is a long term project which will cover a number of economic changes during its life span.</p> <p>As set out in Section 13.6, Telford Homes who own CSDL, have a track record of delivering major projects of this size and the Council is satisfied that they will be able to deliver this scheme. This scheme also benefits from £10.232m of GLA funding which will be granted to Poplar HARCA to fund 173 of the 200 affordable homes proposed for the site.</p>
<p>Para 25.5: how does the council monitor the progress being made by CSDL to achieve voluntary negotiations with the remaining freeholders? What is the expectation (i.e. targets) that CSDL is expected to meet each month?</p>	<p>As per the Cabinet Report (Section 10.30) there are no remaining freehold interests to be acquired and therefore no monitoring is required.</p> <p>LBTH/CSDL/PH meet regularly to review progress on other acquisitions necessary but the majority of such acquisitions have already taken place. Negotiations will be ongoing throughout the compulsory purchase order process and the powers will only be used as a last resort which the Council and Secretary of State has ultimate control over.</p> <p>Council officers from the Housing Regeneration team and Asset management will meet with the developer (or their agent) on a fortnightly/monthly basis to review negotiation to ensure they are in accordance with the offer documents, that they are fair and reasonable and in line with both market values and our statutory duties</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item - 6.4 Implementation of the traffic management order on HRA Land</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>How much of net profit collected last year has been used to reinvest in upgrading in roads, paths and footpaths?</p>	<p>No profit was made from the collection of penalty charges in 2017/18 due to the difficulties encountered in collecting income due from Penalty Charge notices. In future, the aim will be to cover the costs of enforcement including extending the hours of operation. In the unlikely event that income exceeds this, these sums will be re-invested on LBTH estates.</p>
<p>In the light of the government cuts is it fair to increase the non-resident permits to the same as neighbouring boroughs?</p>	<p>During the implementation of TMO's, LBTH tenants and resident leaseholders will have the top priority for spaces on any LBTH estate.</p> <p>Under the new scheme Out of Borough permits which cost £6.35 per week are to be phased out. The position for LBTH residents who are not tenants or leaseholders but who let parking spaces at £2.59 per week is subject to review over the next 12 months.</p>
<p>What is the cost to implement the new e-system and how / where is it coming from in the climate of £58M cuts?</p>	<p>The approximate cost of the new scheme is £12,000 a year including implementation costs. This is a considerable reduction on the current costs of administering this service.</p>
<p>Is the Council losing significant amounts of parking to accommodation and will the Council have a discussion with new build developers to open up their parking spaces after a certain period if they cannot sale them to leaseholders (i.e. after 01 year)</p>	<p>Response provided after the Cabinet meeting.</p>

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**  
**Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 March, 2018 – Questions to be raised at 20 March, 2018 Cabinet**

