

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 6.32 P.M. ON MONDAY, 29 JULY 2019**

**ROOM C1, 1ST FLOOR, TOWN HALL, MULBERRY PLACE, 5 CLOVE  
CRESCENT, LONDON, E14 2BG**

**Members Present:**

Councillor James King (Chair)	
Councillor Kahar Chowdhury	– Scrutiny Lead for Health & Adults
Councillor Dipa Das	– Scrutiny Lead for Housing & Regeneration
Councillor Marc Francis	–
Councillor Tarik Khan	– Scrutiny Lead for Resources & Finance
Councillor Eve McQuillan	– Bethnal Green Ward
Councillor Mohammed Pappu	
Councillor Bex White	– Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment

**Other Councillors Present:**

Mayor John Biggs	
Councillor David Edgar	– Cabinet Member for Environment
Councillor Candida Ronald	– Cabinet Member for Resources and the Voluntary Sector

**Officers Present:**

Adam Boey	– (Senior Strategy & Policy Manager - Corporate)
Sharon Godman	– (Divisional Director, Strategy, Policy and Performance)
David Freeman	– (Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Strategy Manager)
Afazul Hoque	– (Head of Corporate Strategy & Policy)
Mark Griffin	– WASTE MOBILISATION ADVISOR
Dan Jones	– (Divisional Director, Public Realm)
Will Tuckley	– (Chief Executive)
David Knight	– (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sufia Alam and Councillor Andrew Wood.

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST

The following Councillors declared an interest that must be registered in Agenda Item 10

1. Cllr James King;
2. Cllr Tarik Khan;
3. Cllr Dipa;
4. Cllr Chaudhary;
5. Cllr Eve McQuillan;
6. Cllr Mohamed Pappu; and
7. Cllr Marc Francis.

The following Councillor declared an interest that must be declared in Agenda Item 10

1. Cllr Bex White

## 3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

The Chair **Moved** and it was:

### **RESOLVED**

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on June 24<sup>th</sup> 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and the Chair was authorised to sign them accordingly.

## 4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

Nil items

## 5. FORTHCOMING DECISIONS

Noted

## 6. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS 'CALLED IN'

Nil items

## 7. SCRUTINY SPOTLIGHT

### 7.1 Environment Spotlight

Councillor David Edgar (Cabinet Member for Environment) gave a presentation on the creation of an in-house service for the integrated delivery of the waste, recycling and cleansing functions within Tower. Dan Jones (Divisional Director, Public Realm) and Mark Griffin (Waste Mobilisation Advisor) were also present to provide an update and respond to questions.

The Committee then asked several questions about the Service and the points raised are summarised below:

#### The Committee

- Asked about the financial risks of this process as councillors get a significant number of complaints on waste, recycling and cleansing, therefore it would be good to know what improvements that we should expect to see;
- Was informed that the Strategy gives areas of improvements e.g. the collection of household waste as per the schedule and a depot that functions properly and effectively. In addition, (i) the “Modular Buildings” at the depot are an interim measure intended to improve the work areas and staff accommodation; (ii) Regarding employees may be protected under the transfer of the service back in house, LBTH are awaiting the information from Veolia’s July Payroll which will provide LBTH with a set of data in accordance with the requirements of the transfer process;
- Was concerned that between now and the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2019 there might be a deterioration in the service provide;
- Noted that LBTH wants to see improvements in the Service and have asked for and received the level of detail that LBTH have an effective overview of performance. Whereas in the past LBTH had not been given the information that was needed to evaluate the service and had the required IT software to effectively gather the data to scrutinise the Service;
- Noted that LBTH (i) is building effective relationships with the staff that will transfer over; (ii) recognises the need to improve Service with better vehicles; (iii) acknowledges the need to ensure there are supervisors to monitor the performance; and (iv) will have Street Scene Neighbourhood Managers who will have oversight of how things are going in a particular neighbourhood.
- Noted the latest monitoring statistics will be provided once they are available in August.
- Wanted to see more meaningful figures on performance and how issues have been rectified (e.g. incomplete rounds);
- Noted that there had been a week slippage on making improvements at the Depot as costs had been higher than anticipated and therefore additional resources had to be allocated to the budget;
- Commented that Councils vehicle fleet is old, and needs replacing urgently and wished to know when the fleet would become as carbon neutral;
- Noted that LBTH are ensuring that future purchases of vehicles will meet the current standards and deliver the expected level. Whilst going forward the Service is looking at the developments within the market for capable Hybrids; Electric and Hydrogen powered vehicles. In addition, the Council wants to ensure that there is the necessary supporting infrastructure for the vehicle fleet to ensure the Council has a practical and well-regarded service.

