

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Educational Psychology Statutory Service</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 001 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Education services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Education	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	3. Accelerating education
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	John O'Shea, Head of Special Educational Needs	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	1,628	352	-	-	352

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	17	4	-	-	4

## Proposal Summary:

A bid to increase staffing within the Educational Psychology Service (EPS) by 4 FTE to cover the significant increase in demand for assessment of children and young people with Special Educational Needs for Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCPs).

The funding of the Tower Hamlets Educational Psychology Service is provided by 3 sources:

1. The General Fund, which provides for the activities of the Educational Psychology Service that are statutory, most notably, the assessing and writing of Educational Psychology Advice to inform the decision-making process related to requests for EHCPs for children and young people with special Educational needs. Under the SEND Code of Practice (2015) where the Local Authority agrees to carry out a needs assessment of a child or young person with special educational needs it must seek advice from a number of sources, including Educational Professionals, usually in the child or young person's current school or setting, health and care professionals and an Educational Psychologist. This statutory advice is funded by the LA's general fund. The resources allocated have not kept pace with demand in this area of critical statutory work. Before an Education Health and Care plan can be agreed or declined, an assessment from an Educational Psychologist is required under the Children and Families Act 2014.
2. De-delegated funding for the Dedicated Schools Grant, agreed by the School's Forum. This funding ensures that maintained schools in Tower Hamlets are assured of a number of visits from an Educational Psychologist each academic year.
3. Traded Income. Educational Psychology support is commissioned by schools and other educational settings to support pre-statutory support for children and young people with additional needs, including special educational needs. This early help to schools is a key part of enabling them to meet the needs of those children at SEN Support level and supports work to reduce the number of requests for Education, Health and Care Needs Assessments (EHCNAs).

Educational Psychology is a specialist support service for children with Special Educational Needs and the importance of educational psychology advice to the EHCP process is recognised by the fact that Local authorities are under a statutory duty to provide EP advice towards an EHCP Needs Assessment. Educational Psychology advice and it forms part of the evidence bundle when issuing an EHCP. Advice to the SEN service should be completed within the first 12 weeks of the assessment process, ideally sooner than that. The increased demand for needs assessments and the lack of capacity, due to under investment in the service for several years, has led to delays in Educational Psychology in assessments, impacting upon the 20 week statutory timescale for completing and issuing EHCPs. Timeliness and quality of plans must be considered together, for the performance of the SEN service against the 20-week timescale of EHCNAs, for the quality of our Plans as an area of improvement in our WSOA, and to ensure the reputation of the Local Authority and protect itself against claims of maladministration if subject to any Judicial Review on overdue and out of timescale EHCNAs.

Tower Hamlets has historically high levels of need with one of the highest percentages of EHCPs in the country, Since the pandemic and in line with national trends, Tower Hamlets has experienced unprecedented demand for assessments of children and young people with special educational needs for Education, Health and Care Plans. Demand for assessments has

risen by almost 50% since January 2022. The average number of new requests for assessment from parents and educational settings rose from approximately 30 to 35 per month in the years from 2018-2021.

Currently the LA's General Funding provides 650 days for assessment and writing of advices. Based on the figure of 40 advice requests a month needing Educational Psychology advice and the average time for each advice being 2.12 days to complete, depending upon whether or not any pre-statutory work/assessment has happened with the child or young person; or whether a private EP has been commissioned by the school/setting to work with the child. This means that the service requires 1017 days for assessment and advice writing, leaving the service 368 days. At 2.12 days per assessment 650 days amounts to 307 advices per academic year. Based on 480 annual requests for advice this leaves a shortfall of 173 pieces of advice.

By increasing the service capacity by 4 additional EPs the capacity would be added to ensure that all statutory advices are completed and submitted to SEN Service within statutory deadlines, it would also mean that working with the SEN Service to ensure EPS attendance at key phase transition Annual Reviews at secondary transfer and for young people post-19 we would ensure that a vulnerable group of children and young people and their families are supported to make key decisions as they move towards adulthood and support the Local Authorities duty in regards to the management of Special Educational Needs provision. This increased capacity would also meet the mayoral commitment to restore specialist support for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities as a boroughwide service by giving children and young people increased access to Educational Psychology support at SEN Support and for those with EHCPs.

### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

This proposal supports the following priorities in the Council's Strategic Plan 2022 -2026:

Priority 1: Tackling the cost of living (We will address inequalities in access to good jobs and leadership development, so young people and residents from all backgrounds can develop their careers).

- Increasing the capacity of the EP Service to complete the demanding levels of statutory advice will ensure that children and young people with SEND receive the right support at the right time and enable them and their families to access education, training and employment opportunities.

Priority 3: Accelerate Education (We will implement our action plans to improve support for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities and children in trouble with the law. We will strive to improve support for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Support education achievement through a series of learning interventions and financial support)

- Increased EP capacity will improve the timeliness of EHCPs. Targeting EP involvement in phase transfer Annual Reviews, co-produced with parents and young people, will increase resident confidence in the Local Area SEND system as a whole and through the gathering of user feedback on the process and the systematic recording of outcomes, will demystify the annual review process for parents, increasing transparency and allowing the service to respond to the needs of the community.

Priority 6: Empower communities and Fight crime (Uphold and protect equality and diversity in all circumstances)

Priority 8: A council that listens and works for people (Implement a rigorous improvement programme for those services subject to external inspection, and those that are no

### **Expected improvements**

All statutory advice requested for EHCP Needs assessments will be completed within statutory timescales (six weeks from the decision to assess and no later than 12 weeks into the needs assessment process).

100% of targeted phase transfer annual reviews will be attended by an Educational Psychologist as part of the LA's management of SEND provision.

### **Risks and Implications:**

- A lack of capacity for the Educational Psychology Service to carry out the statutory duty to provide advice for EHC Needs Analysis will result in further delays to the timeliness of EHCPs and the efforts to ensure that the SEN Service continues its journey of improvement in terms of EHCP timeliness.
- Reputational damage - Reduction in the local community's confidence – parents and educational settings - in the LA; School frustrations with the Service lead to more opting out of the traded service.

- Increase in tribunal and mediation cases – may increase the costs for parental choices of out of borough provision
- Increase in going to Ombudsman and potential compensation payments
- Non-compliance with statutory duties
- Financial costs to the LA as a national workforce shortage of Educational Psychologists may mean that additional posts cannot be filled and Locum EP services will need to be commissioned to meet statutory duties.
- Inspection risk - scrutiny of EHCP timeliness by the DFE will lead to risk of a failed re-inspection even if current Written Statement of Action targets are met.

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

This investment will address the limited capacity for the service to complete statutory advices, without the need to contract work out to expensive locum provision, which costs over £1100 per piece of advice. This represents better value for residents.

A further service review, looking at traded services and team management structure, will be completed to ensure a sustainable service. The increase in capacity will also ensure the quality of plans and timeliness of advice leading to improvement in overall timeliness in the issuing of EHCPs. This will lead to fewer complaints and increase the efficiency of the entire SEN Service. This will improve the quality of provision for children and young people with SEND.

A more efficient annual review process will support the plan to manage the high needs funding block overspend ensuring efficient review and monitoring of all high needs top-ups distributed to children and young people with EHCPs.

It will support the LA's work to demonstrate the pace and impact required by the written statement of action following the joint Ofsted/CQC inspection, avoiding further intervention from central government and the further associated resourcing costs.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	Yes	Improvement in services.
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Improvement</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 002 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Education services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Education	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	3. Accelerating education
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	John O'Shea, Head of Special Educational Needs	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	6,558	727	-	-	727

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	35	13	-	-	13

## Proposal Summary:

This proposal is a request to maintain the agreed levels of approved growth for 2022-23 into the 2023-24 financial year in order to maintain the service improvements achieved via the growth funding implemented in 2022-23 and to meet the demands of demographic growth. In 2022-23 the SEN Service bid for growth of £643,174 was agreed, which was a combination of long term and short-term growth to support the work to improve statutory services for Special Educational Needs, following the Special Educational Needs Joint Local Area Inspection in June of 2021. The original bid included a year 2 reduction of £249,178 in 2023-24, related to the removal of the short-term element of the bid, however increased demand upon the service, the need to embed good practice and to ensure that all out of timescale work means that it is no longer possible to reduce to that level of capacity and maintain performance.

This Growth bid is in line with Council's Strategic Plan 2022 -2026 priorities as follows:

Priority3: Accelerate Education

- we will implement our action plans to improve support for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities and children in trouble with the law
- improve support for children and young people with Special Educational Needs

Priority 6: Empower Communities and Fight Crime

- uphold and protect equality and diversity in all circumstances

Priority 8: A council that listens and works for everyone

- implement a rigorous improvement programme for those services subject to external inspection and those that are not

There is further additional growth required to support changes being introduced to the collection of statutory returns to the DFE (the SEN 2 Data return and the Alternative Provision return) and to manage the increased pressure on that part of the service that deals with placements of children and young people in order to provide settings with timely support and to rigorously monitor the attendance of children with special educational needs.

The SEN Service is a statutory service that assesses, issues and reviews Education, Health and Care plans for children and young people who have Special Educational Needs and who require levels of support beyond what their schools/educational settings receive from central government. These top-ups to settings are funded via the Dedicated Schools Gant but the service is funded via the General Fund. The growth for 2022-23 was recognition of long-term underfunding of the service and a response to the written statement of action received following the June 2021 Local Area SEND Inspection. Additional funding has meant that clear processes are now in place to ensure the timely administration of the Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCPs), the annual review of EHCPs and the Quality Assurance of plans. Work has continued to improve the timeliness of EHCPs and to reduce the number of ongoing assessments beyond the statutory 20-week timescale. There have been month by month increases in the number of EHCPs issued within 20 weeks as our improvement plan takes effect.

The need for this investment is also driven by the year-on-year increase in the numbers of children and young people with an EHCPs, and in the context of savings being delivered by the previous administration.

**Increased demand for EHCP assessments Baseline 2019 – 2022: 3 year trend but mindful of the disruption caused by COVID is illustrated in the table below:**

Year	2019	2020	2021	2022* (to Sept 2022)
Number EHCPs	3016 ( <i>Croydon 3161, Hackney 2249, Newham 1300, London average 2058</i> )	3257 ( <i>Croydon 3394, Hackney 2645, Newham 1606, London average 2256</i> )	3464 ( <i>Croydon 3556, Hackney 3062, Newham 1867; London average 2443</i> )	3781
% of EHCPs (national)	4.6% (3.1%)	5.1% (3.3%)	5.2% (3.7%)	5.4% (4.0%)

During 2020, at the height of the pandemic demand for requests for EHC needs assessments dropped, however, this has been followed by significant increases in demand as the country returns to business as usual. Nationally the number of requests for new assessments rose by 23% in 2021 and this high level of demand has continued throughout 2022.

Tower Hamlets has historically high levels of need with one of the highest percentages of EHCPs in the country. Since the pandemic and in line with national trends, Tower Hamlets has experienced unprecedented demand for assessments of children and young people with special educational needs for Education, Health and Care Plans. Demand for assessments has risen by almost 50% since January 2022.

The average number of new requests for assessment from parents and educational settings rose from approximately 30 to 35 per month in the years from 2018-2021. In the first 7 months of the 2022 calendar year, the average number of requests per month has been 52.

There are statutory duties relating to the administration of assessment requests that mean that a request for assessment, which may be refused, will still involve significant casework for the first six weeks of the process.

An additional post of a coordinator has been included to bring together the coordination of all the different elements of the SEN programme and the drive to improvement through this coordination and data. There is also a new inspection framework that will make this role particularly important in the coming year as well as the support in delivering our better value programme.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The Annual Reviews process will inform decision making in relation to appropriate educational placements and in supporting young people in their preparation for adulthood and employment. Maintaining the original service growth will enable a proactive response to future demographic growth and increase resident confidence in the range of support, education and training available for children and young people with SEND. Adding the additional growth will ensure that educational settings will receive support for children and young people in a timely manner and that the attendance of children and young people with EHCPs will be tracked and monitored in a proactive and rigorous way. Statutory DFE SEN2 returns and Alternative Provision returns will have be set up to maintain pupil level data as outlined in the changes being introduced.

The improved annual review process, co-produced with parents and young people will increase resident confidence in the Local Area SEND system as a whole and through the gathering of user feedback on the process and the systematic recording of outcomes, will demystify the annual review process for parents, increasing transparency and allowing the service to respond to the needs of the community. Regular reporting of service user feedback, statutory timescales and progress against individual outcomes will ensure accountability.

**Expected improvements**

Systems within the SEN Service for reviewing and recording outcomes, and the amendments made to plans following annual reviews have been reviewed and improved and will be scrutinised through our Sector Led Improvement Partnership with another Local Authority. This work will inform the feedback submitted to the DFE and NHS England in regular meetings to monitor the Written Statement of Action.

Improvements in timeliness of issuing EHCPs will continue and the objective is for them to exceed national levels and London levels. The annual review action plan and this growth proposal will continue to require the service to regularly report performance data, as prescribed in the SEND Code of Practice, via the SEND Governance system.

**Risks and Implications:**

- Reputational - Reduction in the local community's confidence in the LA
- Increase in tribunal and mediation cases – may increase the costs for parental choices of out of borough provision
- Increase in cases going to Ombudsman and potential compensation payments

- Non-compliance with statutory duties (Children and Families Act 2014, SEN Code of Practice 2015)
- Written Statement of Action not delivered – failure to meet the significant weaknesses identified in the Written Statement of Action, leading to further action from Ofsted/CQC and central government.
- Adverse inspection judgement at next re-inspection of the local area under the new Inspection Framework which is currently under consultation and due to be introduced early in 2023.

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

This investment will bring the capacity in line with neighbouring LAs and deliver better value for residents.

The increase in capacity will also enable data held within the service to be used more effectively in future planning and in meeting the outcomes of children and young people. This will improve the quality of provision for children and young people with SEND.

Increased parental confidence will reduce requests for out of borough provisions.

A more efficient annual review process will support the plan to manage the high needs funding block overspend ensuring efficient review and monitoring of all high needs top-ups distributed to children and young people with EHCPs. One of the areas of greatest pressure is the levels of post-19 young people with EHCPs. Increased capacity and monitoring of the Annual Review process will ensure that support via EHCPs for young people over 19 is targeted appropriately and that where plans can be ceased, they are done so in a timely way.

It will enable the LA to demonstrate the pace and impact required by the written statement of action following the joint Ofsted/CQC inspection, avoiding further intervention from central government and the further associated resourcing costs.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:



# GROWTH PROPOSAL

London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-26

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Provision of Universal Primary School Free School Meals</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 003 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Education services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Education	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	3. Accelerating education
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Steve Nyakatawa, Director of Education	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	-	2,000	-	2,000

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposal Summary:**

It is a continuing Tower Hamlets Council priority to provide universal free school meals to all primary school age children in the borough. Currently funding is provided directly to Schools from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) through the schools funding formula. This supports providing free school meals to all children eligible through income based assessment and through a specific grant for universal provision for Children in Reception and Key Stage 1. Tower Hamlets currently extends the universal provision to all children at Key Stage 2, through direct Council funding. There is currently agreement to fund £2m in 2023-24 from the Free School Meals reserve, on top of £1m per year provided through the Public Health grant. These funds are included in the council's medium term financial strategy.

This permanent growth bid requests the continuation of the offer beyond 2023-24 as £2m base budget (with the continued extra £1m per year funding from the Public Health grant).

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

Free school meals are associated with improved educational engagement, better attendance at school, improved level concentration, behaviour, health and well-being.

There is currently an over 90% per cent take up for the Primary free school meals programme in Tower Hamlets Primary schools.

Reduction in childhood obesity; children have access to a nutritious, healthy school meal and are ready to learn.

High levels of take up encourage Children to develop important social skills through eating and socialising communally.

Continual free meal provision encourages school attendance which is essential to support post Covid catch up for all Children.

**Risks and Implications:**

If the Mayor's free school meal programme is not funded through this bid, the programme will cease. In addition, the programme is reliant on a public health grant funding of £1m per annum; this would need to continue to maintain the level of spend.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

Having a universal provision ensures that no means testing is required, reducing administration, and making the scheme run at a school level. Schools will not need to process any cash payments for meals reducing issues for schools including the chasing of non-payment.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	Yes	This ensures all children are eligible for the service and a nutritious meal regardless of family income.
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

<b>Summary:</b>	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

<b>Additional Information and Comments:</b>

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Provision of Universal Secondary School Free School Meals</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 004 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Education services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Education	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	3. Accelerating education
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Steve Nyakatawa, Director of Education	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	2,820	890	-	3,710

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposal Summary:**

Tower Hamlets Council has provided universal free school meals to all primary school age children since 2014. Consideration is now being made to extend this provision to all Secondary School age Children. Currently funding is provided directly to Schools from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) through the schools funding formula and supports the provision of free school meals to all children eligible through income-based assessment. This currently represents 42% of the current Secondary School population.

Extending free school meals to all would require funding to support the remaining 58% of Children currently not eligible for support. These children currently pay for food at School or bring food from home.

The costing for extending the scheme is based on a 90% take up with a meal cost of £2.50. Some children will still elect to bring a lunch from home. There are no assumptions relating to additional staff or facilities at Schools which we would expect to be covered from the school's budget although that assumption is yet to be tested and so there may yet be additional costs. Assumptions are also made on the notional additional sales income from extra subsidised diners. Costs are based on Autumn term 2021 roll data. There is considerable work that needs to be completed with Secondary Schools to identify how this will be delivered to ensure all the outcomes are achieved, the logistics for individual Schools and the administrative costs for extending this scheme.

The proposal supports the following priority in the Council's Strategic Plan 2022 -2026:  
**Priority 1: Tackling the cost of living crisis** (Support children and young people through a package of measures including **universal Free School Meals throughout primary and secondary schools**, educational maintenance allowances for those in post-16 years, and bursaries for young people who want to go to university)  
**(Wage war on child poverty**, as well as loneliness, social isolation and poverty among our older residents)

The proposed date of implementation is September 2023.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

Free school meals are associated with improved educational engagement, better attendance at school, improved levels of concentration, behaviour, health and well-being.

Reduction in childhood obesity; children have access to a nutritious, healthy school meal and are ready to learn. (Priority 5: Strategic Plan – implement a borough-wide healthy child weight programme)

Support for families to mitigate the current cost of living pressures.

High levels of take up encourage Children to develop important social skills through eating and socialising communally.

Continual free meal provision encourages school attendance which is essential to support post Covid catch up for all Children.

#### **Risks and Implications:**

Schools' capacity to provide staff, facilities and space may be limited if there is a much larger throughput at mealtimes. Consideration would need to be given to ensure meal choice is targeted to healthy options and not simply meeting demand.

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The funding to provide a universal provision is a significant ongoing pressure on reserves and whilst supporting the cost-of-living pressure it is not targeted at those most in need who would currently meet most of the eligibility criteria for free school meals.

An alternative option is to have a more targeted approach which will support the next cohort of children and young people most in need. These families' household incomes are just above the benefits eligibility criteria (these families have been described as being 'in work poverty' – they do not earn enough to meet the cost of living). This option could reduce pressure on reserves but also alleviate the cost of living crisis to children and families most in need after the free school meals cohort. This option allows a closer match between need and resources available to be made.

Having a universal provision ensures that no means testing is required, reducing administration, and making the scheme run at a school level. Schools will no longer need to process cash payments for meals reducing issues for schools including the chasing of non-payment.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	Yes	This ensures all children are eligible for the service regardless of family income.
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

<b>Summary:</b>	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

<b>Additional Information and Comments:</b>

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Post 16 Education Maintenance Allowance</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 005 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Education services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Education	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	3. Accelerating education
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Steve Nyakatawa, Director of Education	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	500	-	-	500

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposal Summary:**

To achieve the pledge to support young people to stay in Education Post 16 and achieve well. Currently financial support to stay in Education is only available to a limited number of young people directly through their School or College and the DfE. This additional funding would be for those young people that are outside of the eligibility of the current scheme but would still be struggling to afford to access full time Education with the current cost of living pressures affecting the young people and their families. An allocation of £500k per annum would allow 1,250 young people access to the fund if it was set at £400 per pupil which was the level of distribution prior to its cessation, or 1000 young people to access funding if this was increased to £500 per pupil.

The eligibility criteria and financial modelling is not yet complete, although the work is underway with a view to completion by October when proposals will be taken to Cabinet.

This proposal supports the following priorities of the Council's Strategic Plan 2022 -2026:

**Priority 1:** Tackling the cost of living crisis (Support children and young people through a package of measures including universal Free School Meals throughout primary and secondary school, **educational maintenance allowances for those in post-16 years**, and bursaries for young people who want to go to university)

**Priority 2:** Accelerate Education (**Increase the opportunities for our young people to go on to Further and Higher Education**, including boosting entrance to Oxford, Cambridge and other Russell Group universities, by working with our schools to provide effective additional support; and we will review our sixth form and college performance)

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The purpose is to support young people in staying in Education, getting better outcomes and better long-term prospects.

**Risks and Implications:**

The proposals will require an initial level of scoping work to set the levels of eligibility and thereafter additional support from the benefits team to assess claims and process payments. No additional staff have been included in this proposal. There may be some level of risk that young people who are eligible do not claim funding through their schools and that additional pressure is then put against Council resource. Consideration should be given to creating a dedicated post to promote and increase take up of the current government bursary scheme to reduce pressure on Council resources.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

This does not generate any Council efficiency. Investment in our young people would lead to better job prospects and long-term employment levels which in turn would mean less future costs to the public purse.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	Yes	The proposals extend eligibility to children and young people in disadvantaged circumstances and alleviate the impact of the current cost living pressures for children and families most in need of additional support.
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	More pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds may access Education due to the additional financial support through the Education Maintenance Allowance.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

<b>Summary:</b>	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

<b>Additional Information and Comments:</b>

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	University Bursary Fund		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 006 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Education services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Education	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	3. Accelerating education
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Steve Nyakatawa, Director of Education	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	600	-	-	600

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposal Summary:**

To achieve the pledge in the Council's Strategic Plan to support young people to move on to university from post 16 Education. Currently financial support to go to university is provided through the student loan company which is made in the form of a loan and is repayable. In 2014/15 there was a Scheme called the Mayors Higher Education award, which made Bursary payments of £1,500 per student and funded 400 students per year. The proposed use of reserves of £600k would allow for the same allocation amount for the same number of Students.

