

Item 6.1 Refresh of Tower Hamlets Substance Misuse Strategy 2020-2025	
Questions	Response
<p>Question: £1.5m on drug prevention. How much of this will be on street enforcement?</p>	<p>The £1.5m highlighted for drug prevention includes spend of approximately £925k on the Drug Interventions Programme (DIP). The DIP targets those engaged in crime and/or drug & alcohol related anti-social behaviour with the aim of supporting them into treatment. A further £82k partly funds our commissioned Reset outreach/referral service. This service engages with hard to reach communities including those who are street homeless, to engage them in treatment.</p>
Item 6.2 Award of Contracts for the Support Service in Three Hostels for the Single Homeless	
Questions	Response
<p>Question: What consideration has been made to the expansion of hostel spaces in Tower Hamlets in the face of the homelessness crisis we are facing?</p>	<p>The directorate currently spends £4.872 million per annum on accommodation based and floating support services for residents who are experiencing homelessness or rough sleeping. There are 452 hostel beds in the borough commissioned by the Council. This compares with 200 beds in Hackney, 163 in Newham, 430 in Westminster and 652 in Camden. We work in partnership with our hostel providers to continually look for improvements to hostel provision and to ensure that residents progress through the pathway into more stable independent living.</p>
<p>Question: Will anti ASB/drug dealing covenants be drawn up with Providence Row for each hostel as part of the Service Level Agreement</p>	<p>There is a good working arrangement between hostels and all agencies working with ASB. Multi-agency meetings have been established including hostel providers, the police, ASB team, DAAT, rough sleeping team and hostels usually have</p>

	<p>good relationships with local residents associations. We will monitor how well these arrangements deal with the local issues</p>
<p>Question: How have local GP services been engaged in the contracting process? Practices receive funding for patients that live in their catchment for 2 consecutive quarters- which often isn't the case for the homeless/hostel population they treat.</p>	<p>GP services work closely with our hostel providers and do provide support for residents within hostels, however long they are resident for. In addition, the CCG commission a specialist primary care service – Health E1 – which supports hostels and rough sleepers.</p>
<p>Item 6.3 Adoption of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing the Benefits</p>	
<p>Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>Appendix 3 for Adoption of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031: Managing Growth and Sharing the Benefits Millennium Quarter Public Realm Guidance Manual is to be revoked and removed from the website Question: Given that these documents are much more detailed than anything in the Local Plan and have never been fully implemented, why are they obsolete?</p>	<p>Appendix 3 of the Cabinet report sets out the reasons supplementary planning guidance has been revoked, and this will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guidance being superseded by more up-to-date policy - Guidance has informed more recent policy being adopted - Guidance has already been implemented on sites which have been developed out <p>With regard to the Draft Millennium Quarter Public Realm (MQPR) Guidance Manual, this was prepared to inform The Millennium Quarter Masterplan which was revoked upon the adoption of the South Quay Masterplan.</p> <p>Background The Draft Millennium Quarter Public Realm (MQPR) Guidance Manual (2008) was prepared prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy (2010) and as such, was subsequently adopted as interim planning guidance.</p>

	<p>When the Millennium Quarter Masterplan (2000) was revoked on 6/10/2015 following the adoption of the South Quay Masterplan as a supplementary planning document (SPD) (2015), the draft MQPR guidance manual (2008) was retained so as to continue being used to inform development across the South Quay area.</p> <p>The main purpose of the draft MQPR Guidance Manual was to provide attractive, uncluttered and accessible for all whilst seamlessly integrating public and privately owned land and new public open space. The main principles set out in the manual provide the framework for delivering the vision for MQ streetscene such as: tree lined boulevard, enhance and preserve dockside promenade and enhancing paving surfaces.</p> <p>The following headings below outlines the aims/principles of the draft MQPR Guidance Manual and how it has informed or been reflected in the new Local Plan and the adopted IoD SP OAPF.</p> <p>Two site allocations in the new Local Plan, Marsh Wall West and Millharbour South, cover the same boundary as the area covered by the draft MQPR guidance.</p> <p><u>Strategic Design approach</u> <u>Principles/aims</u></p>
--	---