As a result of discussions on the presentation the Chair Moved and it was:

**RESOLVED:**

To:

1. Receive updates on the progress towards ensuring that the waste; recycling and cleansing functions are carbon neutral by 2025;
2. Ensure that updates on missed bin collections are sent every quarter to the Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment;
3. Receive written assurances from Human Resources on the progress regarding the transfer of the Service back in house (i.e. the TUPE arrangements); and
4. Ensure that the details of the revised waste collection schedule are shared with the Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment.

**8. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**8.1 OSC Work Programme Report**

The Work Programme was agreed subject to the addition of the Partnership Agreement for the provision of Mental Health and Learning Disabilities Services in Tower Hamlets as part of the pre-decision scrutiny of the September Cabinet papers.

The Committee also noted the positive feed-back that had been received on the OSC Work Programme from the local community.

**9. VERBAL UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS**

**Councillor Dipa Das Scrutiny Lead for Housing & Regeneration**

- Noted that at the first meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 the Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Sub Committee had considered (i) the Fire Safety Scrutiny Review Action Plan; (ii) the proposed amendments to Tower Hamlets CHR Allocations Scheme; and (iii) the Social Housing Landlords Performance Report – Quarter 4 2018/19. In addition, it had been decided that implementation of Homeless Reduction Act one year on should be the challenge session topic for 2019/20;
- Whilst at the next meeting the spotlight session would be focusing on High Streets and Town Centres with reference to supporting new and existing business;
- The Lead Member had informed the Committee that she had, had a meeting with Corporate Director for Place Ann Sutcliffe and she had requested that a briefing to be provided on the delivery of 2,000 new home and Rent Levels; and

- It was noted that Cabinet at its meeting on the 31<sup>st</sup> July 2019 would be considering a report on the Strategic Review of Housing Management and once that is agreed the KPI's will be set.

### **Councillor Kahar Chowdhury Scrutiny Lead for Health & Adults**

- Noted that at the first meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2019 Health & Adults Scrutiny Sub Committee had received and considered (i) Healthy Life Expectancy in Tower Hamlets - Annual Public Health Report of the Director of Public Health 2018; (ii) the Work Programme and (iii) Adult Social Care Charging Impact Assessment and asked for feed-back on certain areas where it was felt clarity was required; and
- In September the Sub-Committee will be considering Childhood Obesity and All Age Physical Activity in order to review the actions that the Council has taken and review actions for future planning. Also agreeing the finding and recommendations of the 2018/19 Diabetes Challenge and imputing into the Health and Well Being Strategy

### **Councillor Alam Scrutiny Lead for Children & Education**

- Although absent she had asked that her congratulations on the Ofsted rating of the Council's Children's Services department as 'good' be placed on record which Ofsted had said was 'remarkable progress' and was committed to working with Children's Services to towards achieving "outstanding" in the very near future.

### **Councillor Bex White Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety & Environment**

- Noted that the Lead Member was currently working on the development of several coherent themes from within her portfolio;
- Noted that there had been three scoping session in preparation for the October challenge session on Safer Communities and how the Council; ward councillors and partner agencies can develop a meaningful infrastructure so that resident's voices are heard;
- Noted that the Lead Member had, had meetings Councillor David Edgar (Cabinet Member for Environment) on the Parking Review and Councillor Rachel Blake (Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Planning, Air Quality and Tackling Poverty) on the Air Quality Delivery Plan and the reasons for the move of the Air Quality Action Plan monitoring to the Health and Well-Being;
- Noted that the Lead Member was working with Councillor Asma Begum (Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Equalities) on improving engagement with Ward Councillors and resident to promote safer communities;
- Noted that the Lead Member is reviewing the Transport Strategy and the associated timeline/consultation process;

- Noted that the Lead Member was (i) looking at addressing food waste in high rises; (ii) in August will be undertaking a site visit to the Materials Recovery Facility in Bow and (iii) attending the Mayors Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour Board.

### **Councillor Tarik Khan Scrutiny Lead for Resources & Finance**

- Noted that the Lead Member had, had meetings with Neville Murton Corporate Director of Resources and Kevin Bartle, Director of Finance, Procurement and Audit. It was noted that consideration was now being given to the establishment of a Budget Monitoring Group at the end of September; and
- Was advised that the Lead Member had attended the Grants Determination (Cabinet) Sub-Committee on 3<sup>rd</sup> July and felt need to consider how best to look at the development of a meaningful relationship with the Sub-Committee. The Lead Member agreed to provide an outline of a potential way forward to all Committee Members.

## **10. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF UNRESTRICTED CABINET PAPERS**

The Committee received and noted those questions to be presented at Cabinet by the Chair in relation to unrestricted business on the agenda with reference to the Local Community Fund (LCF). Tania Shaikh Operations Director of the Attlee Centre and Peter Okali Chief Executive of Tower Hamlets Council for Voluntary Services (THCVS) were also in attendance and highlighted several points in relation to the LCF report.