<b>Agenda Item - 6.5 Pan-London Homelessness Prevention procurement Hub</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>How is the Council dealing with homelessness referred from the hospital and what is the average turnaround time to house a homeless person from hospital to home?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. For those who have a local connection to Tower Hamlets - There is a lead worker in the Housing Options Complex Needs team who is responsible for ensuring homeless hospital discharges are as timely as possible. The Royal London Hospital has a NHS funded Homeless Pathways Team who present homeless cases at a weekly multi-disciplinary meeting and at which a discharge plan is agreed with Housing Options. The aim for all is that a suitable accommodation is identified for the day of discharge. This often consists of B&amp;B until longer term options can be identified. At times, suitable accommodation is not identified due to the client's non-medical complex needs and a discharge is delayed. I don't believe the Housing Options team keep data on delayed discharged but the Hospital Pathway team does. I do not know if they have data that indicates which service is creating the delay, e.g. social services because a care package is not arranged? OT as adaptations haven't been possible in a short timeframe etc.</li> <li>2. For those with no local connection to Tower Hamlets - The council funds an award winning Routes to Roots service which is provided by Providence Row Charity. The Hospital Pathway team contacts the service when they have a homeless patient whom they believe does not have a link to Tower Hamlets. The team works quickly to confirm the local connection and secure safe suitable accommodation in that area. This project is very successful and demonstrates good outcomes. However, there are still some discharge delays due to the same reasons stated above and including clients who have no resource to public funds. Again the Hospital Pathway team will have data but I don't know if is broken down by particular service which has caused the delay.</li> <li>3. To support hospital discharge, the hospital and partners have commissioned a step down service, 8 bed unit called Glora House, managed by a Housing association with on-site/visiting (non-medical) support. Some Housing Options and Routes to Roots clients will be discharged to Glora house while appropriate housing continues to be sourced.</li> </ol>
<p>What are the withdrawal options for this venture? For example, if after 3 years, LBTH wants to withdraw from the venture, what process would we go through and what would happen to the properties purchased through the venture?</p>	<p>Each borough that joins Capital Letters as a company member can withdraw at any future stage (with appropriate notice) if they wish. This would require an Executive decision (for LBTH this means a key decision by the Mayor). Capital Letters is not proposing to purchase properties, it will lease them from private owners who retain long term ownership. Properties that were leased by Capital Letters and used by LBTH whilst the Council was a company member would be allocated for use by other company members (i.e. other London boroughs) were LBTH to withdraw from the company before the end of the leases.</p>
<p>What happens to the properties that Capital Letters acquires in the event that the government no longer supports this venture?</p>	<p>As stated above, Capital Letters is not proposing to purchase properties, only to lease them (typically for 5 to 10 years). Were Government support to be ended or scale back, existing leases would continue and new leases could be entered into, however the company (and hence boroughs) would need to make up any shortfall in funding required to secure the leases if Government funding was no longer available.</p>

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**  
**Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 March, 2018 – Questions to be raised at 20 March, 2018 Cabinet**

<b>Agenda Item - 6.6 Vallance Road – Grant of a lease</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
How can the residents of this Council be assured that the rent achieved is best value?	A valuation was undertaken which determined the rental value for the property to be £48,000 per annum. This is reflected in the total inclusive annual charge of £75,000 per annum for the property.
What was the process undertaken to advertise and receive offers for the use of this space? Who was involved in the assessment of the offers? How many other offers were received and why was ADA considered the best?	<p>The Council received unsolicited interest for the property from a number of parties. All of these parties were invited to submit their business cases for the property outlining their proposed use for the space, including the taking up of the whole building, access to the community, utilisation of the building and how long they were looking to lease the building.</p> <p>In total four business cases were received for the property. ADA were the successful party as the other applicants were not proposing to either take up the whole building, not able to afford any rent or not prepared to be open to the community.</p>
Para 3.8: What are ADA's student recruitment methods? How many Tower Hamlets residents will directly benefit from their programmes each year? What protocols are in place to measure student diversity?	<p>“There are two parts to the ADA offer, a specialist sixth form college and higher level apprenticeship training. The specialist sixth form is based in Tottenham Hale. 61 Vallance Road will provide a base for ADA's apprenticeship training which has expanded beyond the capacity of their Tottenham premises.</p> <p>ADA was established with a mission to expand the proportion of under-represented groups in the digital sector. Their priority groups are young people from BAME backgrounds and young women. Their recruitment for the sixth form college is designed to attract these groups and includes outreach to schools across London as well as promotion on digital media. Their selection process is designed to identify interest in and aptitude for the digital sector and is not based on GCSE results or predictions. This means that they don't exclude talented young people from disadvantaged backgrounds whose circumstances may have hampered their academic progress. They monitor diversity data closely and their intake is as follows: two-thirds of their sixth form students are from disadvantaged backgrounds (lowest three deciles using IDACI measure); there are currently 17 different ethnicities taught at the college and 25% are female.</p> <p>The apprentice training is provided on behalf of employers such as Google, Facebook and Deloitte and it is the employers who appoint candidates to the opportunities. However all employers working with ADA support their objective to increase diversity in tech. ADA were attracted to the location because of its proximity to the City, Shoreditch and Canary Wharf where many of their employer partners are based. Members have previously raised concerns that our residents are not getting access to these nearby employment opportunities in the tech sector. ADA will be conducting an extensive outreach programme across all education stages of learning from primary, secondary, sixth forms and adult learning institutions with the following impacts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improving children's digital skills</li> <li>2. Improving adult's digital literacy</li> <li>3. Highlighting sixth form opportunities to our secondary students</li> </ol> <p>Highlighting higher level apprenticeship opportunities to sixth form students</p> <p>All of these interactions will increase digital skills and understanding of the tech</p>

