

**LONDON BOROUGH OF TOWER HAMLETS**

**MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT 6.35 P.M. ON MONDAY, 25 OCTOBER 2021**

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

**Members Present:**

Councillor Mohammed Pappu (Chair)

Councillor Bex White (Vice-Chair)	– Scrutiny Lead for Children and Education
Councillor Faroque Ahmed	– Scrutiny Lead for Community Safety
Councillor Marc Francis	
Councillor Ehtasham Haque	– Scrutiny Lead for Housing and Regeneration
Councillor Denise Jones	
Councillor Gabriela Salva Macallan	– Scrutiny Lead for Health and Adults
Councillor Leema Qureshi	– Scrutiny Lead for Resources and Finance
Councillor Andrew Wood	

**Co-opted Members Present:**

James Wilson	– Co-Optee
--------------	------------

**Other Councillors Present:**

Mayor John Biggs	– Executive Mayor
Councillor Kahar Chowdhury	– Cabinet Member for Highways and Public Realm
Councillor Val Whitehead	

**Apologies:**

Halima Islam	– Co-Optee
--------------	------------

**Officers Present:**

Mohammed Chibou	– (Principal Transport Planner)
Sharon Godman	– (Director, Strategy, Improvement and Transformation)
Dan Jones	– (Director, Public Realm)
Ann Sutcliffe	– (Corporate Director, Place)
David Tolley	– (Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards)

David Knight

– (Democratic Services Officer)

## 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from:

1. Halima Islam (Co-Opted Member); and
2. Councillor Asma Islam (Cabinet Member for Environment and Planning).

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST AND OTHER INTERESTS

The following Members for transparency declared a potential interest in relation to:

1. **Item 9 Pre-Decision Scrutiny Questions** Councillor Marc Francis due to his wife Councillor Rachel Blake being the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing.
2. **Item 9 Pre-Decision Scrutiny Questions** Councillor Ehtasham Haque due to wife Councillor Sabina Akhtar being the Cabinet Member for Culture, Arts and Brexit; and
3. **Item 8.1 Cumulative Impact Assessment Policy 2021 - 2024** Councillor Denise Jones due to her being the owner a property in Brick Lane.

## 3. UNRESTRICTED MINUTES

### RESOLVED

That the unrestricted minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2021 be approved as a correct record of the proceedings and the Chair was authorised to sign them accordingly.

### MATTER ARISING

#### **Minute 3. - Update on attendance at the Mayors Advisory Board (MAB) Improvement Session**

Further to earlier discussions regarding the LGA's one-day 'light-touch' Corporate Health Check (CHC) on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2021. It was noted that after the last meeting the LGA Peer Review Team had been approached to find out what availability could manage in terms of ensuring who the Team got to speak to and the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny was able to speak with them together with a range of people including residents; partners and officers during the one-day visit. Also it was noted that when the LGA return to undertake a full Peer Review then it would be expected that they would be meeting with wider selection of members, residents, partners, and officers.

#### 4. REQUESTS TO SUBMIT PETITIONS

Nil items.

#### 5. CHAIRS UPDATE

Councillor Mohammed Pappu (Chair) provided the Committee with the following update:

- ❖ The latest COVID update information from public health had been circulated today by officers and will aim to continue with this for every meeting.
- ❖ The final session of the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny (CfGS) training session on chairing skills had now taken place. The Chair indicated that he trusted that members had found these CfGS sessions useful and informative and would be incorporated within their scrutiny role.
- ❖ The Chair encouraged members to complete their evaluation feedback so that a better assessment can be undertaken for any future training.
- ❖ The Chair had, had a meeting with the Executive Mayor and the Director of Strategy, Improvement and Transformation to raise those concerns identified by the Committee about (i) engagement with scrutiny; (ii) the relationship between management and scrutiny; and (iii) other members of the wider Council.
- ❖ Stressed the importance of the Councils own Communications Team in raising the profile of Scrutiny, both internally and externally as a means to improving the effectiveness of the function and felt that with regard to the **Liveable Streets item 10.1** refers this support had not been provided.

#### 6. PROPORTIONALITY AND APPOINTMENTS TO SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEES

The Committee noted that at the meeting of Council on 30<sup>th</sup> September a report had been considered that had reviewed the proportionality calculations for the Council's Committees. This had followed the election of Councillor Kabir Ahmed and the subsequent creation of the new Aspire Group on the Council.