Councillor Bex White left the meeting during the consideration of the LCF Report.

The Committee then asked a series of questions about LCF report and they may be summarised as follows:

The Committee

- Noted that the LCF report presented proposals for funding fifty projects to be run by voluntary and community sector (VCS) organisations through the Local Community Fund (LCF) for the period 1<sup>st</sup> October 2019 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023 amounting to £9.31m over the 42-month period;
- Noted that despite many councils reducing their funding for the voluntary and community sector, Tower Hamlets has protected the current level of spending investing £2.6m a year to fund LCF projects;
- Was concern at the situation in the Borough with particular reference to (i) the lack of adequate funding for the provision of staffed play provisions; (ii) those Services recommended for funding 0-18 are all focused on arts and sports (iii) Services for under 5s and their parents are missing, including the youngest with severe disabilities;

- Noted that the Third Sector have requested that this be looked in to with reference to (i) Free unstructured play; (ii) More spaces and affordable activities; and (iii) Information of where families can attend together to improve family life;
- Noted the importance of play on mental health, building resilience, improving concentration, healthy relationships and behaviour;
- Noted that play needs to be considered as separate from sports; arts; drama and culture;
- Noted that despite the high level of funding available, the programme was significantly oversubscribed with bids for 240 projects submitted by over 130 organisations totalling more than £10m a year. Which was almost four times the available budget and it was noted that has meant that some strong bids were unfortunately unsuccessful;
- Noted that the outcome of a review of the process undertaken by THCVS is awaited and LBTH will need to consider how it can assist in the leverage of funds from outside sources;
- Noted that THCVS has been tasked to support those groups through the process and establish a funder's forum and look at how LBTH can use its influence to leverage monies out of other funders;
- Noted that the intention was for funding to be aligned with the Councils priorities;
- Noted that LBTH as a Living Wage Funder is committed to tackle low pay by encouraging those organisations it funds to pay the real Living Wage to their employees;
- Noted with concern that the lack of successful bids which specifically target older people in the south of the borough and that this may have a disproportionate negative impact. However, it was noted that this would be monitored through the Council by regular analysis and development work with successful projects;
- Noted that in the longer term there is the potential that by not supporting some of the older peoples" services which are community led, particularly those led by people from BAME communities, services may have to close, and this day care could be lost;
- Noted that some smaller organisations had not been funded and it was felt that the spread of funding was very uneven e.g. Only one Somali group had been successful in getting funding through the LCF although officers are working to see how the Somali community can be represented in the funded groups;
- Noted that the process is about getting better outcomes for residents;
- Noted that the Council had encouraged bids by consortiums and recognised the value in consortium working and was not focused on a sector or group;
- Noted that there is concern that the funding is not in balance and regarding the many small community language groups, although the Councils small grants programme; the emergency fund and other potential sources for small grants will help such voluntary and community groups;

- Noted that the focus of the monitoring of the programme will be on outcomes and there will be the data to allow for continuous monitoring of the process by both the Cabinet and this Committee;
- Felt that more support was needed for organisations to provide them with leverage to get funds;
- Was not convinced that the commissioning out is this the most appropriate way to manage this process;
- Expressed the view that process needs to be looked at again and to consider (i) is the funding enough for there to be proper mitigation; (ii) how will the outcomes be measured; and (iii) how the funders forum will build groups capacity.

As a result of a full and wide-ranging discussion the Chair Moved and it was:

**RESOLVED:**

To:

1. Authorise the Chair Councillor James King and the Scrutiny Lead for Resources & Finance Councillor Tarik Khan after consultation with Overview and Scrutiny Committee Members to draft a letter for submission to the Mayor in Cabinet on 31st July regarding the Committees concerns about, and recommendations for, the proposed award of Tower Hamlets' Local Community Fund – (**Appendix B** refers); and
2. Requested that the pre-decision questions relating to the Cabinet papers (as set out in **Appendix A**) be presented to the Cabinet.

**11. ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT**

The Committee noted the closure of the 1 O'clock Club and asked for details of the rationale for this decision who authorised the closure?

**12. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

As the agenda circulated contained no exempt/confidential business and there was therefore no requirement to exclude the press and public to allow for its consideration.

