


| | |
|--|---|
| Commissioner Decision Report 24 May 2016 |  TOWER HAMLETS |
| Report of: Zena Cooke, Corporate Director Resources | Classification: Unrestricted |
| Exercise of Commissioners Discretion | |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Lead Member | Rachel Saunders |
| Originating Officer(s) | Everett Haughton |
| Wards affected | All wards |
| Key Decision? | No |
| Community Plan Theme | One Tower Hamlets |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report sets out details of decisions made under the exercise of Commissioners Discretion. Such decisions are required to be the subject of a noting report at a subsequent Commissioners Decision Meeting in Public.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Commissioners are recommended to:

1. Confirm their decisions under Commissioners Discretion as set out in appendix 1.

1. REASONS FOR THE DECISIONS

- 1.1 Agreed procedures require that reports be submitted to Commissioners Decision Meetings in Public to confirm/note grant funding decisions taken under Commissioners Discretion.
- 1.2 The reporting of decisions taken under Commissioners Discretion assists in ensuring that Members and Public are made aware of, and therefore able to scrutinise Commissioners decisions.

2. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 2.1 Agreed procedure requires decisions taken under Commissioners Discretion to be presented to a Commissioners Decision Meeting in Public.

- 2.2 To deviate from this procedure would require a sound reason. It is not considered that there is any such reason, have due regard of the need to ensure that Members are kept informed of all decisions made by Commissioners under their discretionary powers.

3. DETAILS OF REPORT

- 3.1 The decisions made under Commissioners discretion are set out in the attached appendix 1. These decisions relate to Emergency Funding and Home Repairs Grant applications considered outside of Decision Making Meetings in Public.

- 3.2 These decisions were taken outside of scheduled meetings in public in order that grants awarded to organisations that are facing emergencies can be made in a timely manner.

4. COMMENTS OF THE CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER

- 4.1 On the 16th March 2016 and 3rd May 2016 Commissioners considered grant requests totalling £63,937.56 - these are detailed in Appendix 1 attached. A total of £24,837.56 (£12,358 in the form of a loan) of the requests was approved and £39,100 was rejected. The amounts approved will be funded through existing budgets within the 'Home Improvement grants' budget and 'Emergency Funding' provision.

5. LEGAL COMMENTS

- 5.1. Whilst the Commissioners are empowered to exercise their discretion in private, agreed procedures require that such decisions should be reported to Commissioners Decision Meetings in Public for ratification. This self-imposed procedure has been implemented in the interests of transparency.
- 5.2. There are no immediate legal implications arising from this report.

6. ONE TOWER HAMLETS CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1. This report is concerned with the notification of Commissioners decisions under their discretions; and as such has no direct One Tower Hamlets implications. The extent to which there are One Tower Hamlets considerations arising from the original recommendations, these would have been addressed as part of those considerations.

7. BEST VALUE (BV) IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Best Value implications associated with each of the Commissioners' discretions as set out in Appendix would have been identified and evaluated as an integral part of the process which led to the decisions.

8. SUSTAINABLE ACTION FOR A GREENER ENVIRONMENT

8.1 There is no sustainable action for a greener environment implications arising from this report.

9. RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The risk management implications associated with each of the Commissioners' discretions as set out in Appendix 1 would have been identified and evaluated as an integral part of the process which led to the decisions.

10. CRIME AND DISORDER REDUCTION IMPLICATIONS

10.1 Crime and disorder reduction implications, if any, associated with the decisions as set out in Appendix 1 would have been an integral part of the process which led to the decisions.

11. SAFEGUARDING IMPLICATIONS

11.1 Safeguarding implications including risks or benefits, if any, associated with each of the decisions as set out in Appendix 1 would have been identified and evaluated as an integral part of the process which led to the decisions

Linked Reports, Appendices and Background Documents

Linked Report

- NONE

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – details of the decisions made under the Commissioners' discretionary powers

Background Documents – Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information)(England) Regulations 2012

- None

Officer contact details for documents:

- N/A