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**  
**Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 March, 2018 – Questions to be raised at 20 March, 2018 Cabinet**

	<p>sector. Through careful coordination with the Council and the neighbouring education institutions, ADA would love to create a pipeline of Tower Hamlet residents directly into these life-changing higher level apprenticeships at top digital employers. ADA is uniquely situated to help these institutions identify those students that would be best placed to be successful, aid them in their applications and prep them for their interviews. As they scale up this will translate into over 300 opportunities a year.</p> <p>Taken as a whole this activity will significantly enhance our young residents' opportunity to access well paid digital careers, and also support the digital inclusion priority of our Tackling Poverty agenda. "</p> <p>Having ADA in the Borough is a longer term investment in the economic growth and prosperity agenda rather than solely or strictly an education investment.</p>
<p>What is the council's risk strategy on this site if ADA has to close early?</p>	<p>There will be a mutual break clause in the lease after three years. In addition to this, there will be an option to determine the lease if ADA's OFSTED rating is assessed below good.</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item - 6.7 Compulsory purchase of an empty home?</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>Can the Mayor confirm if the £960K is the base cost or the upper end cost for this proposed CPO?</p>	<p>The £960k cost is based on the market valuation</p>
<p>What is the Council doing to ensure such private homes in the borough are habitable again? Or is the Council's intention to serve more CPO notices?</p>	<p>The primary form of intervention is to offer advice and information to the owners of empty properties, and if necessary to set this in the context of our enforcement powers. Advice is provided on issues including reduced VAT rates; probate, capital gains and inheritance tax; and becoming a landlord. A recent study found that only 3% of properties were brought back into use using enforcement action with the majority of properties brought back into use using a combination of advice and guidance. The Council's Private Housing Improvement Team works with owners to identify solutions.</p> <p>The Council will only use CPO powers as a last resort when all other avenues have been exhausted. Empty properties are at a historic low across London, primarily due to market forces making it unattractive to owners to leave properties uninhabited for any length of time.</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item - 6.8 Spitalfields Community Governance Review</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>How will the Council ensure it runs an effective consultation with all stakeholders?</p>	<p>We have undertaken a benchmarking exercise to learn how other councils have done this effectively and provided training for officers on Community Governance Reviews. We have also taken into account the best practice guidelines from the Association of Electoral Administrators and the Local Government Boundary Commission the</p> <p>We have a draft consultation plan and a mapping exercise in place. We are working with internal and external partners to identify key stakeholders that will be consulted as part of this process. This includes all electors in Spitalfields and Banglatown and Weavers wards in accordance with the law as well as neighbouring LA's, Community and Voluntary Sector organisations, TRAs and the most marginalised communities. The two stage consultation process will be conducted by various methods such as face to face.</p>

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**  
**Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 March, 2018 – Questions to be raised at 20 March, 2018 Cabinet**

