

Agenda Item 6.1 Spitalfields Community Governance Review - Consideration of Draft Recommendations	
Questions	Response
Why no mention of the fact that the majority of online responses inside the proposed area supported a Town Council?	Of the 362 responses received from those living in the area proposed by the petitioners 140 (38.7%) were in support of the proposal and 218 (60.2) were against it. Of the 216 online responses from those in that area 132 (61.1%) were in support of the proposal and 84 (38.9%) were against it. However, as a public consultation exercise the council cannot privilege one mode of responding to that consultation over another. It has therefore drafted its recommendations taking into account all the responses that it has received. (A breakdown of consultation responses by area and mode is available in the phase 1 consultation analysis at appendix C)
Why has no information been made available yet about the Council tax precept?	The council's estimate of the income which a parish could raise through the precept is set out in the report in the section 'Financing a parish council'. The council has used the national average band D precept of £65.04 per annum to make this estimate. It is aware that the level of precept set on a band D property by parish's ranges from £0 to over £200 depending on number of factors, including the ratio of spending between different levels of local government. If a parish were to be established it would be for the principal council to set a precept for the first year and for the parish council to set in subsequent years.

<p>Page 9 a) “The parish area proposed is significantly less deprived then neighbourhoods to the south, east, west &amp; north” what proof is there for this statement? What is the data source?</p>	<p>Most of the area of the parish proposed in the petition falls in TH 015B LSOA. In terms of deprivation it is ranked 16,147 out of 32,844 LSOAs in England (i.e. within the 50% most deprived). The proposed parish does contain some areas that are more deprived than this; however, the areas of Tower Hamlets surrounding the proposed parish are significantly more deprived (i.e. -depending on the LSOA - within the 30%, 20% and 10% most deprived in the country). A map and associated data can be found online at <a href="http://dclgapps.communities.gov.uk/imd/idmap.html">http://dclgapps.communities.gov.uk/imd/idmap.html</a></p>
<p><b>Agenda - 6.2 Determination of School Admission Arrangements for 2020/21</b></p>	
<p><b>Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>Elizabeth Selby Infants and Lawdale Junior Schools are both having 15 pupil reductions from 2020/21</p> <p>But at the last Cabinet meeting "Planning for School Places – 2018/19 Review and Recommendations" report there was estimated to be a 548 pupil spare reception places in 2020/21 mostly in western TH</p> <p><b>Q.</b> Are these reductions in Published Admission Numbers too little?</p>	<p>The LA is currently undertaking a comprehensive review of primary school places to address the surplus in the West of the borough. The proposal to reduce the number of places at Elizabeth Selby Infants and Lawdale Junior Schools is related to this work, but most of the reduction will be achieved through the decisions arising from the review.</p>
<p><b>Q.</b> Given the identified need to close primary schools when will the schools to be closed be identified?</p>	<p>The review is not primarily looking at school closures as a means of reducing surplus places. The LA is currently working with a number schools to develop a range of alternative options, with the aim of ensuring that these schools remain financially sustainable and are able to maintain high quality education in the context of falling rolls</p>

	<p>and reducing budgets. These options include changes to school organisation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• federations (two or more schools joining together under one governing body)</li><li>• amalgamations (two or more schools coming together as a single school)</li><li>• the relocation of existing schools into areas of the borough where there is an increasing demand for school places</li></ul> <p>This work will continue through the spring and summer terms 2019, and will include an initial (soft) consultation on these options with schools and their communities.</p> <p>The proposals arising from the review will be presented to Cabinet in the LA's report on pupil place planning in October 2019. The LA will then undertake a statutory (public) consultation on the proposals during November and December 2019. Recommendations will then be presented to Cabinet in February 2020, as part of the LA's annual report on the determination of its school admissions arrangements. If agreed, the aim will be to implement the changes from as early as September 2020, where possible.</p> <p>The challenge of surplus places is likely to be a</p>
--	--