As these payments would be made over an Academic year, there is no pro-rata reduction in the first year.

The proposal supports the following priorities of the Council's Strategic Plan 2022-2026:

**Priority 1:** Tackling the cost of living crisis in the Council's Strategic Plan 2022 -2026 (Support children and young people through a package of measures including universal Free School Meals throughout primary and secondary school, educational maintenance allowances for those in post-16 years, and bursaries for young people who want to go to university)

**Priority 2:** Accelerate Education (Increase the opportunities for our young people to go on to Further and Higher Education, including boosting entrance to Oxford, Cambridge and other Russell Group universities, by working with our schools to provide effective additional support; and we will review our sixth form and college performance)

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The purpose is to support young people in staying in Education, getting better outcomes and better long-term prospects. Supported students complete their studies successfully and have better career opportunities.

**Risks and Implications:**

The proposals will require an initial level of scoping work to set the levels of eligibility and thereafter additional support from the benefits team to assess claims and process payments. No additional staff have been included in this proposal. Costs could be reduced if a dedicated post could be secured to support students in finding and applying for university and charity bursaries available at their chosen university. Dedicated resource could also promote take up of government bursaries under EMA.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

This does not generate any Council efficiency. Investment in our young people would lead to better job prospects and long-term employment levels which in turn would mean fewer future costs to the public purse



## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	Yes	The proposals extend eligibility for Bursaries to young people in disadvantaged circumstances and go some way to alleviate the impact of the cost living crisis for those young people most in need of additional support.
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	More pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds may access University that may otherwise have been discouraged.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-26

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	Young Tower Hamlets		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 007 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Cultural and related services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Tower Hamlets Youth Service	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Susannah Beasley-Murray, Director of Supporting Families	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	<b>Total Growth</b>
Budget (£000)	2,400	6,089	2,411	-	8,500

  

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	<b>Total FTE Increase</b>
Employees (FTE)	15	214	N/A	N/A	214

<b>Proposal Summary:</b>
<p><b><u>Tower Hamlets Youth Service Offer</u></b></p> <p>We are proposing to transform services for young people in Tower Hamlets by delivering a new local authority youth service which will ensure that every young person in the borough has access to a service which provides support and opportunity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b><u>Universal Provision for Young People:</u></b> A step change in the provision for young people with safe spaces across the borough, staffed by skilled youth workers and delivering a range of activities underpinned by a youth work curriculum.</li> <li>- <b><u>Targeted Youth Support:</u></b> Providing targeted support to vulnerable young people and their family in the borough.</li> <li>- <b><u>Integrated Detached Team:</u></b> An integrated offer working in partnership with the Exploitation Service and Community Safety Team as part of a preventative and responsive intervention to violence and exploitation in the community.</li> <li>- <b><u>Quality and Commissioning Team:</u></b> To ensure that the quality of the service is maintained and supported by data and business support.</li> </ul> <p>This model provides a new Local Authority led Youth Service offer as part of a full transformation, with youth provision in every ward. It includes redesign of staffing, safe spaces in every ward throughout the borough and a borough wide Integrated Detached and Targeted Support Teams.</p> <p>The above proposed staffing structures are subject to HR consultation and change process.</p>

### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

This proposal contributes the following Strategic priorities of the Council:

- Accelerate Education
- Boost Culture, business, jobs, and leisure
- Invest in Public Services
- Empower Communities and fight crime
- A council that works for you and listens to you

### **Risks and Implications:**

Without the growth funding, we would be unable to fulfil the Mayor's vision for the future of the Youth Service.

### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

This activity increases the number of young people engaged in youth service activities in a curricular and extra-curricular setting.

The growth bid will improve outcomes for children and young people, ensuring that they receive the appropriate support as and when they need it and gain better outcomes in the future, achieving greater socio-economic growth. A recent report commissioned by UK Youth and released during November 2022 Youth Work Week reports that for every £1 spent on youth work, the benefit to the taxpayer is between £3.20 and £6.40.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	Should the redesign of the Youth Service go ahead this will be subject to a formal legal HR change process to ensure staff are protected and are not placed at a disadvantage.

<b>Summary:</b>	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

<b>Additional Information and Comments:</b>

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Leisure Service Insourcing</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 008 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Cultural and related services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Commissioning and Culture	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	4. Boosting culture, business, jobs, and leisure
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Michael Coleman; Project Director - Leisure Capital Programme and Procurement	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Iqbal Hossain, Cabinet Member for Culture and Recreation

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	N/A	1,925	-	(1,650)	275

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	N/A	8	-	TBC	TBC

## Proposal Summary:

The Mayor & Cabinet have decided that the Leisure Service will be insourced from May 2024. It is currently outsourced to GLL under a contract that will expire on 30 April 2024. This change will provide greater control over the operation of the Leisure Service, as delivered through the Council's seven leisure centres. It also requires the Council to assume all commercial and operational risks associated with running the service.

The new in-house service will operate all seven leisure centres (noting that St George's is shut with its replacement forming part of the portfolio). It may also deliver outreach services using non-Leisure sites (e.g. community centres, parks, etc.), although that is to be confirmed. The service will manage, maintain and operate the leisure centres, presumably to a similar specification to the current GLL contract, although this is also to be confirmed.

Officers undertook a detailed analysis of the financial implications of a range of options, including insourcing in 2021. This indicated that outsourcing offered the best fiscal position for the Council (c. £1.3m annual surplus), and insourcing the worst (c. £800k annual deficit), please note the estimates are not reflective of increasing inflation and utility costs. This was set out in a detailed Cabinet report that recommended outsourcing as the most efficacious solution for the Council, based on risk transfer and financial performance in particular. The financial modelling was based on benchmark data and assumptions that were individually assessed to confirm their robustness. This evidence was presented to the Mayor and Cabinet, who decided to insource the service.

The decision will provide the Council with greater control over the operation of the service, and full responsibility for its performance. It is possible that, with sufficient investment, the service could perform above the model's expectations, which may be true of all options.

The Transition Project costs will be one-off.

Please note that the figures for 24/25 and 25/26 are highly provisional at this stage. The figures for 24/25 do include mitigating the expected operational deficit for that year.

**2023-24 Transition Costs:**

<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>2023-24 £000's</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Transition Project Team	470	Currently unfunded costs only (i.e. additional to 'business as usual')
New Management Team	100	To replace staff who will not TUPE from GLL - Q4 pro rata of £398k p.a.
Leisure Consultancy	405	FY 22/23 cost may need to shift into 23/24 but anticipated full value is required
IT, uniforms, etc.	500	Will need to calculate in greater detail (a benchmarked LA estimated £1.34m)
Contingency	350	Estimated value (a benchmarked LA used £200k)
Marketing/Branding	100	Estimated value (a benchmarked LA used £130k)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,925</b>	

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The proposal to insource meets strategic priority 3 People access joined-up services when they need them and feel healthier and more independent.

The decision to insource has been taken to provide greater control, not to improve the financial performance of the service. The Mayor and Cabinet anticipate an improvement in service quality from the Council being able to intervene directly, in real time as it were, in the service.

**Risks and Implications:**

The Leisure Procurement Board's risk register monitors the implications of this change. It highlights a number of significant risks rated R using the Council's RAG methodology. These include (but not exclusively):

1. The Council will be responsible for the cost of any deficit in the trading performance of the service, currently estimated to be £800k per annum.
2. The Council needs to recruit a bespoke management team to oversee the delivery of this service, employing individuals with the requisite skills and experience to manage the service as effectively as possible. Failing to do so, or to retain staff that have been recruited, will significantly undermine the ability of the service to function effectively.
3. All operational risks will sit with the Council – staffing shortfalls, health and safety incidents, equipment failure, planned and reactive maintenance, customer service, etc.
4. A transition team with experience of undertaking a similar insourcing needs to be appointed urgently to give the Council the best chance possible of meeting the tight deadline of 1 May 2024 for having the in-house model in place.
5. The risk of deteriorating performance from the current provider as the contract nears end.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The proposal to insource the Leisure Service will provide the Council with greater control over how it operates, and thus the theoretical opportunity to alter aspects of its delivery to meet Council objectives. From the financial analysis completed as part of appraising a range of management options, the in-house option does not offer a fiscal advantage over the other options considered (outsourcing, LA trading company or trust). Its value is based on having a more flexible model, in terms of adjusting its delivery quickly and without any recourse to contractual change.

The service could be relatively efficient if sufficient resource is dedicated to allow for as smooth a transition as possible to an insourced operation, and the operational management and staffing of the service once up and running has the requisite skills, expertise and experience required to run it.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Assuming that funding will not be diverted from an alternative use that supports addressing inequality, and new staff will be recruited to run the service, the change to insourcing will not reduce resources to address inequality.
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	As above.
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	Yes	This proposal changes the delivery model of the front-line service, albeit non-statutory, in the form of the in-house leisure service providing facilities and activities directly to residents.
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	Access to the leisure service could broaden access, although using the service is a matter of personal choice.
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	As above, it could increase the number of residents who are theoretically able to use leisure centres.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	Insourcing will require the Council to employ considerably more staff.
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	For existing Council staff who manage the contract with GLL and the strategic direction of the current contract, there will be changes to roles, as yet to be defined.

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	Yes

Additional Information and Comments:
This is a substantive change in how the service is managed, although users will hopefully not see any negative impact upon service quality if the transition is smooth and the new service resourced to succeed. There are, however, some implications for staff – existing Council, and employees who will TUPE across.

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Performance Data Improvement – Children &amp; Adults</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 009 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Investment
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Children Social Care
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Commissioning and Culture	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Layla Richards, Acting Director Commissioning & Culture	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	732	150	-	(150)	-

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	7	2	-	(2)	-

## Proposal Summary:

Persistent weaknesses in performance data and management information are holding back the drive for improvement across Children’s and Adults Services. The growth will fund two senior posts to oversee data and performance improvement in the Strategy, Policy and Improvement teams of Children & Culture and Health, Adults & Community. It is envisaged that growth is needed for 2023/24 and 2024/25 after which we would revert to current structures. Following the Enabling Functions restructure which concluded in January 2022, overall headcount was reduced within the team responsible for supporting the delivery of our data and performance functions. This was particularly the case in more senior posts. Much of the rationale for this was based on technological solutions such as “Power BI which while the council remains committed to implementing, currently we are not a stage where this can account for the reduction in staffing numbers. This proposal will create additional capacity within the teams, at a level that ensures that resources are appropriately managed and targeted and that the new ways of working have the best opportunity to be successful.

This additional capacity is needed to deliver the improvements required and there is a need for fixed term investment over two years to deliver this – at which point the embedding and impact of those improvements and use of Power BI can be reviewed.

Recent inspection and peer review activity has highlighted that we need to be undertaking quality assurance of our data on an ongoing basis, this requires a regular programme of producing and analysing our existing data and working with teams and services to address any areas of weakness – this isn’t possible within existing resources. This poses a risk to future inspection activity; both the recent Youth Justice Inspection and Ofsted Focused Visit highlighted some areas of weakness in this area which require urgent addressing prior to any further visits or inspections.

As well as contributing to overall improvements in the council these posts would ensure more systematic availability and use of data in relation to ethnicity and differential outcomes/ service take-up. Furthermore, they would support the delivery of key pledges and strategic plan priorities including those relating to cost of living such as the extension of FSM to secondary pupils, youth service pledges, further developing our early help offer, returning to offering free home care for eligible residents and ensuring resident views are at the heart of service decision-making. The additional data capacity will also be vital for the meeting the data requirements of the insourcing of leisure centres in the borough, as well as ensuring we are more systematic in reporting on demographic differentials in service outcomes or outputs in relation to ethnicity, gender, age etc.



**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

Improved Management Information, improved data responses to Inspectors during inspections.

**Risks and Implications:**

There are risks to our ability to respond to improvement and inspection requirements if we do not have sufficient data and performance improvement capacity, as well as to the improvement work that is required in respect of the implementation of Power BI. Our ability to provide high quality data is a key metric that we are measured on during any inspection activity. While our current resourcing enables us to prioritise this work, there is a risk that should an inspection be called at a time where there are other key deadlines, such as a statutory return, the ability to provide high quality responses to both key areas would pose a significant challenge.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

This approach would provide more value for money, as well as longer-term additional capacity, as opposed to contracting additional posts on an interim basis.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Community Language Provision</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 010 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Cultural and related services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Commissioning and Culture	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	3. Accelerating education
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Matt Eady, Director Culture and Commissioning	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	800	-	-	800

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	-	TBC	-	-	TBC

**Proposal Summary:**

It is a priority in the Council's Strategic Plan to resume the provision of Community Language education for children aged 8-14 in a range of community languages. This will deliver benefits both in respect of children learning the language but also in respect of learning about their heritage and so strengthening their self-esteem and sense of identity.

The Community Language Service will be built up to deliver classes to approximately 1,500 children. The languages taught will include Bengali, Arabic, Mandarin, Spanish, Lithuanian, Cantonese, Russian, Somali, Urdu and Vietnamese.

Language classes will be delivered from a range of community settings.

Subject to approval of the requested growth commencement of the development of the Community Language delivery model will begin in April 2023 beginning with the recruitment of the Head of Service and the team. It is anticipated the new service will commence in the autumn term.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

This investment will meet one of the priority themes of the Council's Strategic Plan – Accelerate Education. Furthermore, it will provide safe welcoming settings for residents to develop community languages, improve confidence, wellbeing and attainment.

**Risks and Implications:**

The risks in building a large service from scratch at pace will be managed through a clear project structure and project plan. Additional risks relate to increasing costs e.g. staff remuneration, utilities and supplies as a consequence of the cost of living crisis.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

Tight project management in the planning of the service, and rigorous management once implemented will help ensure that the service provides good value for money and is valued by users.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	Currently, there is no equivalent service. Therefore, this will increase opportunity and access to a community language provision.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

<b>Summary:</b>	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

<b>Additional Information and Comments:</b>

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Youth Justice Service Improvements</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CHI 011 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Investment
<b>Directorate:</b>	Children and Culture	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Children Social Care
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Youth Justice and Young People's Service	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	6. Empowering communities and fighting crime
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Kelly Duggan, Head of Youth Justice and Young People's Service	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	873	45	(45)	-	-

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	16	1	(1)	-	-

## Proposal Summary:

The Youth Justice Service was inspected in April 2022 by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) and received an outcome of **Requires Improvement**. The following areas in need for improvement were highlighted:

- Consistent Management oversight and understanding of risk
- A lack of appropriate interventions for children to undertake
- The service not being informed by data

In response to the required improvement rating and recommendations for improvement as detailed in the HMIP Youth Justice Inspection Report April 2022 the Youth Justice Service is proposing additional growth in training. This additional growth will ensure there is sufficient trained capacity to deliver upon the improvement plan and embed the necessary changes within the service and across the partnership to achieve the required impact.

This proposal is aligned to the Tower Hamlets Strategic Plan 2022-2026, specifically in relation to the following:

### Priority 6. Empower Communities and Fight Crime

- Primary aim of the Youth Justice service is to prevent offending of children, the offence profile is primary drug and violence related. The additional resources within the Youth Justice Service will further contribute towards skilling up staff to provide interventions and support with children and their families to address this.
- Children in the youth justice system many challenges including those not of their making such as poverty, trauma, discrimination, exploitation, gang offending and special educational needs. All of which can be a contributing factor to their offending behaviour and vulnerability.

### Training:

- The proposed £45k training budget is aligned with the outcome of the skills audit that has been undertaken with staff and the newly developed improvement plan. The training requirements will span across the below 6 key areas:



**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The HMIP Report demonstrated the areas in which the service needed to improve. We have created a one-year Youth Justice Plan alongside a 12 months' Improvement Plan so we have clear tasks and deadlines for improvements to be made.

**Risks and Implications:**

Risks: Without the training of the staff this would have an impact on the speed of the improvements to the youth justice service.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The investment in the workforce will ensure that the service delivers more effectively and therefore provides better value for money.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	Improving Community Safety - CCTV		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / HAC 001 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Health, Adults and Community	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Community Safety
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Community Safety	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	6. Empowering communities and fighting crime
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Ann Corbett, Director of Community Safety	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Ohid Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Safer Communities

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	68	-	-	68

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	-	1	-	-	1

**Proposal Summary:**

This proposal is for permanent funding. Empowering Communities and Fighting Crime is also one of the Mayor's top priorities.

The proposal will contribute to achieving the objective of "Maintain our award-winning boroughwide CCTV service, which has been vital in detecting crime and identifying offenders. Work with local landlords and businesses to widen its scope"

We will build on the current service and the new digital upgraded service. We propose to introduce additional Video Surveillance Systems (CCTV) technical expertise to ensure that the award-winning borough wide CCTV plus all other council owned video surveillance systems (VSS) are maintained and operated to the highest standards. The new high level of compliance with the data protection law, protection of freedoms and the broader framework of legal, procedural, and risk-based obligations, together with the top-quality standards of our systems and their operating model, will aim for Tower Hamlets to be recognised as the "best practice" borough. **(£67,533)**

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The introduction of additional expertise within the organisation will ensure that the council award-winning public space CCTV and all other Video Surveillance Systems (VSS) meet our obligations under the latest laws and regulations, allowing for its top-quality equipment and infrastructure to be managed and operated to the highest standards.

**Risks and Implications:**

The additional technical expertise is needed to ensure we are meeting our obligations in line with the law/ emerging regulations: this post is needed to ensure the council has the necessary technical expertise and capacity to manage the changes to the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice and data protection.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

This additional resource is needed to ensure we are meeting our obligations in line with new laws and regulations.



## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Improving Community Safety (Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers)</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / HAC 002 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Health, Adults and Community	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Community Safety
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Community Safety	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	6. Empowering communities and fighting crime
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Ann Corbett, Director of Community Safety	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Ohid Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Safer Communities

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	<b>Total Growth</b>
Budget (£000)	1,513	2,829	-	-	2,829

  

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	<b>Total FTE Increase</b>
Employees (FTE)	26	41 (plus 4 apprentices)	-	-	41

## Proposal Summary:

This proposal sets out potential additional investment options to further improve the Council's community safety service offer for residents, to deliver on the Mayor's ambitious manifesto pledges.

This will be achieved by additional growth which will help restore some of the former "safer communities" directorate functionality particularly in relation to enforcement, street-based patrolling, reassurance, deterrence, and improved visibility.

The current operating model for the service is based upon residents' and staff feedback, the crime and antisocial behaviour picture in the borough and the new legislative background post 2015. The current model was designed to address the issues raised by residents, partners and our front-line staff. Residents' surveys consistently highlight that tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB) and improving safety is a top priority for them.

The current reporting and locality model has been co-created with residents to offer them a dedicated point of contact and ensure there are specific resources allocated to localities. Residents told us that the Council is hard to navigate, that they had no single point to contact to report their anti-social behaviour issues, despite often trying to report to the council because the police 101 London number is ineffective. They state that that police community policing has been eroded over the past 10 years. The current model was co designed on this basis.

Even with an improved service offer and more joined up working with police, partners, third sector organisations and community groups - the crime and anti-social behaviour picture, like much of London, continues to be challenging. Drug related offending is one of the key drivers for anti-social behaviour and crime. The violence picture and deprived neighbourhoods are closely linked. There is growing use of other substances such as nitrous oxide which is a key driver for anti-social behaviour, residents' concerns and associated health harms. There are a number of hostels supporting vulnerable residents with challenging and complex needs sometimes linked to substance misuse and associated ASB and crime in neighbourhoods.

Building on the current operating model - we will redesign a new service that will ensure, through the provision of additional uniformed enforcement officers, to be a more visible and deterrence focussed service. Residents' surveys have clearly shown the need for more visibility and uniformed officers out on the street but also the frustration of not having any services that can promptly deal with their concerns. This intervention is designed to meet this demand. We will increase the number of uniformed officers on the street by expanding and re-designing the existing locality-based model. The THEO team will benefit from 41 additional resources that will join the 26 already in place. It is proposed that four local young people will be given the opportunity to join the new service as apprentices.

This will aim to tackle the volume of anti-social behaviour and crime while increasing residents' feelings/perception of being safe as well as improving confidence and trust in public services. This will continue to be delivered through a partnership approach and close work with the Met Police.

**Work with the Metropolitan Police to put more uniformed police officers on the streets, as part of our Community Constabulary which previously boosted policing numbers locally. These officers will be supported by Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers.**

- Residents' surveys have clearly shown the need for more visibility and uniformed officers out on the street and also the frustration of not having services that can promptly deal with concerns. Increasing the number of uniformed officers on the street by expanding and re-designing the existing locality-based model will respond to these issues.
- The Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers team could be expanded by a further 36 Enforcement Officers (THEOs) & 4 Team Leaders from the 26 posts that are already in place (22 THEO's and 4 Team Leaders). This would result in a total team of 58 THEOs and 8 Team Leaders at an additional cost of £2.747m.
- A THEO Manager Post (Grade M) would be required to oversee all these additional resources, at a cost of £0.082m.
- It is also proposed that four local young people will be given the opportunity to join the new service as apprentices (4 THEO Apprentices), to be funded via the Apprenticeship Levy.
- The additional resources will be intelligently tasked to tackle hotspots and problematic areas identified through the analysis of residents' contacts to services, reinforcing existing teams in each of four localities. A new borough wide neighbourhood response team is proposed to act quickly on residents' concerns – this will be shift based work to meet demand.
- The expansion of locality-based teams will maximise high visibility and deterrence patrols, ensuring better contact with the community and an increased knowledge and deeper understanding of hyper local issues. Community based officers will become trusted points of contacts within their area, boosting reporting and improving outcomes for victims through a more effective locality based problem-solving approach. Positive outcomes are expected in terms of residents' satisfaction in statutory services accessibility and response to their safety concerns and in the number of sanction detections by police and prescriptive actions against offenders to bring them to justice.

