

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

| Reference | Action | Assigned to | Scrutiny Lead | Due Date | Response |
|---------------|---|---|--|------------------------------------|---|
| 26/10 meeting | <p><u>1. Budget Monitor as at P5 for 2020/21</u> The Committee would require as part of the budget process in the next quarter a detailed breakdown of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covid costs; • Recovery plans versus population vulnerability; and • What costs will not be reimbursed by Central Government. <p><u>2. Waste Service performance update</u> Next time, OSC wanted to see details of service improvement with particular reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements in waste heading for reuse; street cleansing and bulk waste collections; • How it is now easier for people to report mis-collections through IT systems • How agency staff are used; and • Action plans for the West of the Borough e.g. Weavers; Spitalfields and Whitechapel. | Kevin Bartle Dan Jones | OSC Chair OSC Chair & Scrutiny Lead for Env & Comm Safety | Next time this item returns to OSC | |
| 23/11 meeting | <p><u>1. Strategic Performance Monitoring</u> Details on mitigation of poor performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of adults supported into employment by the WorkPath • Young people entering the youth justice system for the first time • Level of household recycling (quarterly audited) <p>In addition, that more detail should be provided within any future report</p> <p><u>2. COVID-19 update</u> OSC to review the Mayor's response to the Committee's COVID Review</p> <p><u>3. Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) Guide</u> Sought clarification on what OSC is able to do/act on as a part of the CCfA process</p> | Thorsten Dreyer OSC members Adam Boey | OSC chair | Before next meeting | <p>1. PDSQs' responses provided before Cabinet on 25 Nov.</p> <p>2. OSC to provide comments to Chair</p> <p>3. Adam to work with Matthew Mannion to develop a communications approach for Members, including examples showing how and when to use CCfA.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p>14/12 meeting</p> | <p>1. <u>COVID-19 Update</u> The committee requested clarification as to why E1 Health Centre and White Chapel Health Centre were exempt or not participating in the Vaccination 1st Wave Site for Tower Hamlets</p> <p>2. <u>WorkPath</u> To bring back and review WorkPath Services in next year's scrutiny WP</p> <p>3. <u>MTFS 2021 -24 (Budget Update)</u> The Committee requested more information on how and why temporary accommodation costs have arisen and the extent to which this is COVID and non COVID related?</p> <p>The Committee requested more information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Rates • Covid Gap • What support is available from Government • Council Tax Support <p>The Committee agreed to hold a session (prior to the budget scrutiny meeting) on understanding business rates reset</p> <p>4. <u>AOB</u> The Committee welcomed the Executives response to the Call in - Change the Band 3 policy but didn't change the PRS policy. OSC to delegate responsibility to Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Sub-Committee to review the PRS policy and implications for waiting list in 6 months' time</p> | <p>Dr Somen Banerjee</p> <p>Vicky Clark</p> <p>Karen Swift</p> <p>Kevin Bartle</p> <p>Kevin Bartle</p> <p>Karen Swift</p> | <p>OSC Chair</p> <p>OSC Chair</p> <p>Scrutiny Lead for Housing and Regeneration on Scrutiny Sub-Committee</p> | <p>Before next meeting</p> <p>OSCs next year WP date TBC</p> <p>Before next meeting</p> <p>Before 11 Jan 2021 Budget Scrutiny Meeting</p> <p>June 2021</p> | <p>The increase in costs was Covid related because the service accommodated 200 single homeless people into accommodation (mainly commercial hotels). For those who came in not all costs were recoverable from housing benefit. For example, provision of three meals a day and floating support in the commercial hotels to assist hotel management with supporting residents. Some residents were not entitled to benefits, so the cost of their accommodation was not recoverable. Furthermore, the nightly rate in the commercial hotels was above the eligible housing benefit amounts, so even for those who were entitled for housing benefit, the full cost was not recoverable.</p> <p>The Committee was provided (on 07.01.2021 the information via a briefing session which covered business rate reset. Business rates and council tax and Covid funding. Slides were circulated to O&S members and awaiting on the update slides for Covid funding.</p> |
| <p>07/01 Meeting</p> | <p><u>Business Rate Reset/ Council Tax Reset and Covid</u></p> | | | | <p>The CTR caseload has increased from 29,268 in March 2020 to currently 31,626, it was as high as 32,482 in May 2020.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | <p><u>Funding briefing</u></p> <p>1. On the Council Tax Reduction Scheme, the Committee sort for clarification on how much of the increase in the cost of the scheme was as a result of the decision to suspend the income floor for self-employed claimants as part of bringing in line with suspension of universal credit</p> | <p>Roger Jones</p> | <p>O&S Committee</p> | <p>By next Meeting.</p> | <p>Overall, the cost of awarding CTR over the same period has increased from £27.9m to £31.4m. Some of this increase will be down to new claims and some will be down to changes in circumstances on existing claims such as and changes in income (an example of this would be the SEISS payments which will impact on self-employed claims) or changes to the number of people in the household.</p> <p>The DWP suspended the Minimum Income Floor (MIF) used in the assessment of Universal Credit (UC) in April 2020. Since March 2020 the number of CTR claims with Self Employed income has dropped from 857 to 838, but of these the number that are UC claims has increased from 443 to 573. All of these are no longer affected by the MIF.</p> <p>As a result of this the number of cases affected by the Council's MIF has decreased from 297 to 261 during the same period. Where we are advised that the MIF is causing hardship, we are looking at each case to assess whether S13a could be used to mitigate the effect of the MIF. To date this year, we have awarded £133,137.67 under Section 13a provisions to address the impact of the MIF being applied.</p> <p>We have had 358 applications so far and awarded in 213 cases and have a further 29 applications still being considered.</p> <p>We have also awarded £1.7m under the Hardship Fund to those who were assessed as still having something to pay.</p> |
| <p>11/01 meeting</p> | <p><u>Budget Scrutiny</u></p> <p>1. The Committee did not agree that population</p> | <p>Thorsten Dreyer</p> | | | |