It was noted that whilst this minor change in proportionality did not alter the overall proportions on the 3 Scrutiny Sub-Committees which remain at 5 elected Members nominated by the Labour Group and one Member nominated by an opposition group. There are now two opposition groups on the Council and both have two Members. The Committee is therefore required to set out how it should be determined which of the two opposition groups on the Council should fill each sub-committee vacancy.

As a result of discussions on the report the Committee **resolved** to agree the following allocations and nominations to the sub committees

**Allocations**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<b>Aspire</b>	<b>Conservative</b>
Children & Education (plus 6 co-optees)	6	5		1
Health & Adults (plus 2 co-optees)	6	5	1	
Housing & Regeneration (plus 2 co-optees)	6	5		1

**Nominations (Conservative and Aspire)**

1. Children and Education Scrutiny Sub-Committee – Cllr Andrew Wood (substitute Cllr Kabir Ahmed).
2. Health & Adults Scrutiny Sub-Committee – Cllr Kabir Ahmed (substitute Cllr Andrew Wood).
3. Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Sub Committee – Cllr Andrew Wood (substitute Cllr Kabir Ahmed).

**Nominations (Labour)**

1. Children and Education Scrutiny Sub-Committee Substitute – Cllr Marc Francis.
2. Health & Adults Scrutiny Sub-Committee Substitute – Cllr Bex White.
3. Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Sub Committee – Substitute Cllr David Edgar.

**7. FORTHCOMING DECISIONS**

Noted.

**8. UNRESTRICTED REPORTS 'CALLED IN'**

Nil Items.

**9. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK ITEM**

**9.1 Cumulative Impact Assessment (CIA) Policy 2021 - 2024**

The Committee received a report regarding the Councils Cumulative Impact

Assessment (CIA) Policy for 2021 – 2024.

The Committee noted that the Council (i) as a Licensing Authority must review its Cumulative Impact Policies every 3 years; (ii) has two Cumulative Impact Policies or Cumulative Impact Assessments (CIA) as they are now referred to in the legislation and government guidance; (iii) introduced the first CIA in Brick Lane which has been in place for approximately 7 years and the second one, which is in Bethnal Green, has been in place for 3 years. The main points of the discussion and questions arising may be summarised as follows.

The Committee:

- ❖ **Observed** that the Cumulative Impact Assessment forms part of the Council's Statement of Licensing Policy and therefore if CIAs are adopted, then the Statement of Licensing Policy needs to reflect this change. As part of the review of these CIAs a statutory consultation process took place between the 28th of January and 22nd April 2021. If accepted, the reviewed CIAs, which form part of the Statement of Licensing Policy, will go to full Council for adoption.
- ❖ **Understood** that the concept of Cumulative Impact has been included within Section 182 Licensing Guidance issued by the Home Office since the implementation of the Licensing Act 2003. The Act regulates the sale of alcohol, late night refreshment and the provision of entertainment. Section 5 of the Act requires licensing authorities to publish a Statement of Licensing Policy every five years (amended by the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act).
- ❖ **Commented** that a Borough Wide Policy would help to address if there are hotspots of anti-social behaviour or crime **e.g.** many residents indicate that antisocial behaviour is they feel linked to the use of nitrous oxide or some licensed premises is a significant concern. In response it was noted that before acting LBTH would have to ensure that there is adequate evidence from partner agencies that there is a high concentrations of issues and at present these are addressed through the existing CIAs in Brick Lane and Bethnal Green.
- ❖ **Requested** that they receive details on the mechanisms that the resident's and councillors can bring premises in front on a licensing committee.
- ❖ **Noted** that with regards to individual premises or individual locations LBTH have other powers that that could be used in regards licensed premises and the predominant power is about reviewing a licence where local residents or ward Councillors can bring a licensed premise in front of the Licensing Committee for review of that licence which could result in that licence being revoked or further conditions being put on that licence.
- ❖ **Noted** that LBTH has looked at the data used to address issues in relation to licensed premises and were very confident that the data especially that from the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) and in relation noise nuisance provided from the LBTH own service. However, that the data is one element the other element of the information being outlined in **Appendix Four** of the report which provides a summary of

the online consultation survey comments. In addition, residents are constantly raising issues around ASB, noise, and crime in those areas.

- ❖ **Noted** built in potential exemptions for those premises (i) that have 50 or less covers or persons in an establishment at any one time; and (ii) where off sales are provided with a food.
- ❖ **Noted** that LBTH are also have provision for the exemption of smaller premises outside the scope of the Cumulative Impact Area (e.g. seated venues with less than 50 people).