**The total growth bid is in the amount of £2.829m to cover the additional required resources (permanent growth bid) and assuming the 4 apprentices can be funded via the Apprenticeship Levy. This will provide an additional 36 THEO's, 4 Team Leaders, 1 THEO Manager, 4 THEO apprentices.**

#### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

**The proposal will contribute to achieving many of the objectives listed under the “Empowering communities and fight crime priorities” and in particular:**

- The expansion of THEOs team will deliver on the Council's objective to “*Work with the Metropolitan Police to put more uniformed police officers on the streets, as part of our Community Constabulary which previously boosted policing numbers locally. These officers will be supported by Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers*”. The new service will maximise the efficiency and effectiveness of patrolling officers that will be tasked to the areas most affected by ASB and street-based crimes, contributing to the achievement of the council strategic plan's objective to “*Identify crime hotspots and tackle them*”. This should help residents feel safer and impact on the level of offending in relation to street-based crimes like drug dealing and ASB. This will contribute to the achievement of the Council's objective to “*Work with the police and other bodies to tackle drug-related crime and aim to arrest at least one drug dealer every day*”.

#### **Risks and Implications:**

- **Inability to recruit suitable candidates for new posts** – A recent THEOs recruitment process for existing vacant posts has been successful with a sufficient number of suitable candidates, though delays will materialise in the necessary Police vetting process to achieve CSAS accreditation.
- A workforce to reflect the community - The Division is very diverse. Overall, 68% of staff identify as Male and 32% as Female. Attracting females into traditional enforcement type roles has been a historic challenge which we wish to address.
- We will mitigate this by carefully considering our future recruitment campaign and selection process, and working to ensure our job descriptions, adverts use appropriate gender neutral language.

### Value for Money and Efficiency:

Community safety is our residents' top priority and a priority in the Mayor's manifesto.

Antisocial behaviour is economically costly and has a significant social cost. It impacts on individuals, families and communities. Areas affected can appear to be run down and not cared for, generating a lack of ownership. Persistent problems, which are not properly addressed, can generate societal withdrawal where more and more people lose interest and confidence in reporting due to the perception that nothing will be done. This can attract more perpetrators to the area who perceive a lower risk of being caught or reported. By introducing additional resources, services should be able to act early before problems escalate, breaking the cycle and empowering the so called "natural surveillance" which generates community cohesion and is known to be an effective crime deterrent.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	Yes	The proposal will strengthen the Council front-line service provision by adding more resources that will be deployed to work out in the community. Residents, workers, and visitors in Tower Hamlets will all benefit from more visible Council and police officers out in the streets, improving their perception and feeling of safety.
Changes to a Service		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	By increasing the number of resources deployed within the community, Tower Hamlets' visitors, workers and residents will benefit from a more accessible community safety service, where they will be able to report issues face-to-face and where they are based, being reassured that their concerns are immediately taken into consideration and assigned to the relevant team/case worker. This will address the issues reported by residents about the use of 101, the difficulty in navigating the Council and the lack of points of contacts.
Changes to Staffing		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Improving Community Safety - Additional Police Officers (Community Constabulary)</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / HAC 003 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Health, Adults and Community	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Community Safety
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Community Safety	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	6. Empowering communities and fighting crime
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Ann Corbett, Director of Community Safety	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Ohid Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Safer Communities

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	771	1,573	-	-	1,573

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	12	22	-	-	22

## Proposal Summary:

This proposal sets out potential additional investment options to further improve the Council's community safety service offer for residents, to deliver on the Mayor's ambitious manifesto pledges. This will be achieved by additional growth which will help restore some of the former "safer communities" directorate functionality particularly in relation to enforcement, street-based patrolling, reassurance, deterrence, and improved visibility.

The current operating model for the service is based upon residents' and staff feedback, the crime and antisocial behaviour picture in the borough and the new legislative background post 2015. The current model was designed to address the issues raised by residents, partners and our front-line staff. Residents' surveys consistently highlight that tackling anti-social behaviour (ASB) and improving safety is a top priority for them.

The current reporting and locality model has been co-created with residents to offer them a dedicated point of contact and ensure there are specific resources allocated to localities. Residents told us that the Council is hard to navigate, that they had no single point to contact to report their anti-social behaviour issues, despite often trying to report to the council because the police 101 London number is ineffective. They state that that police community policing has been eroded over the past 10 years. The current model was co designed on this basis.

Even with an improved service offer and more joined up working with police, partners, third sector organisations and community groups - the crime and anti-social behaviour picture like much of London, continues to be challenging. Drug related crime is one of the key drivers for anti-social behaviour. The violence picture and deprived neighbourhoods are closely linked. There is growing use of other substances such as nitrous oxide which again is a key driver for anti-social behaviour, residents' concerns, and associated health harms. There are a number of hostels on the borough supporting many vulnerable residents with challenging and complex needs sometimes linked to substance misuse and associated ASB and crime.

Building on the current operating model we will redesign a new service offer that will ensure, through the provision of additional police officers, to be a more visible and deterrence focussed service. Residents' surveys have clearly shown the need for more visibility and uniformed officers out on the street but also the frustration of not having any services that can promptly deal with their concerns. This intervention is designed to meet this demand. We will increase the number of uniformed officers on the street by expanding the existing Police Task Force. The PTF will benefit from additional resources that will join the 12 already in place. This will aim to tackle the volume of anti-social behaviour and crimes while increasing residents' feelings/perception of being safe as well as improving confidence and trust in public services. This will continue to be delivered through a partnership approach.

**Work with the Metropolitan Police to put more uniformed police officers on the streets, as part of our Community Constabulary which previously boosted policing numbers locally. These officers will be supported by Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers.**

- Residents' surveys have clearly shown the need for more visibility and uniformed officers out on the street and also the frustration of not having services that can promptly deal with concerns. Increasing the number of police officers on the street by expanding the existing PTF will respond to these issues.
- The additional resources will be intelligently tasked to tackle hotspots and problematic areas identified through the analysis of residents' contacts to services, reinforcing existing teams in each of four localities.

- The expansion of the existing PTF will maximise high visibility and deterrence patrols, ensuring better contact with the community and an increased knowledge and deeper understanding of hyper local issues. Community based officers will become trusted points of contacts within their area, boosting reporting and improving outcomes for victims through a more effective locality based problem-solving approach. Positive outcomes are expected in terms of residents' satisfaction in statutory services accessibility and response to their safety concerns and in the number of sanction detections by police and prescriptive actions against offenders to bring them to justice.

The bid proposes to expand the existing PTF resources of 2 Sergeants and 10 Police Constables (costing £771k) by a further 2 Sergeants and 20 Police Constables in 2023/24 (costing an additional £1.335m with assumed pay award). This will then make a total of 4 Sergeants and 30 Police Constables. In addition, there will be a recharge for Police vehicles of £900-£1,000 per month per officer, costing an additional £0.238m. The total permanent growth bid is in the amount of £1.573m and will require uplifting in future financial years for any Met Police pay awards that are confirmed.

#### Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):

The proposal will contribute to achieving many of the objectives listed under the “Empowering communities and fight crime priorities” and in particular:

- The expansion of the PTF team will deliver on the Council's objective to “*Work with the Metropolitan Police to put more uniformed police officers on the streets, as part of our Community Constabulary which previously boosted policing numbers locally. These officers will be supported by Tower Hamlets Enforcement Officers*”. The new service will maximise the efficiency and effectiveness of patrolling officers that will be tasked to the areas most affected by ASB and street-based crimes, contributing to the achievement of the council strategic plan's objective to “*Identify crime hotspots and tackle them*”. This should help residents feel safer and impact on the level of street-based crimes like drug dealing and ASB. This will contribute to the achievement of the Council's objective to “*Work with the police and other bodies to tackle drug-related crime and aim to arrest at least one drug dealer every day*”.

#### Risks and Implications:

**A Significant Risk** – The challenge for the Met Police Service in London to attract and recruit police officers to uniformed posts. The local Basic Command Unit has acknowledged this risk, the current lack of resources and challenges in recruiting for new police posts. This can be seen in the abstractions and issues related to local police safer neighbourhood teams across London and Tower Hamlets. This is a London wide challenge and not within the Council's ability to resolve. However, they have been working over the past year to address the issue by delivering “recruitment days” across the capital. We can aim to mitigate this risk by supporting the MPS during their “recruitment days” in the community, and by promoting the benefit of joining the force at every opportunity to increase the diversity of policing and ensure it reflects the diversity of our borough and London.

#### Value for Money and Efficiency:

Community safety is our residents' top priority and a priority in the Mayor's manifesto. Most of the functions are however non-statutory for the Council and it is likely we spend considerably more than other Councils in this area (benchmarking data is hard to ascertain as there is no national data set and Councils attribute spend to a variety of different services/cost headings). Investment in Police is a non-statutory function (albeit the Council has the ability to do this through a provision to contract with the Mayor's Office for Policing & Crime (MOPAC). At the current time the Metropolitan Police Service is recruiting to a significant number of posts and will reach an all-time high level for Police Officer numbers.

Antisocial behaviour is economically costly and has a significant social cost. It impacts on individuals, families and communities. Areas affected can appear to be run down and not cared for, generating a lack of ownership. Persistent problems, which are not properly addressed, can generate societal withdrawal where more and more people lose interest and confidence in reporting due to the perception that nothing will be done. This can attract more perpetrators to the area who perceive a lower risk of being caught or reported. By introducing additional resources, services should be able to act early before problems escalate, breaking the cycle and empowering the so called “natural surveillance” which generates community cohesion and is known to be an effective crime deterrent.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	Yes	The proposal will strengthen the Council front-line service provision by adding more resources that will be deployed to work out in the community. Residents, workers, and visitors in Tower Hamlets will all benefit from more visible Council and police officers out in the streets, improving their perception and feeling of safety.
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	By increasing the number of resources deployed within the community, Tower Hamlets' visitors, workers and residents will benefit from a more accessible community safety service, where they will be able to report issues face-to-face and where they are based, being reassured that their concerns are immediately taken into consideration and assigned to the relevant team/case worker. This will address the issues reported by residents about the use of 101, the difficulty in navigating the Council and the lack of points of contacts.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:



# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Free home care – Introduction of free community care services under the Care Act</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / HAC 004 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Health, Adults and Community	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Adult Social Care
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Adult Social Care	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Joe Lacey-Holland, Head of Strategy, Performance & Improvement	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Gulam Kibria Choudhury , Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing and Social Care

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	(2,434)	-	2,434	-	2,434

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

**Proposal/Objectives** - To amend the Charging Policy for Adult Social Care and re-introduce free community-based care services including home care, day care, direct payments and other forms of home/community-based support. These services are provided following an assessment under the Care Act and are provided to those with eligible needs under the legislation.

The Council has the power (but not a duty) to charge for those services and has done so since 2016. The current charging policy in line with national guidance, provides protection for those on very low incomes and the local policy includes discretionary elements to further reduce the burden of charging, for example, a weekly cap on the total cost of charges for an individual. The proposal will deliver a benefit for residents eligible for support under the Care Act in that they will no longer be charged for services – the Council will cover the full cost of those services. No change is proposed in relation to those receiving care and support in a care home (residential or nursing) as the Council has a duty to financially assess residents and levy charges in accordance with national legislation.

Currently 2,607 people receive a community support service, of which 1,294 have been assessed as liable to pay a charge towards the cost of the service they receive. Of this 695 people (54%) are being charged under £50 per week. 599 people of the total 1,294 people (46%) are being charged more than £50 per week as a contribution towards their community-based care cost.

**Motivation/Reason** – in line with the Strategic Plan, a proposal is being forward in line with the objectives of investing in public services. Implementation of the proposal creates a benefit for residents at a time when the ‘cost of living’ crisis is impacting. However, there is a recurrent cost to Council budgets of implementing this policy change. Nationally reform of adult social care will change the way social care is charged for including the introduction of a cap on the total amount any individual can pay in charges over their lifetime. This proposal can proceed within this context of changing national frameworks.

**Cost** – current income from community charging is £3.007m. A bad debt provision of £0.573m has been deducted as some charges are not able to be collected. A total recurrent budget of £2.434m will therefore be needed to cover the loss of income from charging.

There will be some service users with debt at the point the policy is changed – it is recommended that these debts continue to be pursued to ensure an equitable approach to those who have paid their charges. Any debts which do need to be written off will incur a one-off additional budget pressure.

This proposal is planned for implementation in April 2024.

#### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

- Change to charging policy for adult social care following a short, focused consultation; directly delivering on the of the priorities set out within the Strategic Plan.
- Simplicity of explanation for residents, families and staff (with charging only needing to be discussed and explained for those moving to a care home)
- No barriers to accepting care due to the cost (seen in a small number of cases)

#### **Risks and Implications:**

- The additional cost will need to be found recurrently and the Adult Social Care budget is already significantly overspent with increasing needs and complexity of those supported.
- This change would take place at a time of national reform to the sector and this may increase confusion among residents with multiple changes – this risk is somewhat mitigated by the significant benefit to the resident of not being charged for services.
- Offering free care services increases demand for those services both generally with more people likely to approach the Council than potentially self-fund their care and specifically for some disabled people with high care needs and high levels of income and/or savings.
- Existing debt under the current policy may be more difficult to collect with a move to a new policy.
- The interface with Continuing Health Care (care services provided by the NHS to those with very high levels of health needs) which is free at the point of delivery needs careful monitoring – there is some evidence of low levels of Continuing Health Care funding as a result of the Council providing free care in the past. It is essential that those eligible for NHS free care, receive it to avoid this cost drifting to the Council.

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The amendment of policy to decrease charging income to the Council will result in a cost pressure – the cost pressure is to the Adult Social Care budget which is already forecasting a significant ongoing overspend due to increased needs and complexity. The impact of this policy change will increase the financial gap on the Adult Social Care budget and make the task of achieving financial sustainability in the medium to long term much harder. For the resident, there will be no charge for care services based at home and in the community and this will have a positive financial impact on personal incomes.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	Yes	Front-line social care teams will no longer have to explain the financial assessment and charging process to residents unless they are going to move to a care home.
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	However, there is some evidence that offering free home care can increase demand on services – residents have to be eligible for support under the Care Act however we might see more people approach us for support due to this change.
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	As above.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:
Overall this proposal has a positive impact on residents using adult social care and this is primarily residents with disabilities, mental health issues and age related frailty.

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-26

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Invest in Our Provision of Care for Vulnerable Members of the Community - Adult Social Care Inspection &amp; Assurance</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / HAC 005 / 22-23	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Investment
<b>Directorate:</b>	Health, Adults and Community	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Adult Social Care
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Adult Social Care	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Katie O'Driscoll, Director Adult Social Care	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Gulam Kibria Choudhury , Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing and Social Care

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	<b>Total Growth</b>
Budget (£000)	-	203	(203)	-	-

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	<b>Total FTE Increase</b>
Employees (FTE)	-	3	(3)	-	-

## Proposal Summary:

This proposal sets out how we will respond to the Mayor's Manifesto/Strategic Plan in relation to Adult Social Care. It sets out the national and local context for the service which is one of ongoing financial pressure and uncertainty with funding and reform.

- Invest in our provision of care for vulnerable members of the community
- Ensure we are providing the best quality of services and passing all the appropriate inspections

### Adult Social Care Reform

The government has announced a two-year delay on the adult social care reforms – this provides further uncertainty in the medium term around implementation of the various reforms, timescales and the cost to local authorities. This growth proforma has been updated to reflect the delay to these changes.

### Adult Social Care Inspection and Assurance Programme

Under the Care Act 2014 (part one) local authorities have duties to people who live in their areas around:

- Prevention
- Information and advice
- High quality, appropriate services

From April 2023, the Care Quality Commission (CQC) will inspect local authority Adult Social Care services in relation to the Care Act duties as outlined above. The CQC are yet to publish their assessment framework but have indicated that the initial focus for local authority assessments will be across four main themes:

1. Working with people – including assessing needs, supporting people to live healthier lives
2. Providing support – including care provision, integration and continuity of care, partnerships, and communities
3. Ensuring safety – including safe systems, pathways, and transitions, safeguarding
4. Leadership and workforce – including leadership and workforce, governance, management and sustainability, learning, improvement, and innovation.

Each theme will have a set of quality statements which describe what good looks like. Evidence will be via a range of sources, including peoples experience, feedback from partners, feedback from staff and leaders, observation, processes, outcomes, and performance data.

Local authorities have not been inspected in relation to Adult Social Care for around 12 years and the infrastructure to support such a regime no longer exists in most local authorities. There are no grants being provided to cover the additional burden of an inspection regime. A key priority is preparation in readiness for inspection to ensure compliance and a level of infrastructure will be needed to support this. This proforma has been reviewed to outline the minimum needed in the short term to further support this preparation.

- Programme management (an additional lead role however supplemented by existing resources in Strategy, Performance & Intelligence)

- Data analysis and data cleansing (this is highly connected with the work of the Transformation Programme)
- Practice leadership to support with additional auditing and quality oversight (supplementing the small existing practice development function)
- Co-production leadership to work with service users and carers (a current gap in terms of a dedicated role)

The following resources are proposed for the Programme Team in 2023-24:-

Post	Cost (£000's)
Programme Manager	91
Data Cleansing Officer	54
0.5 Practice Lead	34
0.5 Co-production Lead	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>203</b>

#### Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):

- Service assessed as Good or Outstanding by CQC (assuming similar gradings to comparable inspection regimes however this is not yet confirmed).
- One of the manifesto priorities is an investment in the provision of support to vulnerable residents. This will support this aim.
- A suite of indicators including numbers supported to live at home, timely assessments, safeguarding work and reviews etc.
- Survey feedback from those who use services and their carers.

#### Risks and Implications:

- Proposal is designed to reduce current risks with increasing pressures on Adult Social Care
- Complexity across our own Transformation Programme (financial sustainability), future national reforms and the introduction of an inspection regime
- Risk of insufficient capacity for improvement and development
- Data quality is a key risk across the programmes
- Risk of being rated below 'good' by external inspectorate

#### Value for Money and Efficiency:

Proposal has been reviewed to utilise existing resources where possible however the transformation, reform and inspection agenda is huge and current resources are insufficient to support the implementation and preparation needed. This proposal supports best value whilst achieving quality and compliance readiness.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Demographic Pressures in Adult Social Care</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / HAC 006 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Health, Adults and Community	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Adult Social Care
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Adult Social Care	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Katie O'Driscoll, Director Adult Social Care	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Gulam Kibria Choudhury, Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing and Social Care

Financial Impact per year	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total
Budget (£000)	104,145	4,000	6,804	4,463	15,267

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

Demographic pressures in adult social care have been recognised nationally as a growing concern for local authority budgets. The government has allowed local authorities to add a precept increase to council tax but demand for services continues to rise. In Tower Hamlets, the adult social care precept has historically been used to fund demographic and inflationary pressures in adult social care. However, there is an increased level of uncertainty surrounding grant funding streams in future years despite them being significant for the council.

Council previously agreed £4.7m demographic growth for 2022-23 of which £1.2m was funded through a 1% adult social care precept. The proposal for 2023-24 is further demographic growth of £4.0m of which £2.54m is planned to be funded through a 2% adult social care precept.

The demographic growth calculation assumes that increases in population, combined with other demographic factors detailed below will lead to more clients needing social care support for longer. National and local policy is designed to maintain independence for as long as possible through community-based support, thus reducing the need for more costly residential services. However, more people are living longer with more complex needs.

This increase in demand and resulting cost is subject to transformation work underway across health and social care services, through the Tower Hamlets Together partnership. This includes savings proposals detailed elsewhere, which are designed to make best use of resources across the system to provide community-based support, reduce overall unit costs and ensure efficiencies through contracts with services. This includes joint funded packages of care where appropriate.

The estimated average rate of growth per client group is different and is influenced by a number of factors such as age, ethnicity, deprivation and other such demographic factors.

Predicted population growth in Tower Hamlets will inevitably bring an increase in the number of people who need adult social care services. Tower Hamlets has high levels of deprivation, which in turn is associated with poor mental and physical health. Deprivation levels may be further exacerbated by welfare reform. An increase in the number of people living for longer with poor health is also a factor driving an increase in demand for adult social care across all client groups. There is likely to be an increased demand for adult social care from all sections of the population as it continues to expand.

This bid uses estimated growth rates from the Department of Health sponsored systems 'Projecting Adult Needs and Service Information' (PANSI) and 'Projecting Older People Population Information' (POPPI) systems. The two systems combine population projections with benefits data and research on expected prevalence rates to produce projections of the likely future demand on social care and health services. Projections from POPPI and PANSI for previous years have proven to be reasonably accurate and we are satisfied that these are the most robust figures available for calculating projections of future growth in demand for adult social care for older people and adults accessing physical disability and mental health services.

Summary data for Tower Hamlets from both sources is summarised in Table 1 below. It demonstrates that by 2025, the over 65 population is expected to total 26,600, an increase of 23% on the 2020 population. The 18-64 age population is expected to increase by 7% to 252,600 by 2025 on the 2020 population.

Table 1: **Summary data from POPPI and PANSI Tower Hamlets (2020:2024)**

Source	Category	Description	2020	2022	2023	2024	2025
Pansi	Population	Total Population 18 to 64	236,300	243,800	247,000	249,900	252,600
Poppi	Population	Total Population 65 and over	21,600	23,600	24,600	25,600	26,600
Pansi	Learning Disability	Total population aged 18-64 predicted to have a learning disability	5,846	6,028	6,106	6,177	6,243
Poppi	Learning Disability	Total population aged 65 and over predicted to have a learning disability	450	493	514	536	558
Pansi	Mental Health	People aged 18-64 predicted to have two or more psychiatric disorders	16,944	17,495	17,723	17,938	18,159
Poppi	Mental Health	Total population aged 65 and over predicted to have severe depression	577	628	653	678	705
Pansi	Physical Disability	Total population aged 18-64 predicted to have impaired mobility & a serious personal care disability	10,593	11,256	11,573	11,839	12,095
Poppi	Physical Disability	Total population aged 65 and over with a limiting long-term illness whose day-to-day activities are limited a lot	7,965	8,660	9,013	9,354	9,720
Pansi	Memory & Cognition	Total population aged 18-64 predicted to have early onset dementia	57	62	64	66	69
Pansi	Memory & Cognition	Total population aged 65 and over predicted to have dementia	1,364	1,489	1,521	1,551	1,585

Other categories of population growth figures provided by Poppi and Pansi data have been used to estimate the demographic growth figures for Adult Social Care (not provided in the table above), e.g., increases in population with severe visual impairment and hearing loss requiring adult social care services, substance misuse support, support for carers, and support for social isolation.

#### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

This growth bid relates directly to the strategic plan outcome – Invest in the provision of care for vulnerable members of our community (ref 5.7A).

The bid is necessary to ensure the council can fulfil its statutory duties to residents needing care and support, as articulated in the 2014 Care Act. It relates to the outcomes for adult social care expected nationally, as set out in the adult social care outcomes framework.



Accountability in adult social care is set out in our local quality assurance framework. In terms of our accountability of residents, a key mechanism is the annual local account. This publication is produced every year and sets out the quality and performance of services over the preceding 12 months. It enables residents to scrutinise and challenge our performance.

## Risks and Implications:

### Learning disabilities services

The total population in Tower Hamlets aged 18-64 with a learning disability (source: Pansi) is expected to increase by 1.3% in 2023-24, 1.2% in 2024-25 and a further 1.1% in 2025-26. Population growth for those aged 65+ with a learning disability (source: Poppi) is predicted to increase by 4.3% in 2023-24, a further 4.3% in 2024-25 and 4.1% in 2025-26.

### Mental health services

Evidence suggests there has been a steady increase in the number of adults who have a mental health problem and who are eligible to receive support from adult social care. PANSI has a number of future predictions for mental health prevalence rates amongst working-age adults in Tower Hamlets.

This information is categorised according to mental health condition and does not give an indication as to who might be eligible for adult social care, however, people who have 2 or more psychiatric disorders is a valid indicator to use for these purposes and demonstrates that within the 18-64 age population, increases will be 1.3% in 2023-24, 1.2% in 2024-25 and a further 1.2% in 2025-26.

For the 65 and over population, those predicted to have severe depression has been used as the indicator for mental health, and shows increases of 4.0% for 2023-24, 3.8% for 2024-25 and a further 4.0% for 2025-26.

### Other Services and Net Growth Requirement

The same methodology has been used for all other Care Support Services in Adult Social Care to determine population growth profiles using Poppi and Pansi data and the resulting budget requirement, based on current costs; Physical Support, Support with Memory and Cognition, Sensory Support, Substance misuse support, Support for carers, and Social isolation Support.

### 18-25 years old (transitions)

Young people transitioning from Children's to adult services are estimated using service data from the children with disabilities team and the community learning disability service (CLDS). Historically around 70-80 per cent of young people identified by children's services as having needs which may be met by adults' services are found to be eligible for the CLDS in adult social care. Using the Year 9 tracking record that is maintained by CLDS, it is anticipated 72 people with turn 18 in 2022/23. Using this, and previous trends, it can be anticipated that approximately 73 children will turn 18 in 2023-24, 77 in 2024-25 and 81 in 2025-26. Of this total, this will give rise to additional demand of 45 clients to Adult Social Care in 2023-24, 48 clients in 2024-25 and a total of 51 clients in 2025-26. The average cost of a transition care package is £62k.

### Discharge to Assess Funding

In the past 2 financial years, the costs of placements after discharges from hospital have increased significantly due to increased needs and complexities. Current funding via an agreed s75 and s256 would only allow for these additional placement costs to be part-funded, however the government has now announced new grant funding through an ASC Discharge Fund as part of the Local Government Finance Settlement which will also support these costs.

### Client Death Rates

The growth bid has also been reduced for assumed client deaths, using previous year's actual deaths.

**The growth budget has been capped at £4m in 2023-24 (including funding of £2.54m through a 2% adult social care precept), which considers a risk based approach. The growth budget in 2024-25 is higher, utilising expected increases in adult social care grants as indicated in the Local Government Finance Settlement.**

### Other Factors not included

These estimates do not include an allowance for additional demand which may arise from the Long Covid-19 impact on Adult Social Care which is currently projected at 2%.

Any financial impact of Adult Social Care Reform has not been included in these projections as it is currently expected that the government will provide additional funding to Local Authorities for any implications arising from the outcomes of reform and Fair Cost of Care.

### Value for Money and Efficiency:

The amount required for growth is intended to meet the assessed eligible needs of vulnerable individuals, including home care, day care, meals, direct payments and residential and nursing care services.

Scrutiny on the quality of assessments and their value for money in legally meeting assessed needs is central to social care operational practice. The eligibility criteria are set nationally through regulations within the Care Act, which has a threshold of significant impact on wellbeing as the benchmark on where the duty is reached. This demand-led service is therefore very sensitive to demographic changes.

Against the backdrop of increasing demographic and inflationary pressures, adult social care has set out to improve value for money by:

- Increasing the use of home care and direct payments to reduce and delay residential and nursing care placements.
- Improving the independence of service users through reablement (care after illness or hospital discharge) and employment opportunities.
- Utilising more supported accommodation, extra care sheltered housing and intensive housing support to reduce residential and nursing care placements.

The Adult Social Transformation Programme has 3 key workstreams delivering 11 project streams. These will deliver cost avoidance measures that are being monitored during the financial year and drive performance improvements across Adult Social Care.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-26

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Fire Safety and the Future of Building Control</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 001 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Planning and development services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Planning & Building Control (P&BC)	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	2. Providing homes for the future
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Jennifer Peters, Director, Planning & Building Control (P&BC)	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Inclusive Development and Housebuilding

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	476	401	464	-	865

  

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	20	9	5	-	14

## Proposal Summary:

### Background

Following the tragic Grenfell Tower Fire of June 2017 the Building Control Regulatory environment, especially around fire safety for tall residential buildings has been under intense scrutiny which has culminated in the new Building Safety Act (BSA) 2022. Specifically, this proposes a more detailed risk assessment system for high risk, tall residential buildings, embedding a series of building safety assessments into processes to ensure that existing and new tall buildings are safe in design/structure, construction, fit-out and operation for residents to then safely occupy.

Tower Hamlets likely has more of these taller buildings than any comparable authority in England and the demands that will be placed on the council are significant not only for the assessment and safety of our own stock of tall buildings but also for all private sector residential buildings in the borough. Because of the predominance of tall buildings in our borough (and the height of those buildings) many will look to us for a steer on how to model a service that responds to this challenge, this includes particular interest from government, with senior officers from DLUC recently visiting the borough.

The objective of the proposal was to meet the new demands from the Building Safety Act, some yet unclarified through regulation and deliver a modern, competitive, fit for purpose local authority building control service. Furthermore, that this can meet its considerable workload and offer a robust, resilient and effective service that ensures that the tall residential buildings in our borough are safe for our residents and that we continue to deliver a quality, respected service to all our clients and make all the buildings in the borough safe, accessible and energy efficient. As the Grenfell inquiry has shown, it is not sensible or effective to have an unrealistic workload placed on officers in areas like building control.

High risk buildings have been defined in the Building Safety Act 2022 as any building containing 2 or more residential units either over 18m or 7 stories above ground, which includes flats, hospitals dormitories and care homes. This definition will change, in December 2022, to include Hotels as well. Currently there are approximately 1000 high rise residential blocks of flats (77 owned by THH), we do not yet have the number of hospitals/care homes and hotels that now come into this definition so this will require additional work.

It should be noted that uncertainty remains around several aspects of the new regime brought in by the Building Safety Act and there remain key concerns that recruitment to these essential roles will prove extremely challenging. The bid allows for the time involved in recruitment to the posts during year one and the ongoing growth requirement will need to be reviewed over the next two years, alongside any further understanding of the new regime and cost recovery process.

The proposal in the first instance assumes the full cost of the new RBI posts as they are recruited will be borne by the local authority but with additional RBI capacity to be absorbed in the existing structure under existing trading account arrangements. However, for the work associated with new applications, we understand that the HSE envisage this to be done on a full cost recovery basis and thus over time, the new team and RBI work done by existing staff will bring in income which will reduce the burden on general fund. The timetable for the introduction of full cost recovery and how it will work in practice is yet unknown, but we are assuming that we will start to see some income by year 4 and over time this will significantly reduce the requirement for general fund resources.

## Proposal

While there are still a number of uncertainties, the proposal includes;

- The introduction of Registered Building Inspectors (RBIs) posts for new high-risk buildings responding directly to the Building Safety Regulator with their review on the design and forwarding site inspection notes and finally to recommend a Completion Certificate is issued by the national Building Safety Regulator. These officers should be in place as far as we can understand by October 23.
- The expansion in the capacity of the existing Building Control service to include up to 5 existing staff becoming RBI accredited to work on new buildings and Building Safety assessments (for existing tall buildings) t
- A review of the existing structure, grading and job descriptions of all posts within Building Control (BC).
- Ensuring the existing training pathway is continued to allow us to grow and nurture talent with a consideration of the expansion of the successful trainee/apprentice Building Control surveyor posts and programme which is proving to be a very effective way of securing local people entry into a profession. This could include additional training and development support.
- Ensuring that the management arrangements take account of the role of the Registered Inspectors who effectively will report to the HSE but will be based in LBTH
- Consideration of the expansion of the Building Control support function to include additional roles to support the expanded service.
- Review of the effectiveness of the existing funding mechanism for Building Control which relies on trading account approach to meet 60% of its trading arm costs and taking account of the fact that the work carried out by the RBIs is expected, eventually, to be 100% cost recovery, so the real cost needs to be understood in detail. Moreover, the costs are recovered at the end of a job, which can span many years, thus there will need to be some upfront funding to run the service in advance of the income being received.

Costing and structural staffing review exercises at this stage is therefore extremely difficult to accurately define as nationally details about the status and relationship of RBI to the local council base are emerging, as are responsibilities, ways of working, job descriptions, roles and process working arrangements with a new central organisation (the Building Safety Regulator at The Health & Safety Executive).

We have also not yet been formally advised of the details of how any funding/cost recovery proposals will work. However, it is understood that the work carried out for the HSE (this is the work our Registered building inspectors will do) will be on a full cost recovery basis, although this is likely to take some time for that income to be realised because of the timing of payments and the upfront costs. It should also be highlighted that the RBI will operate with individual responsibility for their assessments so they are carrying a much higher level of responsibility and are individually liable than would normally accompany BC work. This it is considered will demand higher grades than you would ever normally consider for effectively officer roles of similar nature, in addition recruitment which is likely to be at a UK level is going to be highly competitive in an already small pool of BC professionals.

## Costs

The costs as they are currently estimated

- **Building Safety Act – additional RBI posts**

1. A new service to be offered by BC including Registered Building Inspectors (RBI) and those who manage Building Safety Cases – 10 x new posts, Grade M – Grade P.

Costs: Recruitment will be a challenge but to manage costs we propose to try to recruit by phasing in gradings. Costs are modelled on the bottom of Grade M for 5 x RBI staff in Year 1 and bottom of Grade O for all the staff in Year 2 (the 5 Year 1 existing RBI and 5 new RBI). This will need to allow for some flexibility as we establish the market cost of these new staff. All costs are projected to include a 4% increase for the model on the salary for 23-24.

Year 1: 5x new RBI including personal liability insurance, training etc.

However, it is assumed that these posts will not be filled for the full year because of recruitment lag times.

Year 2: The first 5 RBI and 10% for support costs for 5x new RBI including personal liability insurance training etc.

These additional staff will focus on new buildings assessments and staff who manage the review of safety for existing buildings that trigger the assessment threshold. The figure is informed by pro-rata Local Authority Building Control/London District Surveyors Association model applied to a Borough with broadly similar numbers of taller buildings (LB Westminster).

#### – Existing BC Review

2. The new asks of the Building Safety Act and the RBI posts means we will also need to do an accompanying fit for purpose review of Building Control. Following our initial bid discussion, we have relooked at the existing structure to ensure that we maximise the use of existing posts for taking on RBI work. It is very difficult at this time to assess the impact of this on the existing structure and workload as well embracing all the other positive proposals detailed above. We have assumed that a number of the existing posts can be changed to RBIs while ensuring a continued pathway structure in the team to grow and nurture talent. This has reduced the overall growth ask as it requires less new posts than our original proposal. The review includes salary reviews to deal with the current issues of recruitment and retention, the creation of additional trainees and potentially additional responsibility to cover Building Control support cost increases. The trading account delivers at a reasonably consistent level as it stands but has little flexibility. It is likely to need investment to help it increase its business. The growth bid assumes that these existing posts will be paid 60% income as is the current case.

Costs: The review will assume and cost in that 5 of the existing staff will get to the required RBI competency standard. The ambition is to create a BC service which could have 4 x additional posts at apprentice, surveyor and principal surveyor level as well as a regrading of posts to reflect changes in responsibilities and to remain competitive and rewarding. This growth bid is also projecting salary cost increases.

Year 1: Modelled on 40% of the cost as the existing service is a trading style account, 4 extra staff and some grade reviews.

Year 2: Extra salary and support costs in existing BC service, continuing training existing staff and grade changes.

As set out above, while the bid reflects the full cost of resourcing the team in year one, we are assuming that it will not be fully staffed for the full year and the growth amount has been amended to reflect that.

#### – Second year review

3. This Growth Bid proposal also sees a review of progress against the BSA 2022 requirements, recruitment, workload and performance and needs of the restructured BC service. Specifically, this will also consider the impact if needed of additional RBIs would be at this stage for performance and any salary increases for the existing RBI at that time. It is considered that in year 2 we should have a much better understanding of how we are responding to the requirements of the act, the workload resulting from the act and the change in existing workload, what the anticipated receipt of income from the process might be and how the new structure is trading generally against target and whether the 60/40 Trading to General Fund arrangement needs amending which could mean additional general fund.

#### Notes

It should be added that even at these salary levels Building Control is an extremely difficult service to recruit into at any sort of experienced level. However, we need to demonstrate we are trying to do so as there is the potential for the council to ultimately be placed in special measures if it cannot deliver a defined service with all the reputational damage that could bring.

### Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):

Building Control provides a statutory service with some elements currently open to competition with the private sector approved inspectors. Building Control manages risk and is responsible for, amongst other things, the assessment of the safety of building proposals in their construction methodology and materials used.

On one level it underpins many strategic priorities of the local authority as activity from quiet enjoyment of a new or existing home, to the use of an office, business, shop, school, health or community facility all expect to be taking place within a safe physical structure and space and that this is built with fire safety in mind, is well-built, accessible and meets all modern energy efficiency requirements. That is the statutory role of Building Control.

There have long been structural recruitment issues with the Building Control profession – more leaving than starting the profession and more moving to the private sector when they acquire significant experience than remaining in local authority employment, primarily down to pay. To address this the council has over the years introduced part career grade posts, trainee surveyor roles and offered market supplements to encourage new staff to join and experienced staff to remain. While all of these have met with some success the market share has fallen as competition and terms and conditions in the private sector have improved further and taken their toll.

However, the new Building Safety Act offers us an opportunity as a local authority to respond to this challenge and ensure we have a fit for purpose team with the right number of RBIs for both new development and building safety cases and a supported pathway from entry level officers to the RBI positions.

We propose to devise new career grade posts that define and embrace the requirements of the new Building Safety Act and would see the potential for a surveyor to train with us, transfer to a career grade role and remain in post, if learning and development goals are achieved, especially around fire safety qualifications, until they are either ready for a management position or wish to consolidate as an experienced professional RBI. The career is technical but very rewarding and can take 10 years to become an experienced surveyor able to independently take on the large developments we see in the borough single-handedly. Our ambition as an authority is to encourage growth so we can deliver the homes and jobs we need, so to remain in a position to keep that pipeline open we need to have a resourced local authority building control service.

It is anticipated that with review, job descriptions can define career opportunities and acknowledge and reward the responsibilities that go with the new BSA expectations. We hope this will lead us to a fully recruited service, minimising the costs of vacancies and reliance on agency and recruitment and therefore able to meet our statutory duties to fire risk assessment and enable us to be as competitive and resilient as we can be in the trading market environment. The service currently relies on experienced agency staff and the ambition will be to phase out their use as full-time staff mature into the more experienced roles.

### Risks and Implications:

Some of the main risks and implications are:

1. Fire Risk and building safety is a major national concern. The risk of fire in tall, higher risk, buildings in the borough is one which can endanger resident's lives (and that of fire fighters) and remains until all our buildings, especially those with any of the dangerous cladding on them have been fire safety reviewed and assessed (and reviewed regularly thereafter). This work will involve our building control staff working along with staff reporting to the new Building Safety Regulator. Reputationally it will be important for the council to take an assertive lead in reviewing the boroughs high risk building stock and providing confidence to its many residents.
2. Tower Hamlets likely has more higher risk tall buildings than any other local authority so we will be a high profile, influential, performer and need to respond to the challenge. If we do not this will carry a risk for all our residents and building users, and it would also not reflect well reputationally on the local authority.
3. Without a review and rethink there is a risk that overtime the building control service will, as its experienced surveyors retire and other staff continue to be tempted away to the private sector, slowly surrender more competitive business to the private sector and not be able to take on work from the BSR. This will mean the reduced capacity service will not be able to offer residents and businesses, the professional high-quality service backed by a confidence in the council. For example, current major clients range from Canary Wharf PLC to Berkely Homes and Ballymore to residents and business across the borough and bring in around a £1 million in fees. In addition, the BSA puts an expectation on local authorities to ensure they have a building control service to reflect their profile of buildings, as such we would be expected to have one of the biggest services in the country.

4. We must have the required number of RBI to be able to take on the high-risk building work from the HSE. If we do not the HSE can put the council into special measures, which has both financial and reputational risks.

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The cost of supplementing a local authority building control service to provide advice, expertise and assistance to residents and local businesses for years to come ensuring that the borough's building stock is safe and fit for purpose is likely very small in comparison to the impacts of just one high risk incident in the borough.

The Building Control service is already majority income funded from its trading account, but this is not substantial enough to absorb any of the additional costs coming from the Building Safety Act. It is not yet clear whether the building safety cases will provide additional income opportunities, but the authority has so many high risk, tall buildings that it cannot afford to wait and see what may or may not happen it needs to build capacity and resilience early. Trying to recruit to roles will be extremely competitive as most city authorities with tall buildings will be looking for surveyors as well as the new Building Safety Regulator with thin the Health and Safety Executive.

Delivering against the proposal will, it is hoped, enable the income generating role of building control to rebalance the financial position over-time and in the future the service will be able to secure most of its costs once more from a trading account/cost recovery environment. Effectively this proposal will be asking that this balance is switched for a temporary period to help redefine a new building control service delivering to it the capacity to fulfil on its fire safety duties and responsibilities and provide a competitive, attractive, high quality and efficient service fit for purpose going forward.



## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	All roles will need to be reviewed to ensure Fire Safety responsibilities from the Building Safety Act are accurately and consistently embraced. This will also provide an opportunity to revisit the career grade expansion of surveyor posts while also re-affirming existing trainee roles to ensure that Building Control as a service is best equipped to attract d retain new and existing talent.

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>New Local Plan – Truman Brewery Estate Masterplan</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 002 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Investment
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Planning and development services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Planning and Building Control	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	4. Boosting culture, business, jobs, and leisure
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Marissa Ryan-Hernandez, Head of Strategic Planning	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Ahmed - Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Inclusive Development and Housebuilding

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	45	10	(55)	-

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	-	1	-	(1)	-

## Proposal Summary:

The west of the borough – the City Fringe – acts as an area of transition from the large-scale, office-led development of the City to the smaller-scale, mixed-use and residential neighbourhoods towards the east. Within the west of the borough, Spitalfields and Brick Lane have a strong, distinctive character that derives in part from the nature of the uses and businesses within the area, including the concentration of South Asian restaurants on Brick Lane and the small- and micro-scale offices and workshops in Spitalfields. This is in contrast the type and scale of development in other parts of the City Fringe, where non-residential development is predominantly large-floorplate offices.

The current Woodseer Street planning permission (PA/20/00415), which relates to the proposed redevelopment of a vacant car park site on the brewery site in Brick Lane, has generated calls for a planning/development brief to guide the site. The proposed development on Woodseer Street forms part of the wider Truman Brewery Estate (TBE) where there are calls for a more comprehensive masterplan to guide future development.

The Mayor has requested that in responding to and guiding development coming forward at Truman Brewery, the Strategic Planning team explore the idea of developing a masterplan, to see if that can help address the concerns related to the type of large-scale office development common in the City and in areas of the borough within the Central Activities Zone creeping east into the lower-scale, more economically diverse neighbourhoods of the City Fringe, particularly Spitalfields and Brick Lane, and increasing workspace rents, causing gentrification and undermining social cohesion.

A masterplan can assist in providing further guidance as part of the development process, aimed at improving the quality of development and improving the efficiency of the planning and development process. They can provide guidance on site-specific issues and a general planning policy response. The masterplan would need to ensure full compliance with the Local Plan and cannot be used to introduce any new policies.

Depending on the status attributed to the masterplan – as a planning development brief or supplementary planning document – it would need to be supported by a proportionate evidence base and be subject to buy-in from the developer/landowner to ensure implementation as well as engagement with the community. Given the parameters in which the document must be produced, by way of policies and requirements, it should be clear what can/not be delivered on site and how the guidance would not to be able to deviate from higher order policy documents.

If the masterplan/SPD option was to be pursued, the current resource capacity of the Strategic Planning section is not staffed to absorb this additional responsibility as it is beyond that which has been identified and planned for in the work programme over the next 3 years – the focus of which will be the Local Plan, requiring the attention of all officers. An officer or office + consultant will need to be procured for this specialist / technical masterplanning work.