	<p>Identifies movement strategy with clear defined routes for pedestrians/cyclist and vehicles.</p> <p>The two site allocations, Marsh Wall West and Millharbour South, set out and define a new movement strategy with greater priority for pedestrians and cyclists. This movement strategy is more up to date with identified development parcels and sites which have been developed since the draft MQPR was produced.</p> <p><u>Design & layout guidance</u> <u>Principles/aims</u></p> <p>This section provides guidance for the detailed design and layout of public realm. Prescriptive guidance on how the Streets and paths (highways – adopted or private) should be laid out and how they relate to adjacent private developments. The two site allocations specify design principles and delivery considerations which developments are expected to respond to and address.</p> <p>The detailed guidance within the MQPR guidance is prescriptive and the Council would have to rely on s106 contributions secured through the now revoked Millennium Quarter Masterplan for the highway design principles to be delivered. Also given that CIL has now replaced s106 since the production of the Guidance, design principles and aims within the Guidance would be much harder to</p>
--	--

	<p>achieve.</p> <p>Much of the prescriptive design guidance is outside the development sites and applied to the Council's own adopted highways. This is considered to be too prescriptive for the Council and has no direct funding mechanism to deliver it now.</p> <p>It should be further noted that the Local Plan states that 'Development should accord with the design principles set out in the latest supplementary guidance for South Quay'.</p> <p>The relevant SPG for South Quay in this instance would be Isle of Dogs OAPF (IoD OAPF) adopted in October 2019 by the GLA. There are design criteria that developments would need to have regard to in light of this up-to-date guidance.</p> <p><u>Materials and specification</u> <u>Principles/aims</u></p> <p>Sets out prescriptive street furniture specifications such Seating, bollards, bins, cycle stands, bus shelters, wayfinding, lighting, surface treatment, types of trees.</p> <p>The Local Plan or the IoD OAPF does not detail prescriptive specification of street further etc. within the two site allocations as it is not considered appropriate. In addition, product and design as specified have moved on and evolved</p>
--	--

	<p>since the guidance was produced over 10 years ago. For instance implementing TfL’s standardised Legible London signs/wayfinding which are consistent across the whole of London that would be more appropriate rather than that identified in the MQPR Guidance.</p> <p><u>Maintenance guidance manual</u> <u>Principles/aims</u></p> <p>Provides strategy for maintenance and management of public realm spaces, such as how often bins needs to be collected and how often pavements needs to be cleaned/swept.</p> <p>The Local Plan and IoD OAPF do not specify any prescriptive management strategy; however, the highway authority would have a strategic management strategy for their own assets, and an estate management strategy is usually secured through a development management process via s.106 and/or planning condition. This would ensure that the quality of the public realm is retained and maintained.</p>
<p>Item 6.4 Adoption of the Tower Hamlets Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule</p>	
<p>Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>1. Question: What consideration has been put into tightening up the local plan to make it harder for HMOs (accommodation described as co-living) to receive planning permission?</p>	<p>HMO: The new Local Plan introduces a new policy on housing with shared facilities (HMOs) - policy D.H7. This policy covers both smaller traditional HMOs (use class C4) as well as larger HMOs often described as co-living (sui generis use</p>

	<p>class).</p> <p>The policy has been introduced to address two trends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conversion of existing housing into smaller HMOs (due to permitted development rights enabling this); and• A context of increasing market interest in the provision of this form of housing designed to meet the large growth of multi-adult households both locally and in London, which has been broadly supported in the GLA's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (2016) and emerging London Plan. <p>The policy seeks to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The scheme meets an identified need with regards to both the specific scheme and its location. This is to prevent the oversupply of this form of housing.• The scheme doesn't result in the loss of existing larger housing suitable for family accommodation.• The scheme is of a high residential quality and well managed, so it is built as, and remains, a high quality living environment and does not have amenity impacts on neighbours. <p>In addition, a key policy objective is for the development to deliver the borough's priority need for affordable housing. The policy acknowledges that some traditional HMOs do provide a form of affordable housing, in particular for people in</p>
--	---