In conclusion the Chair thanked David Tolley (Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards) for a clear and precise presentation. The Chair also commented that as he sits on the licensing committee and he has (i) seen a number of licences under review from the Cumulative Impact Area; and (ii) seen those measures inaction where reviews are taking place due to alleged breaches of the policy.

As a result of discussions on the report Committee:

1. **Noted** the recent consultation and that the report that will be put to Cabinet with the recommendations as detailed in the report.
2. **Indicated** that when the Policy is considered by Full Council it would be very helpful to have details on the mechanisms that the resident's and councillors can use to bring premises in front on a licensing committee.
3. **Stated** that the evidence does show that there is a need for the CIAs in Brick Lane and Bethnal Green although the area does not at this time need to be expanded.
4. **Welcomed** the flexibility in the policy to address issues as they arise for it to be looked at and if other areas should be included in the CIA

## 10. SCRUTINY SPOTLIGHT

### 10.1 Liveable Streets

The Committee received a presentation on the Liveable Streets programme which is intended to improve the look and feel of public spaces in neighbourhoods across the Borough and aims to make it easier, safer, and more convenient to get around by foot, bike, and public transport. The programme also aims to reduce people making 'rat runs and shortcuts through residential streets to encourage more sustainable journeys and to improve air quality and road safety.

The Chair welcomed Mayor John Biggs and Councillor Kahar Choudhry Cabinet Lead for Highways and Public Realm here in person today, Ann Sutcliffe Corporate Director for Place and Dan Jones Divisional Director for Public Realm who are joining virtually for attending this evening. However, before the Chair handed over to the Mayor he stated that the Committee would like to know the following (i) which of the schemes have been delivered so far and will continue given the recent announcement on the pausing of the Scheme; (ii) what does the recent announcement on the pausing of the

scheme mean; (iii) What were the challenges faced and what does the future of the scheme or any schemes similar to this will look like; (iv) the budget implication on the financial implication to this programme and decision; (v) listening to ward councillors representing the views of their constituents and their own experience. The main points of the discussion and questions arising may be summarised as follows.

The Committee:

- ❖ **Expressed** concern regarding the failure of the Councils own Communications Team to support scrutiny in promoting its activities and especially on this item. Also it was noted that whilst a press release had been sent out today there is a need of further support in raising the profile of Scrutiny, both internally and externally as a means to improving the effectiveness of the function.
- ❖ **Noted** that the Chair had, had to publish a video on his own social media account to increase wider awareness of tonight's meeting.
- ❖ **Noted** the concerns that residents had raised in terms of the apparent short notice of this item however the work programme for Overview and Scrutiny had been published in June 2021 and this item was on the was on the list.
- ❖ **Noted** that (i) an open letter had been received signed by 217 residents highlighting concerns regarding the Liveable Streets Programme; (ii) the Chair had also received a range of e-mails highlighting concerns and questions on the programme which had been shared with Members. The Committee were asked to be mindful of those concerns in tonight's discussions.
- ❖ **Noted** on the whole residents are supportive of the Liveable Streets Scheme but many have expressed frustration of the slowness of the implementation
- ❖ **Agreed** that the Liveable Streets Scheme was always about so much more than closing a few roads and with COP26 (Conference of the Parties) coming up there are concerns especially amongst young people about what is happening across the planet and the impact on our most vulnerable communities both in the UK and worldwide.
- ❖ **Recognised** that there is an ambition to gently persuade people out of their cars and to stop taking short journeys in vehicles if they are fit and able to make them in another way.
- ❖ **Noted** that at a Ward Level it has apparently been challenging for councillors to understand what decisions are being made and therefore to share them with residents.
- ❖ **Concurred** with the view that councillors need to think about what such Schemes mean in terms of the overall permeability of London.
- ❖ **Commented** that it wanted to know what lessons learned from the consultation on the Scheme for future consultations as it is something that across Tower Hamlets councillors want to see an improvement in because that is how LBTH can best serve its residents.
- ❖ **Stated** that it wanted to know how LBTH will consider the needs of young children in these schemes.