Masterplanning work:

Production: 3 – 6 months dependant on whether it will be endorsed as a planning development brief or adopted as an SPD

Consultation: 3 – 6 months dependant on whether it will be adopted as an SPD

Evidence base: dependant on whether it will be adopted as an SPD and require further evidence to support the guidance

Resource requirement: 1x officer or 1x officer + consultants dependant on whether it will be adopted as an SPD and require further evidence to support the guidance

Scope: to be in conformity with policies as set out in the Local Plan

Weight: none or moderate dependant on whether it will be adopted as an SPD

Adoption process: 1 – 3 months dependant on whether it will go to Cabinet to be adopted as an SPD

Approximate total: 6 – 16 months

The following is a broad structure of a Development/Planning Brief, providing an outline of what a brief can cover:

1. Introduction
2. Background for Site Brief
3. Site Analysis
4. Planning Policy Framework
5. Development Strategy
6. Key Development Issues for the Site
7. Vision + Development Principles
8. Implementation
9. Contacts and Further Information

Over two years, we can expect spend of:

- Evidence gathering / consultants: £25k
- Consultation and engagement: £25k
- Production: £10k
- Officer managing: senior officer £40k

### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The policies in the Local Plan document set the vision, objectives and policy direction for how we as an authority want to see Tower Hamlets be developed. Supplementary guidance can support the Local Plan in its role to lead, manage and deliver growth in a way that provides certainty and responds to stakeholders and communities, particularly in a way that helps create and maintain vibrant and successful places where residents benefit from developments.

The wider Strategic Planning function has prioritised the delivery of a new Local Plan and its implementation, in line with the 2021-24 Strategic Plan priority outcomes:

4. Residents feel they fairly share in the benefits from growth and inequality is tackled
8. People feel they are a part of a cohesive and vibrant community
9. People say we are open and transparent putting residents at the heart of everything we do
10. People say we work together across boundaries in a strong and effective partnership to achieve the best outcomes for our residents

Furthermore, Strategic Planning looks to respond to the manifesto and pledges of the new administration, in particular where the Mayor states:

*Local business is the lifeblood of our community. Not only does it sustain our local economy and provide jobs and services to our residents, it also tells the story of our borough in the iconic trades and businesses that have flourished here over the years. I pledge to:*

*1 Work closely with the East End Trades Guild to ensure their priorities are realised. This includes:*

*a) Protecting small businesses on Brick Lane, including those affected by the development of the Truman Brewery*

*b) Supporting an EETG member-led event in November to celebrate small businesses across Tower Hamlets, and raise their visibility to mark the 10 year anniversary of the EETG*

### Risks and Implications:

The Directorate and the Divisional Risk Registers identify:

Risk 1: Too much of the wrong development in the wrong place without infrastructure.

Risk Category: Resources

One of the Main control measures is: Produce a new Local Plan. This would include effectively implementing the Local Plan, through the drafting of supplementary guidance.

The Implications of not actively mitigating this risk include:

- Reduced funding for infrastructure and other benefits for the local community
- Increased costs for the Council in fighting and losing planning appeals
- Poor place-shaping, neighbourhoods not functioning
- Reputational damage and special measures on appeal decisions
- Social cohesion and unrest issues emerge

### Value for Money and Efficiency:

The delivery of a masterplan for this area to a maximum cost of £100,000 could be instrumental in securing the future character of this important, unique part of the borough. Retained with the support of the local community, the developer and presenting opportunities for a wide range of local businesses to be sustained and new uses introduced to the site could help knit together this area.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Transfer of responsibilities from London Legacy Development Corporation</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 003 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Budget Pressure
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Planning and development services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Planning and Building Control / Public Realm	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	2. Providing homes for the future
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Andy Simpson, Head of Strategy, Policy and Improvement	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Inclusive Development and Housebuilding

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	26	-	(26)	-
Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	-	1	-	(1)	-

**Proposal Summary:**

The purpose of the proposal is to secure funding to undertake preparatory work for the robust transition of planning powers from the LLDC by the end of 2024, as well as the other regeneration functions/responsibilities (highways/assets and growth) which will fall to the Council when the London Legacy Development Corporation re-sets in December 2024.

As part of this transition, a number of functions / responsibilities currently delivered by the LLDC will revert back to the council and a range of activity / and due diligence is required in advance of transition to ensure the council is (a) well prepared to receive pre agreed transitioned activity (b) influence the LLDC's approach on items yet to be agreed for transition (c) hold the LLDC to account throughout the transition period.

Programme Management and Shared Growth Borough Partnership costs (£26k p.a: 2023/4, 2024/5.)

The proposal would also secure funding to cover an ongoing contribution to the Growth Borough Partnership for shared activity/due diligence in advance of transition. Covering 2023 - 2025, this would be allocated toward;

- GBP Programme Manager (a contribution to the shared programme manager responsible for convening meetings of the GBP and GBP CEx, and liaising with the LLDC on programme management of LLDC Transition work streams)
- Asset transfer legal review (contribution to the GBP for shared advice among LLDC boroughs to challenge the LLDC on assets they have earmarked as needing to be transitioned back to boroughs, some of which will come with implications to fund ongoing maintenance implications.
- Inclusive economy shared narrative and reporting dashboard (a contribution to the GBP to inform the shape of a shared inclusive economy function, what the shared outcomes / priorities should)
- Borough specific human resources review for TUPE of LLDC planning staff (a contribution towards GBP procured specialist advice on whether LLDC planning staff would have TUPE rights post transfer)

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

- A key element of the reset LLDC will be to ensure promote access to the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park, as well as the socioeconomic opportunities which are presented through the management and operation of the estate.

- As part of securing a smooth transition of regeneration functions as part of the LLDC's reset, the following strategic outcomes will be supported.
  - Priority 2: Homes for the future
  - Priority 4: Boost culture, business, jobs and leisure
  - Priority 6: Empower Communities and Fight Crime
  - Priority 7: A clean and green future

### **Risks and Implications:**

The risk of not resourcing this is that the council increases its risk of not undertaking due diligence and becoming vulnerable to the following risks.

- The council has agreed at a political and CEx level to contributing towards shared activities between LLDC boroughs which support a smooth transition of LLDC. These activities include the shaping of an agreed approach to transition amongst LLDC boroughs as well as undertaking due diligence to ensure boroughs secure an optimal outcome from the transition and are not disadvantaged in terms of outcomes for residents or finances.
- In addition to the reputational damage of not standing behind this commitment, there would of course be financial implications of not undertaking due diligence on elements of transition outlined in the summary section.

### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

Through resourcing this growth bid a range of gains would be made which would achieve value for money / efficiencies. They include;

- Effective local programme management of LLDC transition, ensuring the transition date of December 2024 is secured.
- Robust handover of data re: development management would lead to limited disruption to progression of developments in the LBTH/LLDC area. This would limit any loss of revenues in planning fees which may be the case should data not be transitioned effectively.
- Robust handover of data re: planning obligations would lead to limited disruption in the requesting / collection of CIL/S106 funds which fall within the LLDC/LBTH boundary. and any interest which might be foregone with late payments.
- Inability to secure a robust handover of DM/Planning obligations data by December 2024 would potentially cause service disruption thereafter as officers within the team would be diverted away from their BAU in order to back capture data.
- Further gains in value for money are achieved through undertaking due diligence in relation to (a) the transfer of assets from the LLDC back to the borough (b) querying whether TUPE rights for existing LLDC planning staff. Without due diligence being undertaken, the borough could be assuming responsibility for costs on which there is no strategic or operational need, with limited recompense.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:



# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Encouraging community engagement and improved standards of environmental quality</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 004 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Public Realm	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	7. Working towards a clean and green future
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Dan Jones, Director of Public Realm	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Emergency

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	1,145	109	(109)	-	-

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	20	4	(4)	-	-

## Proposal Summary:

This proposal – linked to the declaration of a waste emergency and the necessity for a Waste and Street Cleansing Improvement Plan – would enable the council to deliver on the Mayor’s manifesto pledge to “encourage our community to become involved in community walkabouts to check standards are being maintained across the borough”, ensuring environmental quality and improving community engagement. This work requires additional staff resources within our Environmental Services Team, and would help us to reduce the impact of environmental crime across the Borough using effective education, advice and engagement, and to provide adequate resources to co-ordinate ward based improvement action.

This growth bid will allow for four existing Environmental Co-ordinator fixed term contract posts to continue until the end of September 2023.

### *What will the proposal deliver?*

The focus of the Environmental Co-ordinators is to

- Develop a programme of community walkabouts, with focus on checking and reporting standards of local environmental quality
- Deliver community engagement events focussed on building partnerships with local business, visitor and resident groups
- Actively promote, support and facilitate local stakeholders looking to volunteer in improving their Local Environmental Quality
- Develop communication plan to promote community walkabouts
- Implement improved reporting mechanism via new webpages, webforms and Love Your Neighbourhood app, for community members to highlight problems areas and incidents.
- Develop plans with landowners and landlords to improve standards on private land

### *What is the motivation and reason for the proposal?*

To be able to effectively and consistently deliver on the Mayor’s manifesto pledges to encourage our community to become involved in community walkabouts, to check standards of environmental quality and improve community engagement. This will support community led and supported behaviour change and improvements in environmental quality and resident satisfaction with cleanliness of the borough.

### *Why is this desirable?*

Additional resources will assist in the effective management of waste and environmental related anti-social and illegal behaviour and help improve the look and feel of the public realm. Increasing community involvement is key to people taking more care and responsibility for their neighbourhood, for managing their waste, wasting less, re-using and recycling more. To encourage others to be more involved and take responsibility for improving the area.

*Evidence any numbers and cost drivers.*

Illegal fly-tipping and other enviro-crime such as fly tipping, graffiti, litter, dog fouling have a significant clear-up and disposal costs to the authority in excess of £3.5m per year. In addition, littering and fly-tipping have negative impact on residents, visitors, and businesses perception of cleanliness across the Borough. This is linked to increased fear of crime and anti-social behaviour and dis-satisfaction in the quality of the local area.

#### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

*How does this proposal contribute to achieving the strategic priorities of the Council?*

This is directly linked to the Mayor's priorities of delivering a Clean and Green future, to empower communities get more involved in community walkabouts and reporting standards of environmental quality.

*What are the expected improvements in service delivery & performance?*

This additional resource will lead to increased community engagement, education and advice, targeting a reduction in environmental crime, increased community engagement to improve reporting of problems, and improved standards across the Borough.

#### **Risks and Implications:**

Without the increase in funding the posts could not continue to be funded until September 2023.

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

These additional resources will help reduce illegal waste disposal cost of £3.5m per year as well as support increased generation of income from legitimate commercial waste collections, and reduced cleansing and waste management costs associated with others people, landowners and landlords not taking responsibility for their waste, cleansing and tenants behaviour.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Waste Treatment and Disposal</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 005 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Operational Service, Public Realm	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	7. Working towards a clean and green future
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Catherine Cooke, Environmental Service Improvement Team Leader	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Emergency

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	11,056	155	(155)	-	-

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

As both a Waste Collection and Waste Disposal Authority the council has a statutory duty to collect and dispose of Municipal Waste that arises within the Authority area. This includes all waste, recyclable materials, food and garden waste collected from households.

We are seeking £155,000 of growth funding in 2023/24 to cover the impact of the increase in the cost of processing dry recycling.

The contract with Bywaters expires on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023 and we are currently seeking a 12 month extension. The market and the contractors underlying costs will have been impacted by changes in the price of fuel and energy and the increase in the rates of inflation since the current contract started. It is therefore anticipated that the gate fee prices secured through this extension will be higher than the current prices.

Current estimated spend 2022/23: £1,718,485

Increase spend with estimated 9% inflation: £1,873,160

### Collected dry recycling tonnage

2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
12,096	13,540	13,794

It is not possible to extend the Bywaters contract for a period less than 12 months for the following reasons:

- The shape and nature of the contract Specification is driven by the service model deployed and the anticipated tonnages to be managed. The Government's waste and recycling policy reforms will impact on the service model but as yet the full details of the policy reforms have not been released by Government. The anticipated timetable for policy reform change is from April 2024, which would coincide with the end of a 12 month extension. The new contract could therefore be shaped to respond to the needs of the policy reforms.
- The time to procure a new contract of this value and complexity is lengthy. In addition to conducting the procurement process itself, the council is obliged to consult the GLA on the shape and nature of the new contract (including the fully drafted Specification) before commencing the procurement process. There is a statutory period for this consultation process which equates to approx. 4 months. In total the process to put a new contract in place is estimated at 12 months.

The Payment Protocol within the MRF contract includes a Materials Rebate, payable to the council, as part of the total monthly payment. The rebate is a per tonne figure, which is not a fixed sum, that is calculated every six months (April and October). A basket value is calculated from sampling our material and a proportion of the revenue received for the sale of recyclable materials is paid to the council. If the value of recyclable materials drops it is possible the rebate could drop to zero or become a negative figure.

The amount of rebate paid to the council in 2021/22 and to date in 2022/23 are shown below:

	2021/22			2022/23		
	Rebate value	Processed through MRF (tonnes)	Total rebate	Rebate value	Processed through MRF (tonnes)(to date)	Total rebate (to date)
<b>Q1</b>	£11.16	3,572	£39,868	£13.07	3,469	£45,341
<b>Q2</b>	£11.16	3,469	£38,709	£13.07	2,388*	£31,215*
<b>Q3</b>	£11.89	3,360	£39,952			
<b>Q4</b>	£11.89	3,355	£39,890			
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>13,756</b>	<b>£158,419</b>		<b>5,857</b>	<b>£76,556</b>

\*waiting for September figures

From 2023, it is unclear what level of rebate from recycling will be received as the initial term of the contract with Bywaters expires March 2023 and we seek an extension.

#### Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):

The council has a statutory obligation to arrange for the treatment and disposal of Municipal Waste within the Authority area in order to protect the environment and human health. The council also has a statutory obligation to send dry materials for recycling and organic waste for composting. The amount of household waste that is recycled or composted contributes to the strategic performance indicator, percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting.

#### Risks and Implications:

There are a number of variables that could have an impact on the cost of recyclable materials processing, some of which are hard to predict at this present time:

- The contract with Bywaters for processing dry recyclable materials will expire on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023. Gate fees for the extended contract could be higher than current rates due to the changes in the price of fuel and energy and the increase in the rates of inflation since the current contract started.
- The percentage of non-conforming loads and contaminated material increases and we are charged at a higher processing rate.
- There is uncertainty over the anticipated level of housing growth which will have an impact on waste and recycling generation.

#### Value for Money and Efficiency:

The Council has made significant strides in mitigating the costs of waste treatment and disposal by maintaining levels of diversion from landfill disposal to other forms of waste treatment through the current waste disposal contract and at the time this contract was procured significant savings were delivered from the procurement process.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

<b>Summary:</b>	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

<b>Additional Information and Comments:</b>

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	Arboriculture		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 006 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Cultural and related services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Public Realm	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	7. Working towards a clean and green future
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Michael Hime, Green Team & Contracts Manager	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Emergency

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	258	51	-	-	51

  

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposal Summary:**

This growth bid is required to fund tree management costs incurred from an increase in tree numbers across the Borough and the emergence of new pests and diseases.

In the last 5 years, the TH tree stock has increased from approximately 19,000 trees to 28,000 trees. This has occurred following an increased tree planting programme across the Borough year on year, Mayoral Manifesto targets to plant more trees and the acquirement of tree management responsibilities at Mudchute Farm and Tower Hamlets Cemetery. We have also seen the emergence of Massaria across the Boroughs London Plane trees and following government cuts, we are also now liable to pay the full costs for the control and removal of OPM nests across the Boroughs Oak trees.

The number of trees inherited from Mudchute Farm and Tower Hamlets Cemetery amounts to 5,000. These 2,000 trees at Mudchute Farm and an additional 3,000 trees at Tower Hamlets Cemetery will result in a budget pressure which can be mitigated with other underspends within the Green Team. However, there are still 4,000 trees which we require funding for, for the following reasons.

Since inheriting the service in February 2013, the Green Teams Arboricultural section has managed the council's tree stock efficiently and effectively and in line with all current Arboricultural legislation and guidance. To do this, the Arboricultural Team regularly inspect and prune trees to ensure they are healthy and safe, to maintain them to proportions appropriate to their context.

Where trees have been managed as pollards, we have had to introduce a pollarding regime where they will be cyclically pruned every 3 years. Pollarding is a tree management technique used to reduce and maintain a trees size through the cyclical cutting of new growth back to the original pollard point. Once a pollarding cycle has been instigated, it is important that it is regularly maintained (pruned every 3 years in line with industry best practice) as regrowth is dense and rapid. As a result of this, branch unions can be weaker leading to a higher likelihood of failure if the regrowth is not appropriately maintained.

The emergence of new tree pests and diseases and an increased prominence of some current tree pest and diseases have had a significant impact on the resources of the Arboricultural service. Two pests and diseases where this is particularly noticeable are Massaria and Oak Processionary Moth (OPM). Massaria is a fungal disease which causes the rapid dieback of infected branches of London Plane trees. Prior to the increased prominence of this disease, the general maintenance of mature London Plane trees was relatively low. Now to effectively

control the disease and manage the increased health and safety risks associated with the rapid dieback of large branches, the cyclical inspection and removal of dead and diseased branches is required. For trees in high target areas this should be carried out annually in line with industry best practice and guidance.

OPM is a pest which defoliates oak trees and also causes a significant threat to public and animal health. Public Health England has found that humans and animals that come in to contact with the hairs of this pest during the larvae (caterpillar) instar are exposed to a range of symptoms ranging from dermatitis to anaphylaxis. Due to the severity of these symptoms the Forestry Commission have so far funded a systematic approach to controlling OPM in the UK. This includes the regular spraying of infected trees and the specialist removal and incineration of nests. As a result of this the Forestry Commission issue Statutory Notices to each local authority for the removal of all OPM nests by September each year.

Since 2020 funding has been fully revoked for the specialist spraying, removal and incineration of OPM nests. This means Local Authorities are currently liable to pay for the removal of OPM nests across their respective Boroughs. This year (2022) the total number of trees infected by OPM was 97 and the total cost to treat and remove the nests was £13,700.

On average, it costs approximately £13.40 per tree, per year to manage the council's tree stock.

#### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

An increase of £51k in the Arboricultural Maintenance Budget will ensure that the Green Teams Arboricultural service can efficiently and effectively manage the above 4000 trees safely resulting in a healthy tree stock across the Borough, in line with local and national policy and guidance and ensure it meets its statutory obligations. This will ensure the risk of health and safety and property damage instances, attributed to both an increase in the number of trees being managed and the emergence and increasing prominence of tree pests and diseases, is adequately mitigated.

#### **Risks and Implications:**

Failure to increase the Arboricultural Maintenance Budget will significantly jeopardise the ability of the Green Teams Arboricultural section to efficiently and effectively manage a safe and healthy tree stock across the Borough, in line with local and national policy and guidance.

This would likely see an increase in the number of personal injury and property damage insurance claims made against the council, attributed to both an increase in the number of trees being managed and the emergence and increasing prominence of tree pests and diseases. This would harm the council financially and be damaging to the council's reputation.

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

An increase in tree stock from approximately 19,000 to 28,000 trees, coupled with the introduction of a pollarding regime and the ever-increasing prominence of Massaria and OPM means the current Arboricultural Maintenance budget is not sufficient to safely and effectively manage the Borough's tree stock in line with local and national policy and guidance.

Increasing the Arboricultural Maintenance budget by £51,000 per annum will ensure that the above 4000 trees across the Borough are managed in an efficient and proactive way, resulting in a safe and healthy tree stock for the public to enjoy. This figure has been broken down below, highlighting the additional costs the Green Team are incurring each year from having to manage an increase in both tree numbers and tree pests and diseases.

An increase in the number of trees we manage by 9000 trees, equates to an approximate 45% increase. Our current tree maintenance budget is £258K, effectively this would amount to an increase in expenditure of £116,100. However, as this growth bid is for 51k it should be noted that the 5,000 additional trees at Mudchute Farm and Tower Hamlets Cemetery will result in a budget pressure which can be mitigated with other underspends in Green Team.

The use of CAVAT funding has been considered but this can only be used for the supply, and not the management, of trees.



This additional funding will allow for the efficient and effective management of safe and healthy trees across the Borough in line with local and national policy and guidance and will reduce the council's expenditure on personal injury and property damage insurance claims. It will also safeguard the Green Teams exemplary reputation as an LBTH service.

This funding will also increase efficiency within the department by allowing us to record each infected tree on our tree management software and create a cyclical pruning schedule which will be raised at the beginning of each financial year. This will ensure all infected trees are pruned as leaves begin to emerge throughout May and June. This will reduce the risk of missing infected and dead branches throughout the crown and ensure all trees are pruned prior to summertime when the highest numbers of people are using parks and open spaces across the Borough and the likelihood of branch failure increases due to leaf weight.

On top of this, it will ensure that we can meet our statutory obligation to remove all OPM nests before September each year.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

<b>Summary:</b>	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

<b>Additional Information and Comments:</b>

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Fully fund housing enforcement officers to hold landlords to account</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 007 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Environmental Health and Trading Standards	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	2. Providing homes for the future
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	David Tolley – Head of Environmental Health and Trading Standards	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Inclusive Development and Housebuilding

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	<b>Total Growth</b>
Budget (£000)	586	168	56	-	224

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	<b>Total FTE Increase</b>
Employees (FTE)	10	3	1	-	4

**Proposal Summary:**

This proposal would enable the council to deliver on the manifesto pledge to “fully fund and resource housing enforcement officers to hold landlords to account”. This is a reviewed proposal and would provide the council with additional resource in this area, better enabling the council to deliver on vitally important work following the ‘preventing future deaths’ report by the Coroner in relation to her findings against Rochdale Boroughwide Housing and the damp and mould issues that led to a young child’s death in Rochdale (Manchester).

If we are to tackle issues within the RSL sector in relation to the duties they have under the Housing Act, and also to support tenants in obtaining rent repayment orders (12-month rent paid back to them) for non-compliant landlords in the private rented sector (PRS), additional Environmental Health/Housing Standards Officers are required. This is particularly the case given that 40% of all housing stock in Tower Hamlets is PRS, meaning we require greater resource.

The growth areas that would be addressed include dealing with the RSL property complaints (currently this is not done), energy efficiency improvements, safety certification auditing, housing condition inspections, increase in prosecutions.

This proposal is dependent on being able to employ Environmental Health staff, which historically has been difficult. The revised proposal suggests we begin recruitment as soon as possible, but reprofiled across both 2023-24 and 2024-25.