**13. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

Nil items

**14. EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS 'CALLED IN'**

Nil items



**15. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL) CABINET PAPERS**

Nil items

**16. ANY OTHER EXEMPT/ CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

Nil items

**The meeting ended at 8.48 p.m.**

**Chair, Councillor James King  
Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

This page is intentionally left blank

**Overview & Scrutiny Pre Decision Questions**  
**29/07/2019**

<b>Cabinet Report</b>	<b>Questions / Responses</b>
<b>6.1 Outcome of recent Ofsted Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services (ILACS)</b>	1. For children returning home from care (Section 20 in OFSTED letter), how do we ensure the quality of practice is consistent?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>As with many other areas of practice the quality of intervention will be monitored through the individual supervision of Social Workers and more widely through the auditing of cases through our QA systems. With regard to the specific challenges raised by Ofsted, we did scrutinise cases ourselves at the time and agreed with inspectors that one of the key ways to improve the overall consistency of practice and planning in this particular area was to strengthen the work being undertaken by the Edge of Care Team. We also acknowledged the need to ensure that all cases where a decision was taken to return a child home was consistently scrutinised/signed off by a Senior Manager.</p> <p>Therefore we have re-issued guidance in relation to the over-sight of decision making for situations when children return home. We have also agreed to undertake a specific audit on cases in where Children do return home. This audit will take place in September and will be able to gauge if practice is strengthening/improving.</p>
<b>Cabinet Report</b>	<b>Questions / Responses</b>
<b>6.2 Local Community Fund</b>	1. How has the Council ensured that a fair and transparent process has been followed when awarding grants?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Co-design with the VCS at each stage of the process from inception to the point bids were invited from</p>

	<p>organisations has ensured transparency at every stage of the process. The LCF has had the highest level of engagement of the VCS of any TH funding programme.</p> <p>The assessment and scoring of the funding criteria designed by the council and the VCS has been executed by an external body using expert assessors drawn from a national pool as well as local specialists. Equalities monitoring of the assessor profile shows 75% female, 55% from BME communities and age profile majority 25-44. The process is part of council's internal audit programme for this year.</p> <p>The assessment criteria and scoring included in the Cabinet report Appendix E were developed with the VCS and published as part of the documentation for LCF bidders</p>
	<p>2. How does the Council support local organisations to bid and what measures have been identified to provide further support for unsuccessful (local) applications.</p> <p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The support programme undertaken by the council and Tower Hamlets Council for Voluntary Service to support bidders is set out in detail in the report (appendix C). Analysis of the participation of VCS organisations shows that 86% of the successful bidders took advantage of the support offered by the council and THCVS.</p> <p>The support programme for unsuccessful bidders is also set out in the report (paras 3.54 to 3.58). All unsuccessful bidders will be offered feedback and signposted to services provided by THCVS and other infrastructure organisations. Those previously funded by the council will be invited to discuss a transition action plan with their VCS Team contact officer drawing on various elements of the transition proposals as appropriate.</p> <p>3. As there were not as many applications for the health grant, will the amount of funding available for this area be allocated to areas which have received a significantly higher volume of applications?</p>

	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>All of the themes were significantly oversubscribed with more than sufficient quality bids to make effective use of the budget available.</p>
	<p>4. How has a Community Wealth building framework been applied to the Outcomes of the LCF and the awards against which these Outcomes will be delivered?</p>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The LCF has a strong local focus. A significant proportion of the assessment score was based on bids demonstrating local connection to ensure that, even where projects are managed by organisations with their main base outside the borough, the benefits, including the economic benefits, are retained in the borough as far as possible.</p> <p>All organisations have priced their bids on the basis of at least the London Living Wage for any staff working on LCF funded projects.</p>
	<p>5. Has a gender, BAME and localism audit been carried out against all of the applicants?</p>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The contract mobilisation stage will include target setting in relation to people with equality protected characteristics. Organisations will also be required to collect equalities monitoring data which will be reported annually.</p> <p>The assessment process included local connection and local impact. This is set out in detail in Appendix E of the report to Cabinet.</p>

	<p>6. What would the effect of a one year halt (or installation of a break clause) to the current award for the undertaking of further organisation audits be?</p>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The current MSG programme commenced in September 2015. There have been a few minor changes in the programme but essentially it is still based on the needs as assessed at that time. To continue the current programme for a further year would risk public funds being used less effectively to meet the current priority needs of local residents. It may also be perceived as being unfair to VCS organisations which are not currently funded by the council losing the opportunity of gaining support for their projects.</p> <p>The contract mobilisation process will confirm the due diligence checks carried out by the external assessors and support organisations to engage in continuous improvement.</p>
	<p>7. It's a great concern to that there is a gap (acknowledged in the equality assessment) in services for pregnancy and under 5's. Council strategy prioritises first 1001 days (i.e. conception to 2) and it is known that this is the most effective age of intervention to improve outcomes for children including reducing the need for care proceedings. It is much cheaper than any attempt to help older children.</p> <p>Some of the most needy families won't access Council run services as they fear that they will be seen as failing, the 3rd sector is in a privileged position as they are seen as less threatening, and we do have organisations who deliver to this group and weren't successful in their bids.</p> <p>Therefore:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How come there wasn't a requirement for this need to be met when assessing the bids?</li> <li>b. What will be done now to ensure that this gap is filled?</li> <li>c. How will we know that this will be done in a fair and transparent way?</li> <li>d. The way previous tendering happened ensured that this need was met so was this a failure of the current design?</li> </ol>