	<p>recurring problem and the review acknowledges that a long-term strategy is required to address this issue. The LA is therefore taking every opportunity to address the issue of surplus places at a strategic level, where due consideration can be given to the number and location of schools that will be needed in the future. This can then be proactively planned for, to ensure that there is an appropriate balance between school places and future demand.</p>
<b>Agenda item 6.4 Tower Hamlets Waste Management Strategy</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>What is being done to deliver food waste recycling to high rises?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tower Hamlets Waste Management Strategy includes the intention to roll out food waste collections to flats, where it is practical and cost effective to do so.</li> <li>• In December 2018 the Government issued its resources and waste strategy which identifies an intention to make the separate collection of food waste mandatory from 2023, subject to consultation. The consultation has now been issued and is asking local authorities to identify what support they need to put weekly separate food waste collections in place. The Council will respond to the consultation which closes on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2019</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Officers are gathering benchmarking information from other local authorities who already provide separate food waste collections from flats.</li> <li>• Officers will be setting up a working group with RSL representatives to look at designing a pilot area for the new service, taking account of the outcome of the Government’s consultation on weekly food waste collections.</li> <li>• Roll out of food waste collections to flats will be implemented after the waste and recycling services are brought back in house in 2020 and subject to funding and support being available.</li> </ul>
<b>Agenda Item 6.5 Recommendations for the future delivery of Contract Services</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
What consultation has or will be done with parents? Particularly around moving the Service to holding the Food for Life SOIL Association “Silver” standard for Primary School meals rather than the “Gold” standard currently held?	The intention is to consult with schools and parents about the proposal to move to the Food for Life Silver Standard.
The report talks about "Birmingham’s City Council’s “City Serve” and has this line: "However, it is acknowledged that they operate at significant scale through delivery of meals to 258 schools in Birmingham and the West Midlands"	The report refers to the £2.5 million surplus that City Serve (Birmingham City Council) has generated since their transformation. To put this number into perspective, Tower Hamlets, with significantly fewer schools than Birmingham, would not be able to generate that level of profit. Nonetheless, depending on the level of investment and remodelling that is introduced, Tower Hamlets

<p>Have any attempts been made to talk to our neighbours about running these services jointly? Since Birmingham would suggest scale matters.</p>	<p>could achieve a break-even and possibly a surplus position.</p> <p>We are in regular contact neighbouring boroughs including Havering, Newham, Waltham Forest, Greenwich, Enfield, Thurrock and Barking &amp; Dagenham as they are all part of PAL (Procurement Across London) Group. The London Borough of Havering's Procurement Team (One Source) lead on the procurement process on behalf of the Group. We already benefit from joint procurement processes for large contracts e.g. Meat, ambient and frozen produce, fruit and vegetables, light equipment and disposables. This method of procurement has always been of great benefit to Contract Services as consistent and improved pricing and quality is achieved due to the increased purchasing power of the participating member authorities.</p> <p>Running services jointly is a possible solution but the boroughs have not been live to this as most wish to maintain direct control of their own catering service and their decisions regarding those catering operations. All operate slightly differently, e.g. Tower Hamlets has Free School Meals for all primary pupils due to the Mayor's funding which others do not have; some services are contacted out and so aligning services would not be</p>
--	---

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 27 FEBRUARY, 2019

	straightforward and there has been little interest shown in joint delivery of the services. Although further approaches could be made.
When will the proposed 3-year investment be fully costed? When will the costings be assessed against the recommendations and what will happen if these are deemed to be unviable as a result?	A full costing exercise for any proposed investment will be undertaken with finance. These will then be assessed against the recommendation; and the findings from the consultation exercise with schools/parents.
<b>Agenda Item - 6.7 Local Implementation Plan [LIF] 3 - Report of Consultation and Final Draft Approval</b>	
<b>Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
How does the element of LIF identified for this plan correlate with residents views on what the LIF should be spent on? What processes are in place to ensure resident's views are delivered?	<p>The reference to LIF (Local Infrastructure Fund) in the LIP3 simply refers to the total amount of LIF funding available. The LIF funding is managed by the Planning Delivery Team. A public consultation was carried out 2 years ago which identified the public's priorities for spending the LIF money on. Services were then invited to put forward projects which met these priorities in order to develop a programme of works to be approved by the Mayor in Cabinet in June as part of the Capital Programme process, thus confirming that funding is only allocated to projects meeting residents priorities. This process will then be repeated from the summer to inform use of further LIF funding which has become available since 2017.</p> <p>Consequently, in the context of the LIP3, LIF is a funding source which could provide match funding</p>

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 27 FEBRUARY, 2019

	for schemes in the LIP where they are consistent with the priorities identified by the public. The forthcoming consultation on transport in Tower Hamlets will also give an opportunity for resident involvement going forward.
Table 14 shows potential funding for the LIP. How does this stack up against what funding is actually required? What is the funding gap (if any) and how will this be filled?	The LIP does not contain detailed projects but outlines the works programmes to which LIP will be applied. Availability of LIP funding gives a kick start to the development process which will ultimately define the detail of schemes and costing. Projects will then be submitted through the Capital Programme process, identifying their cost and sources of funding. This will determine the scope of programmes and projects to meet Strategic Plan aspirations.