	<p>receipt of the shared-room rate housing benefit. However the majority of the new style of larger HMOs do not meet this need and must therefore contribute towards the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>In recognition that this type of housing could come forward on a large site which could accommodate a range of housing types, the Local Plan policy requires all large-scale HMO / co-living schemes to deliver affordable housing according to the same hierarchy as all housing developments: Priority to deliver on-site self-contained (i.e. conventional flats and houses) affordable housing, if this is demonstrably not possible the scheme should deliver off-site self-contained affordable housing and only if this is also not demonstrably possible can the scheme provide a payment in lieu.</p> <p>The emerging London Plan only requires all large-scale HMO/ co-living schemes to provide a payment in lieu for the delivery of conventional affordable housing.</p> <p>To support the implementation of this HMO policy, the Council is in the process of adopting an 'article 4 direction' which will prevent the use of permitted development rights for the change of use from dwelling houses (class C3) to small houses in multiple occupation (class C4).</p> <p>The process to implement an article 4 direction is</p>
--	---

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 27 11 2019

	<p>lengthy, but was agreed by the Mayor in Cabinet on July 24th 2019, with consultation held during August and September 2019. The article 4 direction will be presented to Cabinet on January 29th 2020 for confirmation and the direction will come into force one year on from that confirmation. Once the article 4 is in place, any change of use from dwelling houses (class C3) to small houses in multiple occupation (class C4) will be subject to the new Local Plan Policy described above.</p>
<p>2. Question: Is the Local Plan not amended too much that it now needs another round of Public Consultation?</p>	<p>The process of consultation on the Local Plan has been thorough, and undertaken in line with the statutory requirements. The key stages in the development of the plan, and the relevant consultation processes that accompanied each stage are set out in the Table 1 (after paragraph 3.3) of the Cabinet report.</p> <p>The most recent stage of consultation was the ‘main modifications’ consultation which took place between 25 March and 9 May 2019. This consulted on the proposed main modifications that emerged as part of the Local Plan examination process. The final decision on which modifications should be implemented belonged to the inspector of the plan, and these modifications are set out and explained in full in her final report. A number of minor modifications were proposed at the same time, but these did not need to be consulted on, being typographical and grammar corrections, and other minor changes for clarity. The final decision</p>

	<p>as to what represented a ‘main’ or ‘minor’ modification rested with the inspector. The majority of the proposed main modifications were accepted in the inspector’s final report, with only minor changes to some of the proposed modifications. These changes are set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MM6 – for the Canary Wharf Tall Building Zone Principles, the following sentence was removed: “The silhouette of One Canada Square should be clearly visible in all relevant strategic views and borough designated views, as defined in policy D.DH4”• MM31 – in the monitoring indicators related to A5 hot food takeaway uses, the inspector has added “and/or a local authority owned leisure centre” as a facility that an A5 use should not be placed within 200 metres of (in addition to schools)• MM33 – new modification added by the inspector, to amend the boundary of the Reuters site allocation to omit the data centre• MM34 – new modification added by the inspector, to amend the boundary of the Skyline of Strategic Importance designation so that it accords with the boundary of the Canary Wharf Tall Building Zone designation <p>With regards to the CIL examination, the revised draft charging schedule was submitted for examination on 25 May 2019 – after the end of the Local Plan main modifications consultation. The inspector in the CIL examination was aware of what had taken place at the Local Plan</p>
--	--

