

## Scrutiny Action Log 2021-22

### Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Reference	Action	Assigned to	Scrutiny Lead	Due Date	Response
<b>24/05 Meeting</b>	1. <u>BAME inequalities Commission Report</u> Note to be provided to O&S Committee on details of any allegations (individual claims of discrimination) presented to the Commission and how this has been taken forward.	Sharon Godman	OSC Chair	28/06	See attached appendix 1 for response (June OSC papers)
	2. <u>Air Quality Action Plan Report</u> Add an air quality monitoring station for the Council's Blackwall Depo due to Euro 6 Vehicle emission standards in the area (as part of Air Quality Report Recommendation)	Dan Jones & Dave Tolley	OSC Chair	28/06	Set up an air quality monitoring station for the Council's Blackwall Depot due to Euro 6 Vehicle emission standards in the area. This to take the form of an additional NOx tube to be included near the depot site. Completion date: 31 Aug 2021
<b>12/07 Meeting</b>	<u>Strategic Target Setting Briefing Session</u> 1. Submit recommendations from target setting briefing to Mayors Office. Mayor and IP officers to provide a response to committee comments/recs.	Mayor & Thorsten Dreyer	OSC Chair	13/08	Response received and circulated (via email) to O&S Members 29.01.2021
<b>28/07 Meeting</b>	1. <u>Safer Neighbourhood Ward Panel Action Plan</u> Request a copy of the letter from the Mayor to the Home Office lobbying for further resources to 101 service	Ann Corbett & Stephen Bramah	OSC Chair	13/08	Complete
	2. <u>Outturn Budget 2020/21 Report</u> Request a briefing note on the ongoing squeeze on expenditure through the HRA and THH management fee	Ann Sutcliffe	OSC Chair	13/08	Complete

## Scrutiny Action Log 2021-22

<b>20/09 Meeting</b>	<p><u>Strategic Performance and Delivery Reporting Q1 2021-22</u></p> <p>1. The committee requested a written response to their recommendations/ comments from the target setting briefing session held in July 2021</p>	Sharon Godman & Thorsten Dreyer	OSC Chair	Sep 2021	Response sent to OSC Members via email on 29.09.2021
	<p><u>Budget Monitoring Report period 3 2021/22</u></p> <p>1. Analyses on the impact a rise in inflation will have on council contracts</p> <p>2. What will the impact be of the NI increase for Health &amp; Social Care have on the Council both as an employer and as purchaser of services?</p>	Hitesh Jolapara	OSC Chair	25/10	<p>The current estimate for the annual costs of contract inflation for the General Fund is £3.1m. This includes an allowance for 2% on adult and children's social care spot placements (for London Living Wage and Ethical Care Charter increases).</p> <p>If inflation was between 3% and 5%, this could increase the cost of inflationary increases to between circa £5m and £8m for the General Fund, depending on contract negotiations and individual uplift clauses in block contracts (which can reference increases to CPI/RPI of specific months).</p> <p>Please note that there are currently price pressures in the market across various service areas which could be experienced as block contracts come up for retender/extension, including pressures relating to increases in wage levels, fuel costs and food costs.</p> <p>The one-off increased cost in 2022-23 of the NI increase (health and social care levy announced 7/9/21) for the Council as an employer is estimated at £1.4m for the General Fund. The government indicated that funding would be provided to public sector bodies for the extra cost burden.</p> <p>Providers of adult social care residential and community-based services could request funding from the Council of circa £1m for the extra NI cost of providing care (cost for the request estimated as 1.25% NI increase on an assumed 80% staffing component of the £94m annual</p>

## Scrutiny Action Log 2021-22

	<p>3. What assumptions have other authorities made in the MTFs on the use of New House bonus?</p>	Hitesh Jolapara	OSC Chair	25/10	<p>spend). Similarly, providers of children's social care may request an estimated circa £0.3m for the extra cost of providing care. It is unclear whether the government will provide funding through Councils to support social care providers directly for the extra NI cost or indirectly through allocation from the income raised from the health and social care levy.</p> <p>Providers of other services purchased by the Council could also request an increase of funding, especially for non-block commissioned services and the extra cost could be included in contract bids by providers for contracts coming up for retender/extension.</p> <p>See appended table for response</p>
	<p>4. A number of assets have lost income or have occurred additional costs. The Committee requested further information on what the council is planning to do with their physical assets and what the costs of these are (either direct costs or income forgone)</p>	Ann Sutcliffe & Vicky Clark	OSC Chair	25/10	Awaiting response
<b>25/10 Meeting</b>	<p><u>Cumulative Impact Assessment Report (Licensing)</u></p> <p>1. To provide a written note for Members on how they raise issues with licensed premises to enable a review</p>	Dave Tolley & Dan Jones	OSC Chair	12/11	"Note for Members will be provided by end of next week (19.11.2021) and will be shared via email."