A review on management capacity in the Team would also be required.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The options detailed above will meet the manifesto pledge and closing the current gap by holding Registered Social Landlords to account. The additional resourcing will enable complaints to be fully investigated and action taken using the powers provided by the Housing Act 2004 and associated legislation.

**Risks and Implications:**

There are no statutory risks as the Service does respond to all complaints. There may be additional burden on support services i.e. legal, if further enforcement cases are taken as a result of additional staffing.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The improvement of living conditions is well known to have a positive impact of residents lives and wellbeing. If we are able to improve living conditions for residents then they may be less demand for other health related services in the longer term.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Energy Performance Certificates Programme for Leased Properties</b>
------------------------	--

<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 008 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Budget Pressure
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Property & Major Programmes	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	7. Working towards a clean and green future
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Ralph Million, Acting Head of Asset Management	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Emergency

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	<b>Total Growth</b>
Budget (£000)	-	45	(45)	-	-

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	<b>Total FTE Increase</b>
Employees (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

As part of the national target for the UK to be net zero by 2050, the Government has set a target of raising the minimum energy efficiency standard in rented non-domestic buildings to EPC rating B by 2030. As intermediate targets over the next three years, the Government has set the following.

- 1 April 2023. It will be unlawful for landlords to continue to let non-domestic buildings in the scope of the Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards (MEES) regulations with an Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating of 'F' or 'G'.
- 1 April 2025. All non-domestic rented buildings in the scope of the MEES regulations must have a valid EPC.

The MEES regulations were introduced in 2015 to target the least energy efficient buildings. Since April 2018, landlords of qualifying non-domestic property have needed to ensure that their properties comply, and new leases on properties with an EPC rating lower than an 'E' cannot be granted. The 2023 regulation changes will apply to all existing non-domestic leases, and it will be unlawful for landlords to continue to let (although not sell) commercial property with an EPC rating of 'F' or 'G'.

A Government 2021 consultation paper contains the 2025 date, along with a further date of April 2027 by when all rented non-domestic buildings must meet a minimum EPC rating of C. Whilst the energy usage in these properties is managed by third-party tenants, the improvements in energy efficiency are in line with the council's commitment to become a net zero carbon borough by 2045 or sooner.

The council has 407 property leases of 99 years or less, which are in scope of the MEES regulations. Of these 102 have EPCs, and 305 do not. EPCs are generally only obtained when a property is being marketed, when it is a legal requirement. EPCs only last for 10 years, and the Council also had a number which have now expired, which are included within the 305.

In order to meet the 2025 target, EPCs will need to be obtained for the 305 properties. The cost of an EPC is related to the floor area of the property involved. EPCs are produced by accredited energy assessors; the council buys in the service from suppliers. There is an existing small contract with a total value of £7,500 to facilitate any EPCs required for marketing purposes. The estimated cost for obtaining the 305 EPCs, allowing for 10% failure rate and re-assessment after works is £150,000, uplifted to £165,000 allowing for 10% growth, as per the table below. There is no budget provision for the costs of obtaining EPCs. Where individual EPCs have been obtained previously, the costs have been charged to a budget linked to the rental income, most of which is within the HRA.

This proposal excludes the costs associated with undertaking compliance works to ensure the property meets the EPC Regulations.

Our existing supplier has a sliding charging scale based on size, with it increasing in 1,000 sq ft bands. The median cost is £435 per EPC, with a further £125 for a Recommendation Report, which is recommended even if the property is compliant, as can assist with meeting the more stringent targets. Should the property fail its EPC there is a £30 credit, with a reduced £220 charge for revisiting after the works have been completed to record compliance. It is assumed that 10% of the portfolio will fail to meet an E or higher, based on historic levels. The costs are as per the below Table

**Initial Assessment**

Properties	305		
Ave Cost	£435		
		£132,675	
Recommendation Reports	£125		
		£3,875	
<b>Non Compliance</b>			
Properties	31		
Credit	-£30		
		-£930	
Re-survey	£220		
		£6,820	
			£142,440

A further margin of 15% is sought to allow for price increases due to the proposals to start next year.

The properties involved are held in both the HRA and General Fund (including King Georges Field Trust). The percentage split by number of properties is 70% HRA, 27.5% General Fund, and 2.5% King Georges Field Trust. This growth bid relates to the properties held in the General Fund, which equates to growth of around £45k.

It is proposed that the new EPCs required are obtained during the 2023/24 year. This will allow a period of a year before April 2025 to carry out any improvement works required to deal with any F or G ratings. This excludes any EPCs which are required under Business as Usual (BAU) where properties become vacant and are to be let.

This proposal does not include for works to improve EPC ratings. As the council develops comprehensive EPC coverage, it will be possible to estimate the costs of works and a further growth proposal will come forward at that stage. It is the council's responsibility to ensure that its let properties comply with the MEES regulations, hence the primary responsibility for carrying out necessary work rests with the council.

Based on the situation with the limited number of EPCs carried out to date, the proportion of properties with rating B or above is 8% and 36% at C or above. The achievement of the B or above target for all let properties by 2030 will require intervention in most properties.

Where properties achieve an initial rating of F or G then the assessor will provide guidance as to the works required to improve as well as the impact of them. These will be assessed individually and will be considered on a cost/efficiency basis. It is anticipated these works will be undertaken under the Capital works programme.

The theory is that by having a higher rating then the property is more energy efficient, and the cost of bills will reduce.

### Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):

The impact of increased energy performance in terms of reduced consumption benefits the occupiers of let properties. There may be a marginal benefit to the council in terms of rental value, however it must be assumed that all landlords will be following a similar trajectory as the council.

### Risks and Implications:

The enforcement of MEES regulations is with the council. The penalties for non-compliance are fines. For renting out a non-compliant property for a period of more than 3 months the fine is 20% of the rateable value, with a minimum fine of £10,000 to a maximum of £150,000.

There is reputational risk, given the council's role as enforcement authority and regarding its own carbon reduction policies.

### Value for Money and Efficiency:

The principal driver for the process is to comply with regulations, with a secondary benefit of supporting the council's net zero policy.

Furthermore, by having a higher rated property, then the property should be more energy efficient, with a beneficial impact on bills as well as on the environment

Due to the anticipated level of costs, it is appreciated a full procurement will need to be undertaken, and we will propose that this is by adopting a local government framework to have multiple providers bid for the work and undertake it across the whole portfolio concurrently

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

<b>Summary:</b>	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

<b>Additional Information and Comments:</b>



# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Tackling Poverty Team</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 009 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Growth and Economic Development	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	1. Tackling the cost-of-living crisis
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Ellie Kershaw, Acting Director Growth and Economic Development	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Saied Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cost of Living

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	-	700	-	700

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	12	-	-	-	-

## Proposal Summary:

The Tackling Poverty Team was set up in 2017 to create and manage a number of initiatives relating to tackling poverty. After the first three years, the team has been extended a year at a time. This proposal is to create a base budget to fund the team permanently from 2024-25. The team will be funded in 2023-24 through in year government grants and a service specific reserve.

Over the two years of the pandemic, people in poverty or on low incomes were disproportionately impacted both in terms of health and in terms of finance, due to those in work being the most likely to have customer facing roles, many in industries like hospitality which have still not recovered to pre pandemic levels. Having come out of covid the country has plunged into a cost of living crisis, seeing average energy bills increase threefold, the cost of basic foods increase 15-20% and with an inflation rate of 18% predicted for January 2023.

The government has put some funding and initiatives in place, such as the household support fund and the holiday activities and food programme, both of which are managed by the Tackling Poverty Team, along with an outreach team giving direct advice to residents, who have so far increased resident's income by £5.73 for every £1 invested in them, management of the Council's resident support grant fund, benefit take up campaigns and other projects as identified by national and local research and trends that support families in financial crisis.

It is clear that over the next few years there will be no relief for these households and, indeed, their circumstances are likely to continue to worsen. According to the council's tackling poverty dashboard poverty is increasing in the borough, with an 18% increase between June and July of households in food poverty, 15% increase of households in relative poverty and 18% in food poverty- before we have even begun to see the impacts of impending fuel and food increases.

Much of the work that the team carries out would have to be carried out elsewhere in the council were the team to be discontinued, as the work itself could not drop, particularly that which is government funded.

## Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):

Tackling the cost of living crisis is a priority for the council, and the removal of a team dedicated to this would severely impact the council's chances of supporting residents through this crisis.

It also meets the strategic priority that inequality is tackled.

**Risks and Implications:**

If current team members are not given some certainty over their length of tenure, we risk losing well trained and committed staff to other organisations, impacting the team's ability to carry out the range of work it currently does, which in turn would impact the council's ability to carry out not only the discretionary work, but that which government is currently funding.

Ending the tenure of a team dedicated to tackling poverty during a cost of living crisis could create negative publicity for the council.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

Residents who are struggling financially are more likely to contact the council and need additional support for a wide variety of reasons, increasing costs and pressures in other services.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Low Carbon Fuel Supply</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / PLA 010 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Place	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Highways and transport
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Transport Services Unit	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	7. Working towards a clean and green future
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Robert Williams - Interim Operations Manager (Transport)	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Hussain, Cabinet Member for Environment and Climate Emergency

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	800	180	-	-	180

  

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

This proposal is linked to the decision on the future electrification of the fleet, and would help us to achieve the Council's Net Zero Carbon Targets by 2025. The proposal is to switch to low emission biofuel.

Using Low emission biofuel across the LBTH fleet would cost an extra £180k on the 2022/23 budget from 2023/24 onwards. This is in addition to unavoidable cost pressures from the current rise in fuel prices.

This will allow for a significant reduction in council vehicle emissions linked to zero carbon and air quality improvement plans.

### **Background**

The price of petroleum derived products has increased sharply since April 2020. There are several factors influencing this including: -

- Restarting of economies post Covid
- The move away from coal to oil to generate electricity in some countries, and
- Interruptions in supply owing to the war in the Ukraine.

This proposal is to replace the use of standard diesel (DERV) supplied from Blackwall Depot with hydrotreated vegetable oil (HVO). To make substantial reductions in exhaust and carbon emissions from the Council Fleet. Options have been reviewed in terms of a phased approach – for example converting some of the fleet but not all – however we do not have the capacity to run two different fuel types with separate tanks and fuel pumps. Therefore if a decision is made to proceed, it must cover the fleet.

The Council carried out a major Fleet renewal three years ago, to replace older polluting vehicles with new ones that are compliant with the Euro VI engine and exhaust standard.

Having consulted with other neighbouring authorities, and studied best practice, it was found that the use of HVO (Green D plus), gives a further drop in vehicle emissions, reducing:

- nitrogen oxides (NOx) **by a further 33%**, and
- CO2 **by a further 90%**.

The HVO Green D plus is a sustainable biofuel and providers can produce Renewable Energy Guarantees to confirm this. The current fleet can operate on HVO without modifications to the engines.

The use of HVO makes a very positive contribution to reduce green house gases (carbon) created by Council operated vehicles.

There is a substantial early reduction in carbon emissions for £180k per year, when compared to the estimated cost of £40 million to replace the current fleet with fully electric equivalents. This programme of electrification will take longer to implement given timescales for replacement of vehicles and installation of charging infrastructure.

Alternatively, the council could delay the transition to a low emission biofuel to a later year, however it is proposed as growth for 2023-24 in order to help meet our rapidly approaching net zero target.

#### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

In addition to unavoidable fuel price increases, the cost of switching to HVO would be an extra £180k per year. Under the current contractual arrangement this would increase the cost of fuel by 25 pence per litre

- 719,000 litres of fuel at extra £0.25 per litre we would cost an extra £179,750

This would, however, be a proven route to achieve a strategic priority of improving local air quality, whilst reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The projected cost of replacing the existing Fleet with electric powered vehicles is £40 million in capital.

There is no measurable difference in fuel consumed by vehicles powered with HVO rather than DERV in neighbouring boroughs. There is a further benefit in reduced blockage of the diesel particulate filter (DPF) when using HVO.

The Council will achieve a substantial improvement by reducing harmful vehicle emissions through the use of HVO.

#### **Risks and Implications:**

There is an environmental risk by continuing to use DERV. Although the new Fleet is far less polluting than the previous old vehicles the Council does operate a medium sized fleet in an inner-city environment, so is a contributor to poor air quality in the area. This in turn has a reputational risk to the Council as being seen not to adopt best practice and take steps to reduce 'Scope 1' greenhouse gas emissions, these being in the direct control of the authority.

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The introduction of HVO allows the Council to reduce harmful emissions from the Fleet, without having to make any modifications to engines, and can be delivered using the existing fuelling infrastructure. The current contracted fuel supplier, World Fuels Limited (WFL), is a distributor for HVO Green D plus in the UK and can make deliveries of this new fuel type.

The introduction of HVO would reduce NOx and CO2 emissions at a cost, however, is less expensive than estimated £40 million to electrify the Fleet. In addition, there is the environmental benefit of reducing carbon emissions from the manufacture of new electric vehicles.

We are investigating joint procurement opportunities with LB Hackney and Islington to obtain best price for joint supply of HVO via an open tender to be completed by 31 January 2023. Our estimated price per litre for this growth bid at an extra £0.19 pence per litre is in line with current market rates.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	Yes	It benefits all staff and residents by reducing harmful emissions from the Council Fleet.
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Democratic Services Support to Elected Members</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CEO 001 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Chief Executive's Office	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Democratic Services	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Matthew Mannion, Head of Democratic Services	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Mayor Lutfur Rahman, Executive Mayor

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	158	114	-	-	114

  

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	3	2	-	-	2

## Proposal Summary:

### Summary

This proposal is to meet the Mayor's requirement to increase support to councillors in carrying out their role to improve the service they can give to the public and the committees they serve. This is particularly important after an election where two thirds of Councillors were new or returning after a break from service. Support requirements and demands on the service have markedly increased. The administration have also requested that the service looks to re-introduce some of the support offers available previously which have been curtailed over the years to make savings.

There are currently three Member Support Officers (at a total cost of service of £158k). These officers support Members generally and the Speaker of the Council specifically. Each additional post required would (subject to role evaluations) add £57k per year to the base budget, including on-costs. It is proposed that two Grade I posts be added to the team which would be an extra cost of £114k per year.

### Historical Context

The Member Support Service has always played an important role in helping Members to fulfil their functions to the best of their abilities. However, as demands have changed and technology improved, the service has altered at various times over the years.

For example, in 2011-12 the Member Support team consisted of 6 officers who helped Members with correspondence, diary management, submitting and processing MEs and similar tasks on top of those services provided currently (IT support, surgery arrangements, etc).

Leading up to 2018-19 the team was gradually reduced to 3 members and some of the above listed services were ended. The team have also taken on new work such as managing the Members Bulletin, Members Hub and supporting Member Learning and Development. Processing of Member Enquiries was transferred to Information Governance as they had overall management and responsibility for the iCasework system and so it was more efficient for them to manage all iCasework processes.

### Proposal

The request received is to, as far as possible, return to offering the administrative support to Members that they used to be able to call on. This includes diary management for Chairs of Committees (and Scrutiny Leads) and others who receive Special Responsibility Allowances, supporting use of ICT for those who require it (including sitting with the relevant Members whilst they undertake computer work such as managing emails, issues, correspondence etc), improved support for Member Learning and Development and similar activities.

As set out above, historically it would have required an uplift of three FTEs to meet the demands placed on the service. However, given the increased technological solutions that some Members use it is expected that not all Members will wish to take full advantage of the above offer. It is therefore proposed to increase the service by 2 FTEs at this stage.

Should the above expectation prove incorrect and the burden on the service becomes too great, discussions will be held on whether the service offer should be restricted or a further growth bid submitted.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

This proposal will help councillors to be more effective in their ward duties serving the public as well as improving preparation and participation for committee roles.

**Risks and Implications:**

Where Members are unable to effectively perform their roles there is a reputational risk to the Council due to the inability of Members to offer a level of service to residents that is expected.



## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	Improving casework to deliver the Council's Strategic Plan		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CEO 002 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Chief Executive's Office	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Mayor's Office	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	8. A council that listens and works for everyone
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Amy Jackson, Head of Mayor's Office	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Mayor Lutfur Rahman, Executive Mayor

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	657	1,402	-	(480)	922

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	11.2	27.0	-	(8.2)	18.8

## Proposal Summary:

The Mayor's Office requires resources to commence working on key divisional priorities, programmes and projects to deliver on the newly adopted strategic delivery plan. The Mayor has identified programmes and projects for development and delivery.

The staffing levels for casework, cabinet support and executive support are proposed to be increased by 16.8 FTE at an estimated staffing cost of £820k and £10k for increased training and non-pay expenditure. Also the addition of a 1 FTE office assistant (£40k). The restructure will be carried out in line with the council's policies on organisational change, including taking account of potential redeployees with transferable skills. Vacant posts will be filled for periods of 6 months to a year, with the ability to extend depending on organisational and employee needs, through Workpath to support local residents into the workforce to gain skills and experience for future employment.

This growth bid also includes the staffing cost of one Strategy and Policy Officer post (£62k) to co-ordinate between the Mayor's Office and the Strategy, Improvement and Transformation division and provide policy support and the delivery of the Strategic Plan.

*What is the motivation and reason for the proposal?*

The new administration requires an increase in support in order to run a fully operational office to support the Mayor. From the beginning of September 2022, the Mayor will run twice-weekly surgeries that will run until 10pm, with expected numbers of 50-70 people at each surgery. The Mayor will need a large team to support these surgeries, as well as a Casework Manager to oversee their smooth and effective running. These surgeries will generate a significant amount of casework, which the team will follow up on after the surgeries.

### Casework Team

The casework team will consist of the following:

- Casework Manager
- Casework Coordinator
- Caseworkers x 12

### **Casework Manager**

The casework manager will play an important role in ensuring the Mayor is responding to the needs of Tower Hamlets residents.

The Casework Manager will need to have an in-depth understanding of Tower Hamlets and its diverse communities, the ability to prioritise, strong communication skills, political awareness and the ability to advocate for residents successfully.

The casework manager will:

- Draft letters in response to residents on behalf of the Mayor
- Lead on handling queries, casework, post and other correspondence for the with confidential items sensitively.
- Manage casework reports and report on emerging casework themes to the Mayor.
- Manage the casework team.
- Oversee the Mayor's surgeries.
- Represent the Mayor with residents and Council officers as and when requested.
- Establish and maintain effective working relationships with the public, Members, partners, and Council officers at all levels.

### **Casework Coordinator – existing post**

Currently line-managing the team, completing 'non-casework', and managing any difficult cases or challenging residents.

### **Caseworkers**

We currently have two caseworkers, and are recruiting 10 more.

We need a large number of caseworkers to deal with the volume of enquiries that will come from the Mayor's surgeries. This will also allow for us to have 8 caseworkers at the twice-weekly surgeries which go on until 10pm, ensuring that the late workers can get the time back the next day, but the casework office continues to be adequately staffed, and casework generated from the surgeries can be actioned in good time.

### **Cabinet Support Team**

The current number of Cabinet Support Officers is not sufficient to effectively support the Cabinet members. A number of the Cabinet members are new to both the role as Cabinet member and councillor, and so an increased level of direct support is needed. Furthermore, the strategic plan contains a number of outcomes that the Cabinet members will need increased dedicated direct support on if they are to be achieved within the timescale set.

### **Cabinet Support Officers**

The office currently has 3 Cabinet Support Officers, to support 9 Cabinet Members.

We are recruiting 3 more so the structure of the team will be:

- 1 CSO – managing the diaries of the 9 Cabinet Members and supporting the members with casework.
- 1 CSO – working for the Lead Member for Housing, to support the member with the significant workload that comes with this post.
- 4 CSOs – supporting 2 Cabinet members each.

### **Executive Support Team**

The new Executive Support Team will consist of:

2 x PAs and Executive Support Officers – Managing the Mayor's diary and inboxes requires a higher level of support than is currently available, with support in the office 5 days a week. Two ESOs will allow for the inbox and diary to be managed more effectively and ensures the office to be adequately staffed at all times.

3 x Executive Support Assistants – to assist the ESOs with inbox management, diary management, coordinating papers and any other tasks needed to support the Mayor in his daily work.

These posts have all been filled from within the existing Tower Hamlets workforce.

We will also appoint an Office Assistant, to assist with general office duties, and specific responsibility for meeting and greeting guests, and providing refreshments for meetings. This will free up the Executive Support Team to deal with the inbox and provide the most effective possible service to the Mayor, residents and stakeholders.

This bid also proposes Mayor's Advisory posts (8.2 FTE) until 31 March 2025 at a cost of £480k for each of 2023-24 and 2024-25. The posts will be filled through the council's agency intermediary contract (Matrix). The proposed posts are:

Mayor's Advisory Role	Proposed days per week
Women and Equalities Advisor	5
Somali Community Advisor	5
Researcher	5
BAME Media and Communities Advisor	5
Head of External Relations	5
Social Media Manager	5
Sports and Wellbeing Advisor	3
Policy Analyst	3
Social Inclusion Advisor	5

*What is the motivation and reason for the proposal?*

The Mayor requires a number of advisors to support him in his work as Mayor, in particular acting as conduits to the communities of Tower Hamlets. These advisors must be highly experienced specialists in their area, and be focused on supporting the Mayor, working with the existing council officers where needed to ensure harmonious working across the council. This engagement will contribute to the delivery of all strategic priorities and the Mayor's manifesto commitments throughout his term.

The advisors will not be direct employees of the council. As with the advisors working for the Mayor up to 2015, they will be self-employed consultants. This is consistent with previous practice. The advisors will be line-managed by the Head of Mayor's Office. As with other Tower Hamlets consultants, they would be employed via Matrix.

These consultants will adhere to the same high standards as applied to council employees, and will work within the structure of the council, to ensure there is harmonious working between offices.

These roles are not currently replicated in the council structure. These are roles that have been identified by the Mayor to ensure effectiveness. Regular review will be undertaken as to their ongoing requirement.

### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

Increased staffing in the Mayor's office will allow the office and Mayor to be more responsive to residents' needs and requirements. It will allow for the smooth-running of surgeries, which provide a vital access point to the council services for many residents.