**Response**

- a. The provision of Early Help services was a priority in the LCF programme framework agreed by Cabinet in October 2018 (Theme 1 Scheme A). Organisations submitted bids to provide services in this priority area. However, only one was successful, the bid from Osmani. Maternal health and very early years development was not identified as a specific priority in the development of the LCF but it would fall within the broader Early Help priority.

The Equality Analysis identified that, while there is a recommended project which might address some of the issues around maternal health and very young children, there is no specific provision in the programme. This linked to the EA relating to age and the gap identified in services to support very early years (0-5).

- b. The proposed mitigation is that the council develops a specification for a low value tender for services to meet this need where, as the question implies, the VCS has a particular role to play.
- c. It would be consistent with the approach taken to the development of the LCF that the specification is co-designed with VCS providers. This should also ensure that the process is fair and transparent
- d. This need was not a specific priority in the MSG programme. Maternal health and early years development was within a broader strand, 'Vulnerable and Excluded'. However, it was not a specific priority or outcome in the specification. The response of the VCS to the specification for the Vulnerable and Excluded strand produced projects which include within their scope maternal health and very early years development, and the Commissioners agreed to fund some of them.

<b>6.3 Strategic Review of Tower Hamlets Homes</b>	<p>780 and 300 residents responded to the online and telephone surveys respectively. A comprehensive analysis of the outcome of the surveys is included in Appendix 1.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where can I find the full survey results mentioned in Appendix 1 (which is the Altair review)? There is a word cloud type summary of telephone &amp; email responses in Appendix 2. But none of the online responses. There does not appear to be an aggregate summary of responses in reports.</li> <li>2. Can a decision be taken if the full set of consultations surveys are not in the public domain?</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The full survey results can made available by contacting the ALMO Client Team on <a href="mailto:Housing.Strategy@towerhamlets.gov.uk">Housing.Strategy@towerhamlets.gov.uk</a></li> <li>2. It is considered sufficient to provide the Cabinet with a summary of the survey responses.</li> </ol>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Why were only 197 residents consulted and did they represent a demographic cross sections (including of residents and leaseholders) of THH tenants?</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The consultation on the review of Tower Hamlets Homes was undertaken with all tenants and leaseholders totalling circa 22,000. In supporting this process, the Mayor sent a letter to all residents seeking their views on the future arrangement of housing services. Residents were asked to provide comments to <a href="mailto:Housing.Strategy@towerhamlets.gov.uk">Housing.Strategy@towerhamlets.gov.uk</a> or they could phone 020 7364 7037. On expiry of the deadline, a total of 197 residents responded by email or telephone made up of 85 leaseholders and 74 tenants. 38 residents did not identify their tenure type.</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. What was the response to Mayor's letter to residents?</li> </ol>



	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Of the 74 tenants expressing a clear view, 54% were in favour of the review recommendation to extend the Management Agreement with THH. Of the 85 leaseholders expressing a clear view 30% were in favour of the review recommendation to extend the Management Agreement with THH.</p> <p>Tenants who raised concerns about existing services primarily identified the inconsistencies in the advice they receive from THH staff. Tenants also expressed dissatisfaction with the repairs service, the contractors' approaches, and resultant experiences. In contrast, leaseholders raised concerns around lack of clarity of service charge invoices, capital programme consultation and delivery, incremental services charges and insurance. Overall, there was positive recognition of improvements in the services THH provides by both tenants and leaseholders although management of ASB had mixed views. Residents also want THH to be held more accountable for service failures, and for the Council to scrutinise THH's performance further, and to engage further with residents.</p>
	<p>5. What are the next steps of the process for renewing THH's contract? Will there be a consultation? How will KPIs be set? The paper isn't clear.</p> <p>Specifically there need to be KPIs on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improving Communications;</li> <li>- Creating Value for Money; and</li> <li>- Quality of Repairs.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>A steering group chaired by the Corporate Director Place has been set up to oversee the process of renewing the MA with THH.</p> <p>THH and LBTH agree KPIs annually as prescribed by the current MA. There are a total of 22 Business Critical</p>