	<p>examination, and would have had access to the proposed main modifications that had been consulted on. Indeed, reference to the modified version of the Local Plan is made in the CIL inspector’s final report. While the CIL inspector could not have access to the Local Plan inspector’s final report, which was released after the conclusion of the CIL examination, it is clear that they had a knowledge and understanding of what modifications were proposed to the Local Plan at this time, and examined the CIL charging schedule on this basis.</p> <p>Given the minor nature of the changes between the main modifications proposed in the consultation and those eventually implemented by the Local Plan inspector, and given the fact that these changes do not appear to impinge on development viability in any way, it is not considered necessary to re-consult on the CIL charging schedule. There is no reference in the CIL inspector’s final report to modifications MM6 or MM31, to tall building zones, to A5 uses, or to the Reuters site allocation – and these are the only issues where changes have been made after the close of the CIL examination.</p>
<p>3. The London Borough of Tower Hamlets will retain 5% of CIL charges for monitoring and administrative purposes in accordance with the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).</p> <p>(A) Question: Will LBTH always retain 5% of CIL even if that exceeds the direct monitoring and administrative costs incurred?</p>	<p>No, The Council is not required to use the whole 5% and the actual percentage used may vary</p>

<p>(B) Question: If yes to question 1 what will the excess ‘profit’ be spent on?</p> <p>(C) Question: If yes to the question 1 how will the funding deficit be filled if only 95% of CIL will be spent on infrastructure?</p>	<p>between years, depending on the amount received. Any of the 5% unused for administration is required to be returned to the ‘main CIL pot’ for use on the delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>CIL is paid to the Council in either one or two phases within six months of the commencement of development. Individual payments for large developments can exceed £5m. This means that income from CIL is not regular, but is subject to peaks and troughs, resulting in annual income that varies significantly and therefore so does the annual value of the administrative 5%. Further, Government CIL Regulations state that income received as the administrative 5% must be spent only in the year it is received. The result is that the cost of the administering CIL as a percentage of income varies from year to year.</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Additional funding for infrastructure includes national and regional funding e.g. Government Grants such as for schools, Housing Infrastructure Fund administered by Central Government, Strategic Infrastructure Pot administered by City of London on behalf of London Councils, a range of GLA and TfL funding sources and additional S106 obligations.</p>
---	--

Item 6. 5 Update Report on recommendations for the future delivery of Contract Services	
Questions	Response
Question: Do we have a list of providers who currently provide or could	The resource pack circulated to Health Scrutiny

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 27 11 2019

<p>provide a meals on wheels type service to residents, for example Husseys the butchers in Wapping support a number of local residents</p>	<p>Committee members describes the main alternative provision to the Welfare Meals service. There is a huge range of alternatives, so the resource pack does not include everything. In addition to the resource pack, we expect social care practitioners working in our locality teams to have knowledge of specific local alternatives.</p>
<p>Question: 4.2.15 ii Electric vehicle van hire: Can we not use this electric van elsewhere, as far as I know it is one of only a handful or perhaps the only one used by LBTH despite having declared a climate emergency</p>	<p>We will explore options across the Council for the alternative use of the electric van.</p>
<p>Question: How many new service users have been referred to the Meals on Wheels service in each of the past five years?</p>	<p>Written response to follow</p>
<p>Question: Why the full Equalities Impact Assessment mentioned in para 6.1 has not been published alongside the report, and if that will now be done?</p>	<p>The Equalities Impact Assessment is a working document that is reviewed regularly to identify and mitigate any impacts identified. The document has been circulated to Health Scrutiny Committee members and can be made available as necessary. As the report to Cabinet is an update report, related documents have been referenced but have not been published alongside.</p>
<p>Question: Why have existing service users been told this service is ending before any decision on its future has been taken by the Mayor in Cabinet?</p>	<p>The Mayor in Cabinet discussed the future of the service following a February 2019 Cabinet report entitled 'Recommendations for the Future Delivery of Contract Services'. Following this, Recommendation 8 in the report was carried out: "Undertake further work collectively to assess alternative delivery options and the future operation/function of the CPU". Engagement with current service users was carried out as part of this. The work resulted in an agreed approach of individual reviews to support people to receive meals from an alternative source. We do not view this to be a separate key decision to be made by</p>