<p>Why no mention of (i) CIL and the 25% which would be paid to the Parish Council? And (ii) the ability to use CIL to write a Neighbourhood Plan?</p>	<p>The first stage consultation document is designed to offer a high-level overview of the powers and responsibilities of a Parish Council to guide the public and interested parties in their responses to the consultation. It does briefly set out funding options including through planning gain and under the powers of a Parish Council it references neighbourhood planning. The information provided for the second stage consultation will provide more details in these sorts of areas (including potential sources of income such as CIL and the costs of the Precepts) to go alongside any draft recommendations.</p> <p>The consultation document is in a draft stage and your comments have been forwarded for consideration.</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item - 6.9 OSC Brexit Challenge Session Report - Action Plan</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>How will the Council work with partners to address cohesion and hate crime issues that may arise at the time UK leaves EU?</p>	<p>The Council will work closely with other statutory services and the voluntary sector to support victims and potential victims of hate crime and to enhance community cohesion in the borough leading up to and around the time of 'Brexit'. As part of this, the Mayor launched a Brexit Commission to examine the impact that Brexit will have on the economy in the local area, the lives of residents and civil society and the delivery of public services; the Commission will work together to minimise any negative impact on the borough, while taking advantage of potential opportunities.</p> <p>We co-ordinate a multi-agency No Place for Hate Forum which meets quarterly to ensure development and implementation of a partnership hate crime delivery plan. The priorities within the plan include to ensure support and protection for victims, work with partners to take enforcement action against perpetrators and outreach and engagement with communities to challenge discrimination and promote One Tower Hamlets. The Council also hold a monthly Hate Incidents Panel which ensures a coordinated response to complex hate incidents. The Panel and Forum are made up of members from statutory, voluntary and private sector organisations. They have signed the Council's No Place for Hate Pledge which encourages partners to be more proactive in promoting cohesion and tackling hate. It places more responsibility on all in challenging discriminatory behaviour.</p> <p>The Council has a 'No Place for Hate: One Tower Hamlets Campaign' which sends out clear and consistent messages of public condemnation of all forms of hate. This goes beyond utilising media streams and extends to training, outreach and engagement with all stakeholders.</p> <p>The Council co-ordinates and leads the Tension Monitoring Group which is a partnership group comprised of representatives from statutory services and voluntary and community sector who convene following incidents of high tensions in the borough to discuss, agree and deliver actions to mitigate these tensions. The group met to discuss the spike in hate crime in the few weeks following the outcome of the EU Referendum and agreed actions to address this including running a positive communications drive highlighting how people from different backgrounds get along well together in the borough and also stepping up the communication on the borough's No Place for Hate campaign. Following this brief spike in reported incidents figures then returned to 'normal'.</p> <p>We know that following the outcome of the EU Referendum there was a spike in racist and religious hate crime incidents in the borough. In order to improve security</p>

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**  
**Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 March, 2018 – Questions to be raised at 20 March, 2018 Cabinet**

	<p>of local faith institutions, the Council proactively engaged with various faith institutions that have been effected by hate crime at their places of worship, including two Churches, a Gudwara and 5 Mosques in Tower Hamlets, and supported them in applying for Home Office's 'Places of Worship Security Fund'. This has resulted in over £26,000 of funding to increase security at two different sites in Tower Hamlets. The Council continues to engage with faith groups and institution to apply for similar funding opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item - 6.10 Food Law Enforcement Service Plan</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>Which Data available says that our relative rank in London has declined over the 3 years measured, why is that?</p>	<p>Which? Magazine has over the past few years has collated the result of the Food Standards data return and assessed this data and it ranked each local authority based on three indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how many food establishments were rated for risk,</li> <li>• how many of the medium and high-risk premises met hygiene requirements, and</li> <li>• how many planned interventions (such as inspections or follow up actions) were actually carried out.</li> </ul> <p>The movement on the tables can be significantly influenced between the monitoring years due data cleansing of properties that are not operating as food premises but are recorded as such. The number of 'unrated' or unassessed properties could against the local authority – these may be records of prospective food businesses rather that real ones.</p> <p>During the monitoring year which these results relate to, 16/17, the Team had difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff therefore the number of establishments assed for risk reduced and the number of inspections carried out reduced – during 18/19 we have reduced our vacant post number to one and continue to advertise, we have also introduced a bursary scheme to enable us to 'grow our own' staff for the future.</p>
<p>The complaints seem quite high year on year specially the "Poisoning" element; what is the council doing to reduce this to zero?</p>	<p>The Food Safety Team carry out a programme of risk based inspections ensuring the food preparation and storage is in compliance with current legislation. The general risk score is calculated from the history of compliance and the 'risk' profile of the food preparation. In addition food safety training is carried out to assist businesses to comply with the legislation. The Council also encourages the display of the food hygiene rating to ensure that the public are aware of those businesses that take particular care with hygiene – this information is accessible at the point of service and on line.</p>
<p>How does this report tackle to reduce obesity via food advertising within (Internal) premises? Or should this be included?</p>	<p>Food advertising is outside the scope of the powers of the Food Safety Act, which is the legislation which the Food Safety Officers operate under. This is covered by the Advertising Standards Authority – however we do operate a Food for Health award scheme which is supported by Public Health, which aims at providing Healthier options to the consumer at the point of delivery. The award is ranked from Bronze to Gold and extrapolation of data has been undertaken to demonstrate that such small changes made by the Food Business Operator do have a community benefit with regards to public health.</p>
<p><b>Agenda Item - 6.11 Contracts Forward Plan 2018/19 – Quarter Two</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**  
**Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 13 March, 2018 – Questions to be raised at 20 March, 2018 Cabinet**