	Indicators cross cutting the whole housing service provided by THH including resident's satisfaction and VFM.
	6. With only 10 out of 22 KPIs being met, will a new or improved contract monitoring mechanism be put in place?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Target has been achieved for eight BCIs [47%], with a further five [29%] close to target. Performance was particularly strong in the following areas:</p> <p>Income collection [both rental and service charge]; Housing Service Centre; Caretaking; Capital works [both satisfaction and programme delivery.</p> <p>The five BCIs close to target are 5% or lower. Measures exist for improvement to meet the target at the end of the financial year. Remainder of the BCIs are annually measured, therefore the respective performance will be evaluated at the end of the financial year.</p>
<b>6.4. Air Quality Action Plan Update on Progress</b>	1. (3.24) What is the proposed timeline for reviewing this action to ensure that the council's lobbying of TfL is harmonised with the Liveable Streets, School Streets and other local road design improvement schemes? Have any demands more stretching than reprioritisation been considered, for example charging for journeys that don't originate or terminate in the borough?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>A delivery plan for the air quality action plan is currently being developed. This will be addressed as part of that.</p> <p>The draft Transport Strategy commits the Council to exploring the potential to introduce new travel demand management measures to reduce motorised through-traffic in the borough including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with TfL and neighbouring boroughs to develop proposals for the next generation of road</li> </ul>

	<p>user charging;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using our membership of Silvertown Tunnel Implementation Group to press TfL to make sure charging of Blackwall and Silvertown tunnels is set to reduce the environmental impact and the volume of traffic travelling through the borough;</li> <li>• Progressing the implementation of a workplace parking levy in Tower Hamlets subject to a feasibility study.</li> </ul>
	2. How has the Council promoted the air Text service?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Promoted on the Council's Breathe Clean webpage  <a href="https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/environment_and_waste/environmental_health/pollution/air_quality/Breathe_Clean.aspx">https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/environment_and_waste/environmental_health/pollution/air_quality/Breathe_Clean.aspx</a></p>
	3. How many penalty enforcements have been made as part of the anti-idling campaign?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>To date 29 separate locations in the borough have had anti-idling enforcement visits and 128 drivers have been observed to be idling. No fixed penalty notice (FPN) has been issued as the legislation requires an FPN can only be issued if a driver refuses to turn off their engine when requested to do so by an authorised officer. All of the drivers spoken to have complied. They were subsequently given an information leaflet on idling.</p>
	4. Are there plans for a further Air Quality action fund?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>No. This will require a further growth bid.</p>

	5. Has an AQ audit been done at Woolmore primary school
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>No. Funding for school audits is provided by the GLA. The GLA shortlist the schools to be audited as part of their school air quality audit programme. In 2017/18 two primary schools (Marner and Bonner) and in 2018/19 two nursery schools (Alice Model and Columbia Market Nursery) were selected for audit.</p>
	6. Please confirm the "green wall" mentioned in the report by the A12 is not a green wall but a metal wall mainly designed to reduce noise pollution
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>This is an additional green wall funded by a grant from the Tower Hamlets Mayor's Air Quality fund, the 'Poplar Detox Moss Wall' on Bryon Place (off Zetland Street)</p>
<p><b>Item 6.5c</b>  <b>Appendix 3 -</b>  <b>Risk</b>  <b>Assessment -</b>  <b>Local</b>  <b>Biodiversity</b>  <b>Action Plan</b>  <b>20119-24</b></p>	1. What happens if the Local Biodiversity Action Plan is in conflict with Councils strategy to deliver 2,000 new homes, should this not be on the risk register? i.e. Limehouse Triangle
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>There is very rarely a conflict between biodiversity and development (including housing) in the Borough. On the contrary, new development is one of the main implementation mechanisms for the Local Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> <p>On the rare occasions when biodiversity and housing development are in conflict, the development</p>

	<p>management process has to consider relevant policies in the Local Plan, and make a decision based on those policies. It is usually possible to mitigate or compensate for impacts on biodiversity, and end up with a net gain. The Local Biodiversity Action Plan provides guidance on the sort of mitigation and compensation which is most appropriate in such cases.</p> <p>In the specific case of the Limehouse Triangle (Locksley site D), the combination of a biodiverse green roof, features for biodiversity in the landscaping, and enhancements for biodiversity elsewhere on the estate will be sufficient to ensure net gains in biodiversity in line with the Local Biodiversity Acton Plan.</p>
<b>Item 6.6a Appendix 1 - Children and Families Strategy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there any analysis of numbers of children who leave TH as they grow older (families moving out to more family friendly areas?). Demographics of children do not match demographics of adult population and we also have a below average number of children?</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The consequences of demographic change and demand for school places is currently under consideration.</p>
<b>6.7 Response to OSC’s Challenge Session Recommendatio ns: Communications</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In regards to <b>Recommendation 4</b>, the ward-specific element of communication with members appears to have been lost. What will be done to ensure both a culture and a system that promote information-sharing with ward councillors? This links to the second part of <b>Recommendation 5</b>, which rightly says that “People need to include [ward councillors] when circulating information about [consultations]. How will we ensure that this actually happens?”</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>On <b>Recommendation 4</b>: This is being looked at as part of the Strengthening Local Democracy work being led by the Monitoring Officer and supported by the General Purposes Committee. Some of the elements they are looking at includes making changes to the Members Hub so there is a mechanism where directorates can update members on issues in their wards.</p>