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 27 11 2019

	<p>the Mayor in Cabinet. The explanation for this view is articulated in the answer to the below question 'Why is the decision to end the meals on wheels service not considered a key decision. Existing service users were sent a letter to inform them of the planned change.</p>
<p>Question: Why the effective closure of the Meals on Wheels service was not subject to public consultation?</p>	<p>The Council is not ceasing providing support around meals but changing how support is provided to make it better aligned with the requirements of the Care Act to promote independence, choice and control. This approach helps build resilience and find personalised solutions for people.</p> <p>A range of approaches to engagement and consultation were considered and an individual and personal approach was agreed, focused on the 160 people directly affected by the change. The changes being made will continue to meet individual needs. Measures have been put in place to ensure the impact of these changes is not detrimental. Concentrating our efforts on the individuals and talking through alternative options is a proportionate approach and more likely to result in the best outcome for them.</p>
<p>Question: Why is the decision to end the meals on wheels service not considered a key decision?</p>	<p>We do not view this decision to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards or electoral divisions. This is because the decision does not mean that service users stop receiving meals, but rather it changes the way that meals</p>

	<p>are provided. The resource pack outlines some of the large range of alternatives available to people. We do not consider these alternatives to result in a significant material impact, impact on wellbeing or impact on the quality of service received. The Equality Analysis identifies the barriers people might experience in accessing these alternatives, and concludes that mitigating actions are in place to overcome them.</p> <p>The February 2019 Cabinet report ('Recommendations for the Future Delivery of Contract Services') includes the following recommendation, which was subsequently agreed: "Recommendation 8: In partnership with Adult Services undertake further work collectively to assess alternative delivery options and the future operation/function of the CPU. The findings of this work will be the subject of a future report to Cabinet".</p>
<p>Question: 101 reviews have been undertaken and only 12 solutions have been identified. Are there alternatives realistically available and deliverable by March, 2020?</p>	<p>We are making good progress and most of the alternative arrangements will be in place by January. It is important people are given a bit of time to adjust where required and that new arrangements are implemented at the correct pace. There are processes to identify complex cases and the type of support they require. All cases will have new arrangements by February 2020.</p>
<p>Item 6.6 Scrutiny Report - Improving health, environmental quality, economic and social outcomes through Housing Open Spaces</p>	
<p>Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>

Question: Given the scrutiny report will LBTH now commit to not building on any housing open space that it owns?

No. The objective of the joint scrutiny review was to improve health, environmental quality, economic and social outcomes through Housing Open Spaces. In delivering the joint scrutiny review, members of the joint scrutiny panel agreed to review good practices and policies in housing open space management.

Key issues of importance arising during the review were:

- Improving the quality of open spaces
- Enhancing bio diversity
- Improving connectivity to open spaces
- Place making

The joint panel agreed that in a borough with a growing population, where the lack of affordable housing is one of 3 top resident concerns, c.19, 000+ people are on the housing register, there is a Mayoral priority to deliver 2,000 Council homes, where existing open space deficiencies exist and underutilised open spaces is an issue, delivering a balance between competing priorities to achieve quality open spaces is crucial (Recommendation 2b).