CS5367 Film Location Concessions Contract	The profit share arrangement generated £356,000 in 2016-17 and £343,000 in 2017 -18. There are also some direct payments made to parking and asset management
What income does filming generate for TH?	
How many filming agreements were made last year?	We will provide this information separately to O&S as it has not been possible to analyse the data within the permitted timeframe. We are aware that the Council had the second largest number of filming days in London with Westminster topping the table.
Can the contract ensure that the charges to the film companies are slightly below market price so that we can encourage maximum participation with maximum revenue which will enable better contract in future	Charging is not the strongest indicator of a competitive service and this is reflected in the proposed scoring criteria. Good and well managed locations are important, user friendly web sites, problem solving and smoothing the way for filming are more important than differences in fee levels.  Tower Hamlets is unlikely to overtake Westminster in popularity for filming but the fact that we have gone from 7th to 2nd over the last few years is a good indication that our tendering process and contract management have been successful in achieving good income for the borough and its businesses.
<b>Agenda Item 11.1 – Management of the Integrated community equipment Service</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
Have options like working with local NHS (i.e. Barts, ELFT and Mental Health) facilities considered to share their facilities and work together to retain in-house (ie. NHS Continence and supplies & procurement department)?	These have traditionally been separate services in Tower Hamlets. They require different logistical support / arrangements. Combining CES with other services would not address the need to find an alternative store and the challenges of timescale and achievement of the savings. This would not be practical or cost effective. .
The recycle amount (according to point 3.2) is just over 50% (4700 items) how can the service improve to recycle more; what is the future plan of the service to increase the recycling ratio?	The facilities within our store limits the potential to increase the recycling rate. A significant increase could only be achieved within a new store or through Medequip's stores. The recycling rate for Medequip is round 80%; therefore LBTH would expect a 10% year on year improvement from the current recycling rate.
By having this change how would the hospital discharge improve where equipment is required? Please can you provide us comparisons of now and future expectation linked to hospital discharges?	Performance on providing timely equipment is strong despite the difficulties of recruiting and retaining drivers to deliver equipment. Providing the service through Medequip would result in more resilience as discharge pressures increase. Local stores with more standard small items will continue as at present. An attempt to provide more detail on comparisons would be too speculative. Medequip has a strong track record across London and other parts of the country and recognises the importance of prioritising hospital discharges through fast delivery and installation of equipment. Contract monitoring will ensure targets are met.
Has this been consulted with other stake holders and service users? If not why not?	The main consultation was prior to the recent due diligence work. An Equality Impact Assessment was undertaken which concluded there would not be any negative impact on service users. Health commissioners and providers and Children's Services strongly support the recommendations.
Your risk assessment cannot guarantee a price hike on equipment and costs of TUPE etc. what would therefore be the anticipated tolerance on savings from the estimated £308k	The TUPE costs would be subject to a contractual agreement. The TUPE estimate is a prudent amount (20% of total staffing costs) and would not be expected to be higher than this given that some staff may not be part of the transfer. The cost of equipment may rise regardless of provider but Medequip have more ' buying power' through purchasing at very high volumes so present less risk and would be better able to meet rising demand and reduce the pressures on the increasing number of packages of care owing to demographic pressures. The financial modelling allows for an estimated 3% inflationary increase on equipment costs. Any inflation higher than this, and demographic pressure, would need to be mitigated through a review of the equipment catalogue and delivery speed requirements.