- ❖ **Noted** that LBTH did consult with Emergency Services at a statutory level and they indicated they were satisfied with the proposals. However, there may have been issues when a particular ambulance crew using satellite navigation (Sat Nav) to get to a call find that they cannot get down a street because their Sat Nav is still directing them down that street although it has been closed to through traffic.
- ❖ **Observed** that one of the benefits in the pauses in the programme is to consider whether you can have more permeable closures that does allow emergency vehicles to go through and enforced by automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) cameras. The drivers of other motor vehicles passing through would receive a fine.
- ❖ **Agreed** that we need to make decisions but we need to know if young children are not going to be able to respond to a consultation who speaks up for them (**e.g.** the Public Health Team).
- ❖ **Noted** that In terms of the funding the one that's the cause of concern financially is the Brick Lane as if LBTH was to make any significant changes in that area, TfL has indicated it is likely we would not get the funding for that LBTH is discussing with them as part of the review of the Brick Lane scheme.
- ❖ **Understood** that LBTH did not anticipate that paper responses would be completely overtaken by the number of responses that came in online from people **e.g.** LBTH have a situation where a multigenerational household receives a paper copy of the consultation document and then sends it back as a single response whereas other people are going online and these are individually counted as responses. The Committee agreed that this is an important issue and it is important to get to the root of how this is addressed.
- ❖ **Agreed** that LBTH needs to rebuild that trust with the community and any new consultation methodology needs to go far enough to address the issues especially given the sensitivity of this subject.
- ❖ **Accepted** the importance of tackling the health impacts of traffic in Tower Hamlets and the environmental degradation of having a Borough where so much of the land area is taken over by vehicles being used on very short journeys and what we can do about that and how we can support people who want to make the shift to more sustainable transport (**e.g.** promote walking, either with the health benefits or incentives, or improve public transport). In addition, some further thought needs to be needs to take place about what's going to happen with schemes within the Borough (**e.g.** The implications of the Wapping bus gateway and Old Ford Road at Skew Bridge should be considered together).
- ❖ **Agreed** one way to encourage more people to use cycling as a mode of transport, LBTH could help residents who do not have anywhere to store their bikes by installing more cycle hangers wherever suitable locations can be identified.
- ❖ **Indicated** that there is very little information within the presentation to actually scrutinise as whilst it is a very good update about what is happening there is no information really to analyse exactly what has happened so that the Committee can undertake a proper scrutiny spotlight of the Liveable Streets Scheme.



- ❖ **Noted** that in terms of the measures the impact negatively or positively of the schemes needs to be done over a period of time to make sure that LBTH undertakes a proper analysis in these areas and the way the traffic has been affected (**e.g.** LBTH have undertaken face-to-face conversation with people and partner agencies regarding most locations and will take on board their comments as part of this whole review of the scheme).
- ❖ **Noted that LBTH** are currently undertaking a proper analysis which will be brought back at the appropriate time to the Committee.
- ❖ **Agreed** that if people know what is happening they are much happier therefore LBTH must make more use of the elected members who can take messages out to people in the Borough. Councillors know how to get hold of people in their wards which is an invaluable way to get messages out (**e.g.** social media such as WhatsApp groups that residents use and councillor can put out messages that are correct)
- ❖ **Stated** that LBTH need to look at how it can support businesses not just the direct impact of any highways works taking place outside of their shops. Businesses have been squeezed by Covid and now are often having to compete against coffee shops that can expand into the public realm space that LBTH has now created.
- ❖ **Agreed** that it is important for LBTH to take residents with them over the course of what would be quite a fundamental change to some people's habits and lifestyles and behaviour.

Accordingly, as a result of discussions on Liveable Streets programme Committee **agreed** that:

1. there should be an investigation on the use of capital for a local Green Transition Fund to support the delivery of the wider agenda as outlined in the Scheme.
2. LBTH should set and publish pollution and traffic reduction targets with particular attention to the safety and health of those under 18.
3. members should (i) investigate the letter from the Chief Executive of the London Ambulance Service; (ii) see a response to that in writing so that the detail of the issues and how they have been addressed can be understood.
4. a mechanism needs to be established for speedy and transparent response to unforeseen negative impacts when these are brought to the Committees attention by residents and businesses.
5. to establish a reporting facility e.g. through "Love Your Neighbourhood" for persistent speeding because that has come out a lot in communications from residents around this meeting and they need a quick way that they can flag up those hot spots
6. to establish a clearly thought-out policy on resident exemptions so schemes currently being designed can take that into account (**e.g.** LBTH needs to be clear on what resident exemption actually means).
7. there needs to be an ongoing borough-wide listening platform so outside of specific consultations there is an ongoing way that residents can communicate with LBTH in the coming decades **e.g.** people can tell LBTH what would help them through the reduction in

private car use; businesses can tell LBTH what would help them reduce their road miles; and those residents who actually do need to drive can tell LBTH what they need.