Increased staff numbers will ensure the office is always fully staffed, and that promotes the health and wellbeing of staff so they are fully supported.

These appointments will be made via WorkPath, which targets recruitment of people in Tower Hamlets. This will assist in the Strategic Delivery Plan's objective of a Workforce to Reflect the Community.

The advisors will ensure that the Mayor is directly supported by highly-skilled individuals in ensuring he is representing and communicating with the residents of Tower Hamlets to the best of his abilities. The specialist knowledge and support that the advisors will bring will increase and complement the existing resources available in the council. A number of the advisors will be working on engaging with some of the more vulnerable and harder to reach sections of the community, which helps us to meet our strategic priorities of empowering communities and being a council that listens and works for everyone.

The Mayor is expected to make a number of high-level decisions on a daily basis, and requires easily accessible expertise and skills to support him in making these decisions to the best of his ability. The advisors will be able to directly assist the Mayor across a number of work streams, increasing his capacity for output. They will also increase the ability of the Mayor's Office to work with and support other teams across the council, ensuring harmonious working across offices and a greater output by the council overall.

**Risks and Implications:**

There are no identifiable risks involved in these appointments.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The additional capacity in the office will assist with resident contact and support, and will ensure that the Mayor and Executive are fully supported in their roles and are equipped to deliver what is required of them by the people they represent. They will also increase the ability of the Mayor's Office to work with and support other teams across the council, resulting in increased output by the council and more efficient and effective working.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	Yes	The expectation is for additional resources to help to deliver a new strategic plan which is focussed on making a difference to residents in Tower Hamlets. We will be focussed on our residents and improving their outcomes.
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	There could potentially be a change to the roles of a small number of staff, to be confirmed through the consultation.

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	Yes

Additional Information and Comments:
An Equalities Impact Analysis will be carried out as part of the restructure in line with the council's policies on organisational change.

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Developing a Vibrant Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS)</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CEO 003 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Chief Executive's Office	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Strategy, Improvement & Transformation	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	8. A Council that listens and works for everyone
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Afazul Hoque, Head of Corporate Strategy & Communities	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Saied Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cost of Living

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	5,195	1,255	-	-	1,255

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	13	4	-	-	4

## Proposal Summary:

### *What is the proposal and its objectives?*

The council's new Strategic Plan 2022-2026 under priority 3 sets out a commitment 'to work with the voluntary sector to develop a new funding framework for the sector'. The Council is developing options for future corporate grants programmes for the voluntary and community sector. The voluntary and community sector plays a key role in delivering improved outcomes for local residents and is in a lot of cases the first point of contact for residents. The new grants policy and outcomes framework will set out how it will contribute to the delivery of corporate priorities. The borough's VCS Strategy sets a key priority to ensure we have a more resilient and sustainable VCS. Funding from the council provides a stable platform for VCS organisations to secure external funding and support local residents. This proposal relates to increasing current VCS Grant funding from £3.5m to £4.5m which will support local organisations to support residents on a wide range of local priorities.

Furthermore, at present grants are managed by the council and commissioned providers and this proposal relates to a proposal to bring back all grants management to the council. This will mean capacity of the current team will need to be increased to work with voluntary and community sector to deliver the grants programme. The team will manage all aspects of the grants including development of the programme, providing support to VCS organisations, grants application process, assessment and monitoring and management processes. The team will also be able to support grants programme from other parts of the council which are targeted towards the voluntary and community and ensure across the co-ordination we have a much more co-ordinated grant function.

### *What will the proposal deliver?*

The proposal will deliver an additional £1m for VCS organisations to bid for to deliver key corporate priorities. These priorities will be developed following engagement with local residents and the VCS Sector.

The voluntary and community sector team will enable the council to effectively manage corporate grants and local VCS organisations are supported to access the grants and contribute to the delivery of the Council's corporate priorities as set out in the Strategic Plan 2022-26. The team will support delivery and monitoring of the following new funding programmes:

- Mayor's Community Grants Programme
- Small Grants Programme
- Capacity Building & Infrastructure Grant Programme

The request is for 4 additional staff members as follows:

Title	Grade	Unit Cost	FTE	Total
VCS Lead	M	£76,098	1	£76,098
3 x VCS Development Officers	J	£59,506	3	£178,518
				<b>£254,616</b>

*What is the motivation and reason for the proposal? Any changes in legislation etc.*

The council has an opportunity to review and improve the ways it supports and works with voluntary and community sector organisations. Ensuring the new grants programme meets the needs of local residents, improve outcomes and reduce the demand on council and other public sector services. The new funding programme will also ensure it meets one of the key objectives of the VCS Strategy by strengthening financial stability of a larger number of VCS organisations.

*Why is this desirable?*

The Voluntary and community sector acts as a front door of support to local residents as seen during the pandemic. By providing additional funding to the VCS this will reduce demand on public sector services and ensure marginalised residents are supported.

The council is developing a new VCS funding policy and grants programme and to deliver this effectively capacity needs to be increased. This will ensure the new funding programme is transparent and managed effectively and delivered in line with agreed approach.

*Evidence any numbers and cost drivers.*

The new grants programme will lead to hundreds of grant applications which will need to be assessed, awarded and monitored. To ensure best value from these grants we will need robust monitoring and reporting of the progress of grants programmes.

#### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

*How does this proposal contribute to achieving the strategic priorities of the Council?*

The grant programme will address several priorities in the Strategic Plan ensuring VCS organisations funded by the council contribute to improving outcomes for residents, reducing inequality and empower residents to engage and lead on service delivery.

*What are the expected improvements in service delivery & performance? Provide performance information data.*

An increase in provision by VCS organisations and will increase capacity to performance manage grants deliverables and increase support to voluntary and community sector organisations.

#### **Risks and Implications:**

Ineffective management of the council grants programme can lead to reputational risk, potential challenge by VCS, lack of value for money and impact on the council's relationship with key VCS partners.

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

Voluntary and community sector are much more connected to the community and act as a first point of contact for residents. Increasing their capacity will result in a reduction on demand in council services.



## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Strengthening Community Cohesion</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / CEO 004 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Chief Executive's Office	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Cultural and related services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Strategy, Improvement and Transformation	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	8. A Council that listens and works for everyone
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Afazul Hoque, Head of Corporate Strategy & Communities	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	83	-	-	83

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

*What is the proposal and its objectives? What will the proposal deliver?*

The proposal is to increase engagement with mosques in Tower Hamlets of various capacity and sizes to develop their leadership, governance, and ability to tackle inequalities (non-religious needs); improve outcomes for the Muslim community as set out in the strategic plan; strengthen community cohesion and harness their contributions to civil society through partnership and collaboration.

The project will deliver:

- Involvement of mosques in delivery of activities which help address poor outcomes for the Muslim Community
- Enable mosques to deliver a broad range of support including social welfare through for the benefit of the local community
- Mosques are actively working to safeguard children and vulnerable adults, and prevent radicalisation and extremism, as well as having appropriate policies and procedures in place delivering wider social and welfare services to the local community.
- Facilitate relationship building with Council, VCS groups, and other partners to help improve outcomes for the Muslim community.
- Enhance collaboration between mosques.
- Mosques deliver activities and events for the whole community to strengthen community cohesion.

*What is the motivation and reason for the proposal? Any changes in legislation etc.*

- The 2011 Census data showed that 38% of the population of Tower Hamlets are Muslims and is the largest single religious group in the borough. We are still awaiting data release on faith from 2021 Census. However, the numbers are still likely to remain significant.
- There are approximately 56 mosques of different sizes in Tower Hamlets which engage a large proportion of the local Muslim community in their activities. It is noted that while several medium sized mosques had developed their ability to serve the non-religious needs of their communities over recent years, there remains many mosques with very limited human and financial resources with which to provide social and welfare support to the communities they serve and enable greater engagement with non-Muslim communities. Mosques have considerable reach into the Muslim community and engagement with them provides a key mechanism for the Council to build an understanding of the needs of the Muslim residents as well as a means of developing partnerships to address those areas where outcomes for Muslim residents are poorer than those for non-Muslims
- Covid-19 pandemic showed the crucial role faith groups including mosques play and its reach in the community both nationally and locally. Without significant collaboration with faith institutions, it would have been far more difficult for local authorities to spread Covid-related messaging and provide the necessary support to the local communities.

Research conducted by Goldsmith's University for Faith and Society APPG reported collaboration between Local Authorities and faith groups increased rapidly during the pandemic including with mosques. Over the summer of 2020 for example, 24 percent of local authorities have been working with mosque-based food banks<sup>1</sup>.

- Faith institutions in Tower Hamlets played an important role during the pandemic. Covid-19 proved that engagement and partnership with Mosques by the council can help achieve significant outcomes for the Muslim community and the wider community. This became even more important as majority of the Muslims suffer from health inequalities. Due to the mosques reach, public health messaging was able to be spread to all parts of the Muslim community ensuring significant adherence by Muslims to the covid -19 restrictions limiting the spread of the virus and also providing front line services. Some of the mosques provided emergency support to those in need from both the Muslim and non-Muslim communities during the pandemic, which has also impacted positively on cohesion. Previously Mosques have played an important role in delivering council priorities such as improving school attendance, recycling and health.
- The Muslim community suffers from high level of inequality in various areas including health, employment and education. Furthermore Muslims are likely to suffer from higher level of deprivation compared to most groups. Below are some statistics that demonstrates this:
  - Muslims have tested positive for COVID-19 at a rate 3.5 times higher than the UK average<sup>2</sup>
  - It's been reported in April 2022 that 50% of the UK Muslim households live in poverty, compared to 18% of the general UK population<sup>3</sup>.
  - A report in 2021 suggested that Muslim community is falling into poverty at a rate 10 times higher than the UK population.<sup>4</sup>
  - Job losses among Muslims have been six times greater compared to the rest of the population since the pandemic began <sup>5</sup>
  - 42% of Muslims have used their savings to cover expenses due to the pandemic compared to 30% of the UK population<sup>6</sup>
  - By ethnicity, Bangladeshi (21.9%) groups have the highest proportions of people aged 16 or over with poor English language proficiency. By faith community, the Muslim population has the highest proportion of people aged 16 and over who cannot speak English well or at all (16%).<sup>7</sup>

*Why is this desirable?*

The project will enable mosques to social and economic benefits to residents and help reduce inequalities which is in line with the council's strategic priorities.

#### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

*How does this proposal contribute to achieving the strategic priorities of the Council?*

This proposal has an impact on several corporate priorities as set out in the Strategic Plan 2022-26:

Priority 1: Tackling the cost-of-living crisis – through mosques being a source of information regarding support available and where possible hosting support services in the mosque

Priority 2: Homes for the future – Mosques will be able to provide support on consultation with residents on future of housing management services including THH

Priority 4: Boost culture, business, jobs and leisure- through mosques being a source of information regarding support available and where possible hosting support services in the mosque

Priority 5: Invest in public services – improve access to services

Priority 6: Empower Communities and Fight Crime – strengthen engagement and cohesion

*What are the expected improvements in service delivery & performance? Provide performance information data.*

<sup>1</sup> Keeping the Faith: Partnership between faith groups and local authorities during and beyond the pandemic p2

<sup>2</sup> <https://muslimcensus.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/year-of-lockdown-revised-v1.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.islamic-relief.org.uk/half-of-muslims-in-the-uk-will-struggle-to-feed-themselves-this-ramadan-as-the-cost-of-living-soars/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://muslimcensus.co.uk/financial-impact-of-covid-19-on-the-muslim-community/>

<sup>5</sup> <https://muslimcensus.co.uk/financial-impact-of-covid-19-on-the-muslim-community/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://muslimcensus.co.uk/financial-impact-of-covid-19-on-the-muslim-community/>

<sup>7</sup> Office for National Statistics, (2011). Census Data on English Language Proficiency. Analysis of data from table CT0558 - Ethnic group by proficiency in English by sex by age.

This proposal will contribute to several key corporate performance indicators including:

- More residents agreeing that the local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on together
- More residents from local area doing voluntary work
- More residents are satisfied with their local area as a place to live

#### **Risks and Implications:**

- Not finding appropriate contractor to deliver the programme
- Mosques not engaging, no buy in from mosques

#### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

Mosques and other faith institutions provide crucial services to the community with limited resources and capacity. With engagement and small amount of support mosques can potentially provide far bigger outcomes for both the Muslim and non-Muslim communities.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:
This proposal will tackle inequalities facing the Muslim community and strengthen cohesion between different faith groups.

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Customer Services – Telephone System Improvements</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 001 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Customer Services	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	8. A council that listens and works for everyone
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Jo Kelly, Head of Customer Services	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Inclusive Development and Housebuilding

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23 (000s)	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	200	(135)	-	65

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

### Centralisation of Telephone Contact

One of the first priorities highlighted by the Mayor and Members was to address residents' concerns in not getting through to the council on the telephone. Having reviewed the cause for poor response times it has been identified that the technology used for accepting calls in the council is fragmented. The discovery found that there are over c200 telephone lines operating across the council. Inbound calls are coming into the council using different forms of technology. The structure and technology for managing calls is outlined below.

1. There is a Corporate Contact Centre and 6 other mini contact centres which operates on Automated Call Distribution System. The ACD technology enables services to monitor the calls coming through for speed to answer, understand the volume of calls coming through and the length of time it takes for each member of staff on the lines to respond to the enquiries. At the same time, it offers call recording to monitor call quality. Managers can monitor who is logged onto the system. At the same time if the caller needs to wait to get their call picked up scripts can be read to give further information about the service.
2. In addition to the ACD Technology the council also has calls coming through via Hunt Groups. Hunt Groups rely on individuals logging onto a phone extension which forms part of a group so that when a call comes in the phone can be answered. If no one logs on to the extension the caller will still hear the call ringing but call bounces around until it cuts off. Unlike the ACD technology there is no visibility for managers to monitor if staff are logged on to the Hunt Group
3. Additionally, there are over 20 direct dial lines advertised on the council website – some of which are not on either of the technologies outlined above. Again, with no opportunity to monitor if calls are being answered this results in poor customer experience

This bid seeks funding to move all existing Hunt Groups and Direct Dial lines to the Automated Call Distribution System. The benefit of this will be better management control on calls coming into the council, more visibility on service performance in responding to calls and better understanding of the types of calls coming in to support service improvements. At the same time, calls can be recorded and monitored for quality and improvement so that staff can be trained to meet customer services standards.

To improve the telephony systems by moving phone lines on to an ACD system, the first year 2023-24 one off project costs will be £135k and £65k ongoing licencing costs totalling £200k. From 2024-25 the ongoing licence costs will be £65k.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

It is expected that by moving calls to a system that can provide better management control response times to calls can be improved achieving better outcomes for residents.

**Risks and Implications:**

If we fail to improve our telephone offer, we will continue to get complaints from residents and disadvantaging those who have no option but to contact the council by phone.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

Once we have calls on a system that can be monitored, we can establish further the resource levels needed to manage calls and look for opportunities to centralise services and achieve economies of scale and possible return on investment.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	Improves response time for telephone and social media contact.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:



# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Customer Services – Residents’ Hub</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 002 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Cultural and related services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Customer Services	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	8. A council that listens and works for everyone
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Jo Kelly, Head of Customer Services	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Inclusive Development and Housebuilding

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24 (000s)	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth (000s)
Budget (£000)	-	1,104	-	-	1,104

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	-	20.5	-	-	20.5

## Proposal Summary:

One of the key issues facing the borough is not having an effective face to face offer for our more vulnerable residents who cannot use online services. The Residents’ Hub service has been proposed as a key service that will operate from the New Town Hall in Whitechapel. With the recognition that there is a need for face-to-face support in the borough, the Mayor’s Manifesto suggested that we would reopen One Stop Shops. The Residents’ Hub model goes beyond the support which was offered by the original One Stop Model, offering a holistic, collaborative and responsive approach to supporting our more vulnerable residents. Aligned to this is building strong and effective partnerships with our voluntary and community sector organisations. In developing the Residents’ Hub Model research identified that there are 5 key issues impacting residents- Housing, Welfare benefits, Wellbeing, Debt Management and Employment and Skills.

### **Residents Hub Model – Case for Funding**

To offer a Residents’ Hub from the New Town Hall as part of the original business offer a transition (Pilot) has been set up to get an insight into what demand could be expected and how could a more collaborative working approach with the Voluntary and Community would support the Target Operating Model. A transition service was launched at Mulberry Place in March 2022 and Idea Store Whitechapel in May 2022. To date over 4000 residents have accessed the service supported by 16 partners with a number in the pipeline going through the onboarding process. The highest demand to date has been for Housing and Welfare Benefits support.

This is a new service therefore there are no existing resources to support the transition (Pilot) phase or ongoing service offer. Existing staff from Customer Services (Corporate Contact Centre) have been drawn in to support the Residents’ Hub Pilot. This is in addition the service absorbing social media contact from the communications team with no additional resources. at the same time, calls continue to increase for Benefits and Council Tax services which the Contact Centre manages. Stretching the resource to this extent is having an adverse effect impact on being able to answer the increased volume of calls and achieve service performance standards in answering calls within 2 minutes.

The feedback from the Contact Centre staff supporting the Residents’ Hub suggest that we could add further value to the model by extending the triage support to the Corporate Contact Centre particularly so that we can ensure that residents contacting us through that channel are also offered holistic support. However, without additional resource to support this approach would again impact on capacity to answer calls.

Given the demand for the service from residents and the speed in which Partners are joining the service, along with high profile organisations such as the DWP and GLA wishing to be part of the Residents’ Hub model, it has been proven that the model works and is a much-needed service in the community. Discussions with Customer Services Lead Member and the Mayor has resulted in consideration to developing a localities model in addition to the one to be set up in the New Town Hall.

### Recommendation and Resource Model for the Residents' Hub Localities Model

The Residents' Hub service will support the high demand shown through the pilot with a focus on supporting vulnerable residents. To effectively and efficiently manage the face-to-face and telephone triage service the resources needed is shown below. There are assumptions built into this option. However, without any publicity and only offering the service from Mulberry Place and light touch at Idea Store Whitechapel there has been over 4,000 visits since March.

- 0.5 FTE Customer Services Development Manager to manage the RH partnerships and overarching continuous development of the services (O)
- 1.0 FTE Residents Hub Manager to lead on the operations of the 5 Residents Hub and digital support responsible for staff and partner engagement.(M)
- 3.0 FTE Residents Hub Team Leaders supported to manage 4 residents Hub sites (J)
- 4.0 FTE Customer Services Advisors (CSA) at the new Town Hall Residents' Hub (G)
- 3.0 FTE CSAs supporting Idea Stores Chrisp Street
- 3.0 FTE CSAs Idea Stores Bow (G)
- 2.0 FTE CSAs supporting Rushmead. Tower Hamlets Homes will be at Rushmead to support any housing enquiries (G)
- 2.0 FTE CSAs at Cubitt Town Library (resource at this site will be continuously reviewed and if necessary increase to be aligned with demand) (G)
- 2.0 FTE CSAs based in the Corporate Contact Centre to offer a telephone triage and referral service, additional social media work and telephone demand (G)

Table 1 below outlines the costs of £1,104k for the above staffing resource model including supplies and services.

To ensure that the Residents' Hubs is visible in the localities there will be the need for each site to have additional furniture and signage. The furniture will entail a desk with privacy screen and some seating for residents in the designated area. The cost of this will be met within current budgets.

Table 1: Resource Needed – 5 Residents' Hubs, including New Town Hall	Post Grades	Full Time Equivalent	Costs (£000's)
Customer Service Development Manager	O	0.5	49
Service Manager	M	1.0	82
Team Leaders	J	3.0	194
Customer Service Advisor (RH)	G	14.0	673
Customer Service Advisors (Telephone Support)	G	2.0	96
Supplies and Services @ £500 per employee	N/A	-	10
<b>Total Staff Related Cost</b>		<b>20.5</b>	<b>1,104</b>

### Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):

The service will seek to track outcomes for residents not just for internal services but also with partners. A set of agreed KPIs will form the basis of monitoring performance. In addition we will have a better set of management information for understanding demand to make informed strategic decisions.

### Risks and Implications:

- If we do not get the long-term funding to support the Residents' Hub we will not be able to continue resourcing from current resources which is having an impact on current performance on the phones.
- If we do not get the funding to extend the service to the localities this will have an impact on the Manifesto and customer access to a much needed and high demand service.
- Failure to support vulnerable residents at an early stage of issues arising will cost the organisation more to support downstream

### Value for Money and Efficiency:

It is anticipated that the Residents' Hub model and improved telephone contact will contribute to the Mayor's Manifesto to support the most vulnerable people in the borough suffering from the economic impact from rising costs of living. At the same time the model seeks to address residents' issues at the early stages thus avoiding crisis cases which cost more to address. A robust holistic early intervention support service as well as an effective telephone support service leads to cost avoidance and improved organisation reputation but more importantly allows for more accessibility for our residents.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	Yes	It offers a collaborative and holistic service for the most vulnerable residents to get the support they need as early as possible.
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	Opens up an additional channel for residents to get support.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Digital Heritage Preservation</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 003 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Investment
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Cultural and related services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Customer Services	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	8. A council that listens and works for everyone
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Tamsin Bookey, Heritage Manager	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	316	-	13	-	13

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

The Mayor's Manifesto (page 17) includes a pledge under **Priority 5 – Invest in public services** - to “invest in the future of our borough’s libraries and Idea Stores, including the Bancroft local history library and archive”. The new Strategic Plan adapts this into the corporate Priority 5. Also relevant is Priority 8 of the Strategic Plan – “a council that listens and works for everyone”.

There are two discrete requirements for urgent additional ICT funding for Tower Hamlets Local History Library & Archives (THLHLA). This investment is essential for the service to meet the challenges of recordkeeping in the digital age. It will also bring the service up to date in harnessing the power of digital so as to broaden public access to the histories of the East End and its communities. THLHLA is responsible for preserving the corporate memory of the council and its predecessor bodies with records dating back to the C14th. Without urgent access, archives that are in digital formats will be lost forever. Actions undertaken by THLHLA now – “contemporary collecting” - dictate whether future generations will have any archives available to them that document current and recent activity.