	<p>On <b>Recommendation 5</b>: There may also be opportunities with the new Consultation Hub (online portal) we are bringing in to have automatic notification to members on consultations.</p>
<p><b>Item 6.8 Proposed additions to the local list</b></p>	<p>1. Are there plans to reopen this process for additional buildings to be added to the local list in another tranche in the future?</p>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Yes, this is addressed in paragraph 3.4 of the Cabinet report, which states that:</p> <p><i>“Nominations for the local list can be made throughout the year. Officers will review nominations on the first of October each year and will refer appropriate ones to the local list selection panel. A six week public consultation will be held before a final decision is made, by Cabinet, about which buildings will be added to the local list.”</i></p> <p>Details of how to nominate a building for inclusion on the list can be found on the council’s website.</p>
<p><b>6.9 Revised Commercial Property Lettings and Disposals Procedure</b></p>	<p>1. Where is the democratic oversight when the Executive decides to lease buildings to community groups, how can we know what has been leased to whom and for how much? it exists for disposals but not lettings which is inconsistent</p>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Under the Council’s scheme of delegation, officers have authority to agree terms for leases, up to the threshold value. This applies to all Council property, including community buildings as well as the commercial portfolio. Information in respect of a new lease of a particular property or group of properties can be provided to Members on request. Some leases are subject to Community Benefit Rent Reduction. Decisions on rent</p>

	reductions are reported to the Grants Determination Sub-Committee.
<b>6.10. Land to the West of Virginia Street - London Docks School</b>	1. If this is a DfE free school imposed on TH by the DfE then shouldn't the DfE hold the lease and pay for the costs of the school?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>No this is not a DfE Free school; the Education Department (following a consultation process) is hoping to appoint Mulberry Trust to operate this school.</p>
<b>6.11. Angela Court, 315 Burdett Road; Lease to Mulberry Housing Society</b>	1. Can you provide a breakdown of who sits on the Mulberry Housing Society Board and detail how many members are Tower Hamlets residents?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The Members of the Mulberry Housing Society Board are Michael Tyrrell, Ken Jones, Syed Uddin, Ann Sutcliffe and Mark Baigent. Syed Uddin is a local resident.</p>
	2. What other housing associations offered to acquire these properties?
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>It is understood that Canary Wharf Group sought offers from a number of Registered Providers. The Council did not ask for, and was not provided with, the identities of the RPs involved.</p>
	3. Why did Canary Wharf Group pick an offshoot of the Council to acquire these properties?

	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The property has been acquired by the Council. The Cabinet report contains the recommendation that the Council grants a lease of the property to Mulberry Housing Society. The Council submitted a bid to acquire the property to Canary Wharf Group. After due consideration Canary Wharf Group decided to accept the Council's bid.</p>
<p><b>6.12 Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q1</b></p>	<p>1. In regards to the <b>Community Safety underspend</b> - can we have confirmation that the delays in police deployment relate to the previously advised MET recruitment issues, and not to matters in the control of the Council?</p>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The Council funded police team (Partnership Task Force - PTF) has been operating at 50% capacity since September 2018. The Council has made a number of representations and sought reassurance from the MPS BCU Commander and the Deputy Assistant Commissioner, to provide officers up to the full complement of 4 sergeants and 20 constables to deal with the neighbourhood issues that impact on residents. Unfortunately due to a shortage of overall police officers the decision has been to prioritise safeguarding posts. In addition the council has offered to support a local recruitment campaign to attract police officers to the Metropolitan Police. The matter is out of the control of the council.</p>
	<p>2. Why did the Council not consider taking over the free holder arrangements for Aberfeldy provision in order to create a long term rental income stream (which other local authorities have done</p>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Previously it had been agreed that NHS Property Services would be the freeholder and would lead the fit-out of the premises, but the practice in question preferred an alternative model of delivery, in order to realise potential benefits of an integrated service with a community provider in Poplar Harca. Poplar Harca are the existing freeholder on the adjacent community space site as well as community café space. Plans are in place to</p>