8. the Mayor and Cabinet Member are asked what is going to be done to increase cycle parking provision and to encourage people to make those changes to sustainable transport and to make sure any proposals include enough space for non-standard bikes (**e.g.** those used by families with young children or people with disabilities as not all bikes look the same).
9. That Bus gate enforcement policy must be consistent across the Borough and a report on this issue brought before the Committee at the earliest opportunity..
10. LBTH needs to look at how it can support businesses during the disruption caused when such schemes are being introduced.

## 11. UPDATES FROM SCRUTINY LEADS

The Committee received and noted the updates submitted and also received the following verbal update from Councillor Bex White on the recent **SEND** inspection.

The Committee:

- ❖ **Noted** that the Special educational needs and disabilities (**SEND**) has been a regular item on the Children's Sub-Committee agenda throughout including a "deep dive" in October 2019 the Sub-Committee then had an update to the Committee on **SEND** inspection preparation in February 2021 and James Thomas, Corporate Director, Children and Culture commented that of the three **SEND** inspections that this will be the most challenging the inspection and the Sub-Committee had a brief update at the September 2021 meeting but the outcome of the inspection was at that point embargoed by Ofsted and it was not possible to be shared at that point.
- ❖ **Noted** that Councillor White as the Chair had not been made aware of the outcome of the inspection about point because of the embargo and therefore, limited what could be shared at that time.
- ❖ **Noted** that the outcome of the inspection was that **LBTH** is required to produce a written statement of action because of some areas of significant weakness within the **SEND** service as the outcome letter did highlight a number of strengths and some key areas for development and the written statement of action will cover those areas of significant weakness. Which are the poor quality and oversight of Education, Health and Care Plans (**EHCP**) plans including annual the process; the lengthy waiting times for assessment and diagnosis of Autistic Spectrum Disorder (**ASD**); fragmentation in the provision of speech and language therapy which means too many children and young people do not get the specialist help and support they need; weaknesses in communication between area leaders and parents **e.g.** misunderstandings for many families are not aware of services they

could access and do not have knowledge of the areas plans to improve.

- ❖ **Noted** that there is a plan for a “deep dive” discussion at the February meeting of the Sub-Committee and we chose this date so **LBTH** has the opportunity to begin to address the areas of significant weaknesses and so that we can then input into that process as it goes along and there are further plans in place to improve support for children with **SEND** more generally these are via the **SEND** improvement plan which is monitored by the multi-agency **SEND** improvement board which is sub-group of the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- ❖ **Noted** that work on the return **SEND** Action Plan has begun and is this would be submitted to the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (**Ofsted**) and the Department for Education (**DfE**) by the end of December 2021 Meaning that when the Sub-Committee looks at the issue it will be the first meeting that has had an opportunity to look at that response and Councillor White agreed to keep the Committee updated on this issue as it progresses.

## 12. PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY OF UNRESTRICTED CABINET PAPERS

Following comments by the Committee the Pre-Decision Scrutiny Questions (PDSQ) Members **agreed** the particular questions/recommendations that they wanted to raise with Cabinet on the 20<sup>th</sup> of September 2021 (**See attached appendix**).

## 13. ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

Councillor Francis raised the following:

### **New Homes Bonus**

Councillor Francis place on record his thanks for officers who had provided information about the New Homes Bonus benchmarking and whilst he indicated that he would like to know which local authorities were included in the benchmarking process it was appreciated that this information would not necessarily within the public domain. However, it would be of use to have that information when the Committee next scrutinises the Budget.

### **Victoria Park**

The Committee noted an issue about commercial contracts for events in Victoria Park which went to the Cabinet in January 2017 after a long history of problems with “Live Nations” events and the new contract was awarded to AEG and under that contract events had been much better managed than by their predecessors.

However, it was noted that this year AEG came back with a variation of the contract to hold an event in August and that was supposed to be a one off but

it was noted that AEG want to hold the event in August at least next year if not the year after as well and so there's a lot of issues about the way that these decisions are being made or delegated to officers to drawn up that contract.

It was noted that if this had been considered as a key decision this would then be subject to some kind of public information and scrutiny. In addition, the committee needs to have an explanation about how LBTH came to be in a position where LBTH is not perhaps as well placed to negotiate any changing variation in that contract.