Through resident engagement the Council housebuilding programme empowers residents to be active in the design of schemes. This includes enhancing open space / green space sites through intelligent design and planting, and working with the ASB preventions officer to design out ASB. The joint panel acknowledged the Council's

	<p>approach to design and stakeholder engagement and requested that the Council prioritise and encourage underutilised spaces to be co-designed and transformed to deliver a balance between competing priorities.</p> <p>Additional outcomes that the Council is progressing since the review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploring the conditioning of environmental improvements as part of Council schemes • Organising a workshop bringing together everyone who delivers open space projects <p>Another issue of importance is the question - how housing open space improvements will be funded if not through new development?</p>
<p>Item 6.8 Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q2 2019-20</p>	
<p>Questions</p>	<p>Response</p>
<p>6.8a App1 for Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q2 2019-20 Capital Receipts Table 5.2 Less: Poolable amount paid to DCLG 0.8M</p> <p>Question: I thought we had an agreement with the Mayor of London that we would not lose Right to Buy receipts not spent within the timescales. Is this money really lost?</p>	<p>Any right to buy receipts that are paid back to MHCLG are passported to the GLA and held by them for three years for use by LBTH. After three years, any receipt not used will be lost; therefore the Council will prioritise use of receipts held by GLA.</p> <p>Background: The Mayor of London launched the Building Council Homes for Londoners funding prospectus in May 2018. The prospectus contained details of a Right to Buy Ring-fence Offer for councils under which the GLA will ring-fence any Right to Buy receipts that a participating council collects and returns to the GLA (via central Government) for use by that council. This decision approves the receipt from central Government of funds collected</p>

	<p>by councils in London from Right to Buy receipts and, where the funds received derive from a participating council's area, the award of such funding by the GLA as affordable housing grant to be spent on delivering new social housing for rent by that council. It also approves applying such receipts to the Mayor's Homes for Londoners: Affordable Homes Programme 2016-21 budgets retrospectively at the end of each year, once amounts received are finalised.</p> <p>The Mayor of London approved on 5 November 2018 that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The receipt from central Government of grant on a quarterly basis for amounts up to that collected by councils in London from sales receipts (plus any interest) of dwellings under the Right to Buy scheme; 2. Where councils opt in to the GLA's Right to Buy Ring-fence Offer, as described in the Mayor's Building Council Homes for Londoners funding prospectus, making allocations of affordable housing grant to spend on delivering new social housing for rent up to the amount received (or expected to be received) from central Government in respect of the decision above; and 3. Applying the grant received from central Government under this Mayoral Decision to the Mayor's Homes for Londoners: Affordable Homes Programme 2016 21 budgets at the year end. <p>Link: https://www.london.gov.uk/decisions/md2369-right-buy-ringfence-offer</p>
<p>6.8g App7 for Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring Q2 2019-</p>	<p>Whilst receiving only one bid is not commonplace,</p>

20, item 6.8 Barnsley Street - This scheme exception records that following extensive market testing and a 9 week tender period, only one submission was received from Mulalley. The proposed contract sum for the scheme is £18,826,413.00 which is over the PTE of £16,752,300.00.

Question: Receiving only one tender is unusual, how common is this?

Question: Why only one tender?

it does happen and tends to occur more now than it used to. Precise reasons for non-response have not been received from the other Framework members yet but the following factors are known to have an influence:

1. Market costs have gone up but the cost driver from local authorities is downward as the impact of the austerity measures still pertain, meaning that potential bidders are more selective in the opportunities they respond to.
2. Mulalley is an established provider for LBTH and so knows it well as a client. On this basis Mulalley can bid more confidently as opportunities arise.
3. The tender was undertaken via a Framework. This, by definition, limits the market able to bid, which means:
 - a. Providers can be more selective in the opportunities they pursue as they will always be one of a select number of tenderers for any opportunity they choose to bid for
 - b. If providers on the Framework choose not to tender, there is not an 'open market' of bidders who might step in and make up the numbers. Whilst Frameworks are a very useful tendering medium for both clients and contractors, these factors combine to illustrate the limited benefits of this route to the market.

A single response is always disappointing but not unknown. Brownfield infill sites present logistical problems that might render the opportunity less

PRE-SCRUTINY QUESTIONS – CABINET 27 11 2019

	attractive to the market, and so more readily bring the factors above into play.
--	--