	<p>discuss how we strengthen the integrated health and healthcare landscape with enhanced services to provide better community healthcare. This change will enhance the programme delivery.</p> <p>LBTH are reviewing future opportunities where the council taking over freeholds could be beneficial.</p>
<p><b>6.13 MTFS Refresh and 2020-21 Budget Planning</b></p>	<p>1. What is the scope for budget consultation to be brought forward in future years and/or done in two phases: initial outline and one on more detailed proposals?</p>
	<p><b>Response</b></p> <p>Budget consultation is initially focussed on the budget quantum rather than individual proposals which allows for Members to take into account the views of both statutory consultees (businesses) and other interested stakeholder, such as residents, whilst deliberating on the budget. The timing for budget consultation therefore has a certain reliance on confirmation of funding arrangements from central government.</p> <p>However, it is possible for Council's to engage in a pre-consultation phase of activities that inform on the impact on areas of the budget informed by stakeholder groups. A recent Best Practice Budget Consultation workshop was attended by finance, and Strategy, policy and Performance staff which will be used to review the approach in Tower Hamlets.</p> <p>None of this precludes or replaces the detailed consultation required on proposals for service change before they are implemented.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Tower Hamlets Town Hall  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Mulberry Place  
5 Clove Crescent  
E14 2BG

Tower Hamlets Town Hall  
1st Floor Mulberry Place  
5 Clove Crescent  
London E14 2BG

[www.towerhamlets.gov.uk](http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk)

31st July 2019

Dear Candida and John,

### **Tower Hamlets' Local Community Fund 2019-2023**

We are writing to you to put on record our concerns about, and recommendations for, the proposed award of Tower Hamlets' Local Community Fund (LCF). We have put these in writing in order to elicit a formal response from yourselves.

Primarily, we are concerned that the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) identified several areas where the award does not meet the desired outcomes originally set out for the Fund. These include the Fund reaching:

- Older people, especially in the south of the Borough;
- BAME led community organisations;
- Somali groups;
- Carers;
- Young or new families with complex lives; and
- Addressing the health and wellbeing of young people.

Additionally, we are concerned that no awards have been made to organisations that deliver play or community language learning. The latter is particularly disappointing as many organisations that deliver this were encouraged to apply as a safeguard against the proposed closure of the council's Community Language funding.

We are concerned that the commissioned funding, being implemented to plug the gaps found by the EIA, will be too little and too late. We were assured that £180,000 was available to be awarded by October 2019. However, we have received no assurances that this award will be enough to achieve the desired outcomes not reached in the original LCF award.

That is why we would like to recommend the Cabinet:

- Publish information about the unsuccessful bids which would have met the standards set out in the EIA;
- Ensure additional commissioned funding goes through the same scrutiny process as the rest of the LCF award; and
- Engage other funding organisations operating in the Borough, to increase the funding pot to help fill in funding gaps for future bids.

We are also concerned that larger institutions seem to have benefited from the LCF award, to the detriment of the patchwork of smaller groups that deliver on a more local level.

Throughout the process it has been feared that the 'outcomes based' focus of the LCF and its more stringent application processes, would benefit charities able to dedicate resources to research and bid writing. And looking at the list of successful bids for the LCF, this has been borne out.

We recommend:

- Closely monitoring the geographical spread of successful bids across the Borough, ensuring there is no concentration in one particular area;
- Reviewing the transition funding of groups previously funded by the Mainstream Grants Process, who will not receive an award under the LCF; and
- Create task funder forums, to help build the capacity and expertise of BAME-led and smaller organisations, to assist in creating bids for funding opportunities in the future.

We have also included some general recommendations for how the whole process can be improved before the next round of funding goes out to tender before being awarded in 2023:

- Promote the Fund to organisations which work within protected characteristics, to actively encourage them to bid;
- Make sure there is a robust equalities framework, which ensures the most disadvantaged benefit from the programme;
- Begin a new commission for the outside body which receives applications and makes funding recommendations;
- Review alternatives to the 'outcomes-based' approach for the assessment of bids;
- Add an additional review stage into the future grant funding process, to improve scrutiny and allow time to mitigate issues with the original recommendation;
- Engage other large funding organisations (like those based in the City of London, religious institutions, corporate donors etc.) to boost the size of the Local Community Fund (or its successor) or better align their giving with the priorities and desired outcomes of the borough. And;
- Do away with requirements to fully fund projects to help facilitate the above.

Tower Hamlets' stark inequalities and the sheer number of communities both defined by geography and demographic, mean we have a unique third and charitable sector. The Borough should be doing all it can to protect and promote this. Whatever the outcome of the award, we will continue to monitor its delivery through the Grants Determination Committee.

Yours sincerely,



Cllr Tarik Khan  
Scrutiny Lead for Resources & Finance



Cllr James King  
Chair, Overview & Scrutiny Committee