In conclusion, the Chair called this meeting to a close; thanked all those attending for their contributions and informed the Committee that the next meeting would be on Monday, 22<sup>nd</sup> of November 2021.

### **13.1 ACTION LOG**

Noted.

### **14. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

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

Nil items.

**The meeting ended at 9.05 p.m.**

**Chair, Councillor Mohammed Pappu  
Overview & Scrutiny Committee**

Questions	Response
<b>Item 6.2 Tower Hamlets Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Inequalities Commission Action Plan</b>	
1. Para 3.11 "we will undertake a detailed analysis of ethnicity pay gap by December 2022" since we hold all of the data already why should this analysis take 13 months ?	We already have top level data on pay gaps across the workforce as reported in our pay gap reporting. The proposed data analysis is a deep dive into the data to understand the root causes and points at which pay divergence occurs. This will enable us to identify policy and practice intervention options to address the root causes. The second stage of analysis will then model these options to ensure we pursue the most effective option. The second stage will also allow us to model possible consequences of different options, including understanding possible negative impacts elsewhere across the workforce.
<b>Item 6.3 Local Infrastructure Fund (LIF) Virements to the Approved Capital Programme 2021-22 to 2023-24</b>	
1. Which LIF projects have already been delivered or are in the process of construction / procurement / delivery?	The attached spreadsheet identifies those projects that have already been delivered or are in the process of delivery. Note that the list includes LIF Programme 3 to be approved at October 2021 Cabinet.
2. Which LIF projects have had money spent on feasibility?	The attached spreadsheet identifies those projects that have required feasibility spend.
3. How many of the projects listed came directly from residents ideas?	The attached spreadsheet identifies projects that were direct project nominations by local people through consultation. There were a range of priorities for spend identified through public feedback and generic programmes suggested, where specific projects were not nominated – e.g. 'spend money on public safety measures'. The spreadsheet therefore also identifies where projects have been established to respond directly to the LIF spend priorities and ideas identified by local people.
4. How much CIL is currently in the bank?	£97.451m

### Item 6.6 Development of William Brinson Centre– Appropriation and use of Section 203 Powers (Rights of Light)

1. Did the Council do a letter drop to the affected properties of its "intention to appropriate the William Brinson Centre"	Letters from the Council were sent recorded delivery advising affected properties of its intention to seek approval to exercise its S203 powers. Where a failed delivery occurred, letters were delivered by hand. A follow up letter from the RoLSurveyors was sent subsequent to the Council's letter.
2. Has the implications of this acquisition been made clear to affected residents?	The letters made clear the implications of the Council exercising its S203 powers.

### Item 6.8 George Green School: Procurement of works and services

1. When will the public consultation start on the design? given the use of school buildings out of hours by a number of organisations	The expectation is that the architect will be appointed in November 2021 and that public consultation will take place in early January 2022 to ensure that external organisations who use the school buildings outside school hours can contribute to the design development process.
2. How will the Council mitigate any negative impact on children's education from studying on a construction site?	As part a planning consent, the submission of a Construction Management Plan by the appointed contractor will be conditioned. This plan will set out the ways in which the negative impact of the construction activity will be mitigated as far as practicably possible, e.g. noisy, and intrusive work will take place outside core teaching and learning hours. It is recognised that there will be some disruption, but this is balanced against the greater disruption and of providing off-site decant accommodation for the duration of build programme.
3. Will the opportunity be taken to provide additional facilities for example a base for the local	The new build is expected to provide a replacement school that meets current BB103 standards for a 7FE secondary school. The design of the new school will be expected to take

Scouts and Police Cadets and extra sports facilities or is this a like for like rebuild with no net increase in space?

account of the need for the building to contribute towards meeting wider community needs.

### Item 6.9 Vacant School Sites proposals

1. Does 'Meanwhile Use' include a primarily religious use?

Premises offered for 'meanwhile use' can be for a variety of uses, including religious use, however priority will be given to those which are widely inclusive. Organisations who have expressed an interest in meanwhile uses have been looking to use premises for gallery space, arts studios, community activities, cafés. Meanwhile use is not intended to replace the usual marketing of properties, but to provide either a short-term occupancy or long-term project where there are considerable up-front costs I

### 6.11 Canon Barnett Playground – Land Swap Agreement

1. Does the Council know who the ultimate owner of Alliance Asia Property Incorporated is?

Alliance Asia Property Incorporated is 100% owned by Mr Khalid Rangoonwala.

This page is intentionally left blank