## Scrutiny Action Log 2021-22

	<p>2. <u>Liveable Streets Programme Spotlight</u></p> <p>(a) Following the spotlight, OSC to write to the Mayor with their recommendations/ actions for</p>	<p>Cllr Mohammed Pappu</p>	<p>OSC Chair</p>	<p>11/11</p>	<p>Letter sent out to the Mayor, Cabinet lead and council officers (see appendix 2)</p>
	<p>(b) The Mayor to provide a written response to OSC's recommendations on LV Programme</p>	<p>Mayor's Office</p>		<p>10/12</p>	

## Scrutiny Action Log 2021-22

### Appendix 1: New Homes Bonus Benchmarking

London Borough	What assumptions have you made in your MTFS on the use of New Homes Bonus (NHB)?	Are you holding any unallocated NHB as a reserve	If yes to question 2, what is the value of that reserve?
1	Currently only legacy, less than £2m	No	n/a
2	Loss of £2m pa (so, -£2m, -£4m, -£6m, -£8m across MTFS; will leave final value at nil	No	n/a
3	Assumption is payment for the fourth year of payments from 2019-20. Not assumed yet that there will be any additional funding in 2022-23 although this assumption will be revised before setting the budget. SR/Budget will make this clearer.	No	n/a
4	Assuming that NHB is no longer available from 2024/25.	No	n/a
5	No assumption of NHB in our 22/23 MTFS. Historically we had quite significant NHB payments which have now all dropped out. We will receive a small amount of legacy NHB + any award this year or returned NHB. We will treat this as one off so are not including in the MTFS	No	n/a
6	Currently use NHB to reduce general revenue costs, which would indirectly include offsetting costs around housing related expenditure. MTFS assumes that NHB will gradually reduce by the legacy payments and we will receive no more payment by 2023/24. However, we have assumed that we will continue to receive funding in future years from the new scheme which the government is currently working on but this will only be a fraction of what we have received in the past, i.e. 1 payment each year compared to 4-6 legacy payments each year	No	n/a
7	Use NHB as part of the total revenue funding.	No	n/a
8	NHB is baked into the base budget and we are forecasting a reduction in line with the model produced at Settlement last year.	No	n/a
9	Nil	allocated previously some NHB monies to support housing initiatives (earmarked	n/a

## Scrutiny Action Log 2021-22

		reserve)	
10	Only assuming legacy payments from previous years allocations and no further new funding. Therefore, we have built-in £0.565m in 21/22 which we are due this year and £0.492m for 22/23. Without any further info, we have assumed that the NHB will cease and be wrapped up in the fair funding review for now. Have not always met the threshold to receive NHB in recent years, so have made no assumption for receiving an additional allocation in 23/24 at this stage.	No	n/a
11	21/22 - £5.168m, 22/23 - £7.595m, 23/24 - £9.363m This is being reviewed in light of Housing Ministry changes.	Yes	£11.3k
12	We build out NHB into our MTFs and it just helps out the bottom line. We based the calc on the govt calculator.	No	n/a
13	Does not form a significant element of the financial resources and at this stage have rolled over the current funding as per the expected distribution under the current scheme.	No	n/a
14	Full use in year of receipt to fund revenue spend. To run down to zero in 2023/24 (as 2022/23 is the last year in the NHB calculator)	No	n/a
Tower Hamlets	Given the uncertainty in the amounts to be received and that payments in future will be significantly lower, the Council prudently reduced its reliance on NHB as a funding source in support of its general revenue budget and allocated £10.0m in 2021-22 to the revenue budget with the additional sum of £7.6m received placed into earmarked reserves.	Yes	£40m (31/3/20)

SCRUTINY

Appendix 2  
12 November 2021

## Overview & Scrutiny Committee: Liveable Streets Recommendations

Dear Mayor Biggs

Thank you for attending the Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting on Monday 25 October to discuss the Liveable Streets programme. It was a very productive discussion, and the Committee welcomes further engagement on the programme as we enter a period of review and consider how we can amend the programme to best meet the needs of all our residents.

The Committee encourages the council to really listen and respond to what our residents are telling us and this needs to be an iterative process given the nature of this programme and the wider perception of what other boroughs are doing. We must ensure that as we move through each stage of the programme, we are taking our residents with us and guiding them through what are transformative changes to their habits and behaviours.

We appreciate getting the balance right is always going to be challenging but keeping our residents and other stakeholders informed in a timely manner (not just through consultation) will be critical to the delivering the programme successfully.

It's clear to the Committee that we need to move swiftly to find a resolution to address the concerns our residents have raised, and this programme has become very polarising and damaging for our community. To this end, the Committee strong suggests the following recommendations to help tackle and progress some of the key issues emerging from the programme.

The Committee recommends the following:

- R1.** That the council investigates the use of capital for a local green transition fund to support delivery of the wider agenda.
- R2.** That the Committee be provided with a copy of the letter from the Chief Executive of London Ambulance Service and a response to this in writing to



**Tower Hamlets Council**  
Town Hall  
Mulberry Place  
5 Clove Crescent  
E14 2BG

understand how the issues have been addressed.

- R3.** That the council establish a mechanism for speedy and transparent responses to unforeseen negative impacts of the schemes when these are brought to our attention by residents and businesses.
- R4.** That the council establish a reporting facility for persistent speeding and provide a quick way for residents to report hotspots
- R5.** That the council establish a policy on resident exemptions so that future schemes and those currently being designed can take this into account. Need to be clear on what this means for residents in car free developments.
- R6.** That the council open an ongoing, borough wide, listening platform (outside of specific consultations) so there is an ongoing process for residents to communicate with the council.
- R7.** That the council increase cycle parking provision in the borough and provide the committee with a note in writing with details how this will be delivered.

Thank you for consideration of the Committee's recommendations. We would be grateful if you can provide us with a written response which details how the recommendations will be addressed.

Yours Sincerely

**Cllr Mohammed Pappu**

Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee

Mohammed.Pappu@towerhamlets.gov.uk