### **Digital preservation**

Since the late 1990s the majority of council documents have been created as digital rather than paper records. Archive services are required to preserve records in their native format with the original metadata preserved, rather than take in copies printed out on paper or converted to other formats. This preserves their authenticity, without which their evidentiary integrity can be called into question. Over the last 20-30 years best practice and international standards have been established for the permanent preservation of digital archives. These 'digital preservation systems' go beyond the functionality of digital asset management systems to ensure that records remain accessible and legible in their native format despite the inevitability of software and hardware obsolescence. Democratic Services have recently advised that even formal, signed Committee, Cabinet and Full Council minutes will no longer be printed out and transferred to the archives in hardcopy. THLHLA will receive only digital version of these unique items for which it is the sole repository.

Preservica, the global market leader in digital preservation systems, has produced a range of digital preservation solutions to meet government security level clearance requirements. Funding is requested for the service to obtain Preservica Cloud Essentials – which is the basic edition of the software and is in use by many local authorities in England.

The costs are:

- £18k – Year 1 subscription plus set-up costs – funded by the Digital Portfolio Board Capital Programme
- £13k – Revenue cost per annum subsequently (subject to inflation)

### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

#### **Digital preservation**

Digital preservation is an essential element of THLHLA's core business. THLHLA supports the council's Information Governance function in ensuring that key records are retained or disposed of in line with corporate retention policies. However the function is not able to be executed properly at present without a suitable specialist digital preservation system in place.

There is a substantial backlog of already acquired digital records awaiting transfer into Preservica which is taking up space on the NetApp Azure shared drive. Once the new version of Preservica has been installed and implemented work can begin on processing these archives and uploading them into the Preservica system. This will relieve capacity on the corporate ICT systems. The corporate shared drive, though unsuitable, has been used on a temporary basis to store digital archives for the last 10-12 years while trying to make the case for a specialist system to be procured.

### **Risks and Implications:**

It is essential that the council is compliant with legislation around recordkeeping. The mandate on LBTH as a public body to support the democratic rights of citizens to access key public records is at risk without a digital preservation system. The TOWER values of OPEN and EXCELLENT are not being met by the status quo. For over a decade of attempting to tackle this challenge, using the shared drive as a temporary holding area, staff have been treading water, trying to prevent the loss of records permanently but unable to catalogue preserve or provide public access to them.

### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

THLHLA was provisionally accredited by the National Archives in 2018 on the condition that a digital preservation system would be in place by 2020. The pandemic bought additional time but accreditation is now lapsing. The National Archives have made clear that digital preservation system must be in place in order to reapply for accredited status with any hope of success. Accreditation is the national standard and benchmark for archive services in the UK. For THLHLA to lose accredited status would be a serious KPI failure.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	Yes	Yes, positively by helping to ensure a greater percentage of THLHLA's collections are available for public access.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

<b>Summary:</b>	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

<b>Additional Information and Comments:</b>

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023-26

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	Information Governance – Records Management and IG Support		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 004 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Investment
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Customer Services	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	8. A council that listens and works for everyone
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Raj Chand, Director of Customer Services Usman Zia, Head of Information Governance	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Kabir Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Inclusive Development and Housebuilding

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	763	111	-	-	111

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	15	2	-	-	2

Proposal Summary:
<b><u>Records Manager: Records Manager requirements for a local authority</u></b>
<p><b><u>1: Legal requirements for role</u></b></p> <p>As a public authority, we have key legal responsibilities for management, retention, and destruction of records. These range over various forms of legislation, guidance, and codes of practice. Some key examples are:</p> <p><b>Section 46 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (“FOIA”) ensures a Code of Practice via the secretary of state on the management of records</b>  <b>Section 77 of the FOIA places a duty on a public authority and its employees to not incorrectly alter or destroy records which if contravened is a <u>criminal offence</u>. There is a similar provision under Section 19 of the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 and Section 173 of the Data Protection Act 2018 (“DPA”)</b>  <b>Section 224 of the Local Government Act 1972 places a legal duty for councils to make proper arrangements for the custody of documents</b>  <b>Schedule 1 of the Public Records Act 1958 has applicability of the legislation and responsibilities to local authorities</b>  <b>Regulation 17 under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 requires that health and care providers must securely maintain accurate, complete, and detailed records</b>  <b>UK GDPR Article 5(1)(e) about storage limitation specifies that personal data shall be kept for no longer than is necessary for the purposes for which the personal data are processed</b>  <b>The data protection principles under the DPA set out the requirements that personal data is accurate, kept up to date, not kept longer than necessary and processed securely</b></p> <p>Without proper records management resource within a public authority, some or all the above legal obligations and regulations risk being breached with the inclusion of criminal offences. The above is not an exhaustive list and it is likely that without additional resources, other statutory and regulatory breaches occur on an ongoing basis.</p> <p><b><u>2: Need for a dedicated role to ensure compliance and avert risk and regulatory measures</u></b></p> <p>While information governance is a shared responsibility across all officers of the council, the council wide requirement for records management compliance is too wide reaching a level of responsibility and resource to share across existing local authority officers and IG responsibility holders (such as SIRO, DPO etc). Currently there is no individual and central source for the local authority to ensure compliance and council wide oversight and enforcement of standards. The above diverse statutory requirements and wide-reaching scope of records management should evidence that an individual responsible role with specific and specialist skills and responsibilities is required at the council.</p> <p><b><u>3: Consequences of inadequate resource for records management</u></b></p> <p>As well as the legal and statutory breaches above, inadequate records management can lead to significant reputational and financial damage via regulators like the Information Commissioners Office (“ICO”):</p>

### Members Enquiries Information Governance Support Officer:

In order to bring the Mayor and Members up to date please note; the IG team have been supporting the Mayor and Cabinet case workers in training and assisting officers, as well as processing over 2000 ME's for the Mayors Office and Cabinet Members from May 22 until present. The circa 14 New case officers taken on in the Mayors office have now become more proficient in dealing with ME's and the system used. It is now necessary to hand over any Mayor and Cabinet ME's to the team. The IG service has only 2 Officers dealing with 36 Members and MP enquiries which limits capacity hugely and puts Officers under an immense level of pressure which is not sustainable and presents a contingency risk with such a low number of officer resource over such a key and growing area of council priority and resident delivery.

The IG service has undergone a thorough review. The review was not focussed on savings, the key objective was to deliver a fit for purpose service for the organisation as a whole, to bring it up to standard as a modern service and to ensure the service can respond to the increased demand for transparency and effective management of information. And understand any gaps.

ME's were transferred over to the IG Service in January 2020 as an outcome of budget reductions in the Democratic Services area. A temporary £20k budget was provided to cover a 6 month period, after which vacant posts within the IG service were redistributed to cover the service on a temporary basis. 2 posts: the Senior ME Officer and ME Officer have continued to be funded from within the IG budget and built into the new structure moving forward. In addition to this, one new ME/IG Support Officer is required to deal with the additional demand across the service.

The service is both internally focussed to provide guidance and advice in IG but also plays an external role in dealing with FOI's, SAR's, EIR's, Complaints and Members Enquiries. When ME's were transferred to IG in Jan 2021, resources to deal with the additional work did not transfer, however a temporary resource was seconded into the team to help cover ME's. The post was part funded from a one off £20k budget and continued to be funded from and underspend in IG as result of the Head of IG vacancy, which has now been recruited to. The processes and how we manage ME's has since been transformed. The IT system has also been configured to manage ME's more effectively. To continue to provide the level of support, meet response times for ME's and further support to new Members in the new administration, there is a requirement to ensure sufficient resources is added within the IG service. To;

Undertake a range of activities, designed to provide effective support to the Information Governance Service, including: Supporting the provision of a council wide MP/Members Enquiries function. In line with the Local Government (Transparency Requirements) (England) Regulations 2015, assist with publishing LBTH's Transparency Code. Assist with publishing the Council's Publication Scheme and updating the Disclosure Log, in line with the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Support the filtering and sign-posting of contacts to the appropriate team within Information Governance Service. Assist in developing and implementing sound organisational procedures, processes and systems, to help the Members Enquiries function deal effectively, efficiently and lawfully with all members enquiries, all matters relating to the Disclosure Log, Transparency Code, and the Publication Scheme.

### Member Enquiries stats – All Parties

Sep-21	333
Oct-21	320
Nov-21	308
Dec-21	248
Jan-22	321
Feb-22	362
Mar-22	474
May-22	318
Jun-22	379
Jul-22	355
Aug	444
Sept	391
Oct	563

It is proposed to have one additional IG Support Officer role to deal with the increased demand that is and will continue to come into the service moving forward.

Breakdown of costing:

Post Title	Post Grade	Cost (£000's)
Records Manager	Grade I	61
1 x ME/IG Support Officer	Grade G	50
<b>Total</b>		<b>111</b>



### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

- Ensure the council legally compliant with its duty for the implementation of key legislation and codes of practice
- Ensures transparency and information that should be in the public domain is clearly available via a properly managed and structured – Scheme of Publication
- Will reduce the numbers of Freedom of Information requests and information requests
- Customers, residents, business requiring information from the council will be able to access things more readily
- Retention and destruction of information will be enforced across the organisation ensuring compliance and fulfilling our public duty

### **Risks and Implications:**

The council collects and stores large volumes of records and personal data in different forms – electronic, paper etc. The management and control of this information is vital.

Failure to follow the code may mean that an authority also fails to comply with other legislation concerning the creation, management, disposal, use and re-use of records and information, for example:

- Public Records Act 1958;
- Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA);
- Re-use of Public Sector Information Regulations 2015;

Would result in breach of its statutory obligations resulting in large fines and penalties from the ICO (Information Commissioner's Office).

### **Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The roles have been benchmarked against resources in other public sector organisations and evaluated accordingly. Some organisations outsource the RM role, which equates to much higher costs, no support to internal services and less control over policies and processes. In addition, the ME/IG support officer will ensure we are appropriately resourcing to be able to deliver key services to our residents.

If the council were to have and ICO audit on records management the fines/penalties would be far higher than the cost of the resources being requested.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	Yes	An improvement on service offered.
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	Yes	The additional posts have been requested as a result of the transformation, increase in demand and a full review of the service.

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:
An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed for the purpose of the restructure.

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Full Reopening of Idea Store Watney Market</b>
------------------------	---

<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 005 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Mayoral Priority
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Cultural and related services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Customer Services	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	Council Strategic Plan Priorities 3, 4, and 5
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Raj Chand, Director of Customer Services Sergio Dogliani, Head of Idea Store	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Maium Talukdar, Statutory Deputy Mayor & Cabinet Member for Education and Lifelong Learning

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	263	507	(20)	-	487

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	4	8.44	-	-	8.44

## Proposal Summary:

Idea Store Watney Market (ISWM) had been used by the NHS for Covid-related purposes during the pandemic and until March 2022. The original post-pandemic plan was to reopen the store and offer reduced library services, operating over 40 hrs a week (5 days) and using only one floor, with the other two floors being used by other services.

This proposal is now to consider fully reopening the ISWM for library, learning and information services (7 days, 69 hours), with a focus on families and young people. ISWM was purpose built and opened in 2013, it is still in an excellent condition and bringing it back to be fully operational would be particularly beneficial to residents in Watney Market, Limehouse, Shadwell and Wapping. The benefits would be as follows:

- i. Efficient and equitable distribution of library, learning and information resources to cover a wide geographical area that extends to Shadwell, Limehouse, Watney Market and Wapping
- ii. Full use of all three floors for Idea Store services in a building that was designed as a modern library, learning and information centre
- iii. Longer opening hours (seven days, including most evenings)
- iv. Opportunity to integrate some Career Young WorkPath provision within the building and make a direct connection with existing facilities for young people at the site
- v. Space for Members' Surgeries
- vi. Opportunity to introduce adult learning offer (ESOL and Skills for Life and Work), adding adult learning in the Watney Market area will minimise the impact of relocating courses from the Shadwell Centre (subject to appropriate allocation of capital funds)

Resource required	Full Time Equivalent	Cost (£000)
Team Leader (Grade J)	1.00	64
Customer Service Advisor (Grade G)	7.44	373
<b>Subtotal Staff Related Cost</b>	<b>8.44</b>	<b>437</b>
Supplies and Services @ £500 per employee		4
Security cover		18
Cleaning		28
<b>Total Permanent Growth (from 2024-25)</b>		<b>487</b>
One-off set up costs in 2023-24		20
<b>Growth required for 2023-24</b>		<b>507</b>

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The service will seek to track outcomes for residents and customers as part of the overall Idea Store service. Agreed KPIs will form the basis for monitoring performance.

**Risks and Implications:**

None.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

It is expected that the Full Reopening of Idea Store Watney Market will contribute to the Mayor's Manifesto Priorities as follows:

*Council Strategic Plan Priority 3 – Accelerating education*

*Council Strategic Plan Priority 4 – Boosting culture, business, jobs, and leisure*

*Council Strategic Plan Priority 5 – Investing in public services*

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Cloud Hosting to Improve Application Availability, Functionality and Performance</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 006 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	IT	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Paul McHale, Head of Business Applications	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Saied Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cost of Living

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	186	-	-	186

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposal Summary:**

Migrate three service critical applications – Synergy (Education) and Telecare and Zellis (HR) – to vendor cloud hosting to improve application availability, functionality and performance. Synergy (for Education) estimated at £110k per annum and Jontek (for Telecare) estimated at £16k per annum and Zellis HR estimated at £60k.

Synergy is a large and service critical application underpinning all education related services in the Council. The current separation of the application and hosting is causing application availability and performance issues, including the system being unavailable for three weeks every year for termly upgrades. Migrating its sister application – Mosaic – to vendor hosting has reduced down time dramatically and eliminated performance issues.

Telecare is a smaller application and supports a critical 24x7x365 service supporting vulnerable adults in the community. The system is currently hosted in Mulberry Place so urgently needs to be rehosted before we vacate the building. Vendor cloud hosting will also allow access from other locations, improving service resilience.

Zellis is the Council's HR / Payroll system and migration to the vendor cloud hosted version will bring in additional functionality to improve management of our establishment and enhance services to schools.

Other major applications including Mosaic (for social care) and NEC (for housing) are already vendor cloud hosted and have demonstrated significant improvements in availability, functionality and performance, reducing down time for colleagues, adding new functionality and virtually eliminating situations where services were unable to support citizens and staff in these areas.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

This improvement will create greater resilience in the applications, reduce planned maintenance downtime, accelerate development work, improve performance and accessibility.

**Risks and Implications:**

This will be a change in design which may affect some of the uncontrolled practices in place currently.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

While vendor hosting increases the IT costs it increases availability and performance for colleagues using these applications to support citizens and staff in areas of high demand.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Maintaining the Council's Cyber Security</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 007 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	IT	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Adrian Gorst, Director of IT	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Saied Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cost of Living

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	500	265	10	10	285

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposal Summary:**

Cyber-security incidents present an existential threat to the Council. The cyber-security threat continues to evolve and grow as criminal enterprises and unfriendly states attack organisations for profit, for publicity or for political ends. The National Cyber-Security Centre (NCSC) has directed all public sector bodies to enhance their cyber-security in light of the war on Ukraine as Russia and its allies have extensive cyber-attack capabilities and may choose to indiscriminately disrupt allies of Ukraine. Cyber-security incidents are now a matter of when we are attacked rather than if we are attacked. The impact of a successful attack can be massive, with the loss of essential data, systems being unavailable for months, restricted services to citizens and recovery costs estimated at around £10m for a local authority.

The Council meets recommended standards; however, these standards continue to evolve in response to growing threats and this growth bid allows us to maintain appropriate cyber-security measures to protect the Council's systems, information, staff and citizens.

Continue and expand immutable backups. These allow us to recover data in the event of a cyber-security incident as once written the backup can't be changed by ransomware and other malware. The amount of data we hold is growing so these costs rise year on year. £100k / £110k / £120k

Continue and improve the detecting and response capabilities for security incidents. We are seeking a co-managed detect and respond solution available 24/7/365. The expectation being that most threats will be contained and where possible remediated by our external Security Operations Centre (SOC) provider. The council internal IT support service is available between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 hours. There is no support out of hours for IT services within the council and sadly, most attacks are initiated over the weekend and evenings. The cost is estimated at £60k per year based on what other local authorities report they pay for this service.

Extend our use of Redflags to provide in-the-moment security advice to colleagues to supplement traditional cyber-security training. [The initial implementation was grant funded as a proof of concept.] £35k per year.

Additional external penetration test to provide additional assurance in addition to our existing annual penetration test and internal monitoring for the rest of the year. £20k per year.

Upgrade to Microsoft Defender for Cloud for our virtual servers to provide enhanced protection and integration with our wider security monitoring. £15k per year.

Retained security service to provide rapid assistance in response to a major cyber-security incident. £35k per year.



**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

Maintain Council's cyber-security posture. We can use our penetration tests to monitor technical outcomes and the LGA Cyber360 peer review to monitor overall posture against national standards and other local authorities.

**Risks and Implications:**

The cyber-security threat continues to grow, and without additional investment we will fall behind recommended standards, be more likely to experience a cyber-security incident, with greater impact, and slower and more expensive recovery, to the detriment of all Council services and citizens. Cyber-security is a corporate risk on the risk register.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

We will test value for money through our procurement process, with benchmarking of costs against other similar size local authorities.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	Investment in cyber-security enhances the protection of all our services including those addressing inequality.
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	Investment in cyber-security enhances the protection of all our services including those supporting vulnerable citizens, who may suffer worst if their information is lost and Council systems are unavailable.
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	Investment in cyber-security enhances the protection of all our services including frontline services, which are often worst affected by cyber-security incidents.
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	Investment in cyber-security maintains accessibility to services.
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	Audio Visual Service in New Town Hall		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 008 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	IT	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Adrian Gorst, Director of IT	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Saied Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cost of Living

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	120	(50)	-	70

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	-	1	(1)	-	-

**Proposal Summary:**

The Town Hall will have modern meeting room technology and digital signage throughout. The advanced features require additional licencing to maintain these services beyond the first year covered by the project and additional engineer support to ensure the technology is maintained and colleagues can access training and support in its use.

Estimate £70 per annum to licence the advanced functionality that enables hybrid meetings and the door panels and to extend onsite hardware support.

£50k for one year to hire an audio-visual technician to maintain the technology and provide user support and training. Preventative maintenance to include daily checks in all meeting rooms and on all digital signage to allow early diagnosis and fixing of faults, completing the installation of regular software updates. User support and training to include training new users in the use of the technology and in-the-room support for our most important meetings to ensure the technology runs smoothly.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

With a desk ratio of 4:10 at the new town hall, many staff will not be 'in the office' at any one time, which means that hybrid working arrangements will be essential. Hybrid meetings are also used extensively to work with partners. The AV systems provide functionality to hold efficient hybrid meetings with participants who are not in the office. The continuous operational maintenance of AV and digital signage will provide predictable availability of these systems – which are a critical part of the Smarter Working (hybrid working) arrangements.

**Risks and Implications:**

The advanced hybrid meeting features will not be available without the additional licences. Hardware repairs or replacements are likely to be slow without hardware support Experience indicates the audio-visual technology will quickly become unused and unusable without ongoing technical and user support.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

Ensures the investment we've already made results in the technology being usable and used to achieve a return on investment.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Microsoft Licence Costs Increase</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 009 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	IT	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Melanie Rose, Head of IT Service Management	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Saied Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cost of Living

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	1,440	360	-	-	360

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposal Summary:**

Our current licencing arrangement with Microsoft ends in March 2023 and we anticipate renewal will cost £360k per annum more than the current budget. The Council would not be able to function without these Microsoft licences and there are no feasible alternatives in the short to medium term.

The cost increase is due to global price changes from Microsoft, adverse exchange rate movements making US dollar priced services more expensive in UK pounds, and the end of discounts to encourage the move from on-premise to cloud services.

This growth bid is an informed estimate, and the final cost will be determined through a competitive procurement between Microsoft partners, and is not expected to vary significantly at this time. Having benefitted from a three-year fixed unit price arrangement we will seek a similar five-year arrangement to avoid further cost increases in the medium term.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The Council would not be able to function without these Microsoft licences.

**Risks and Implications:**

The Council would not be able to function without these Microsoft licences.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

Social Value will have a 5% overall weighting in the tender evaluation process with the requirements being developed and defined during the preparation of the Tender Pack. This will include consideration of Social Value benefits that can reasonably be delivered within the proposed contract.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Bank transaction fees for increased online and phone card payments</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / RES 010 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Resources	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Revenues and Benefits	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	8. A council that listens and works for everyone
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Chris Boylett, Interim Head of Revenues and Benefits	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Saied Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cost of Living

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	448	200	25	25	250

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

As part of its “digital by default” transformation programme, the Council is successfully increasing the ability for residents, community organisations and businesses to book and pay for Council services through online and telephone touchtone services. This has streamlined and improved access to services and created efficiencies for the organisation, reducing staff time and contributing towards MTFs savings in services across the Council.

This has meant that more payments are made through credit and debit cards, which has increased the bank transaction fees paid by the Council, as demonstrated in the table below:

2016-17 Expenditure	2017-18 Expenditure	2018-19 Expenditure	2019-20 Expenditure	2020-21 Expenditure	2021-22 Expenditure	2022-23 Expenditure Forecast
£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's	£000's
312	337	377	405	439	591	648

Costs increased 35% from 2020-21 to 2021-22 and are forecast to increase by a further 10% from 2021-22 to 2022-23.

Contributing factors:

- 1) Bank charges are driven by:
  - a. Debit/credit card charge % has increased, and these are set by card providers. *(Please refer to Table 1 below)*
  - b. Charges are based on transaction value, accelerated by the pandemic, now showing to continually increase as more residents move to digital and self-service options. Note that the council is unable to pass on transaction costs to individuals for council tax and business rates. *The option to charge businesses paying with a business card is being investigated with our provider.*
  
- 2) Due to additional requirements for Children and Adult services, the number of prepaid cards issued by the council has increased resulting in the doubling of the monthly fee from £2,000 (until January 2022) to £4,000 per month.
  - a. Charges for 1 to 1000 prepaid cards amount to £2,000 per month.
  - b. Charges for 1001+ prepaid cards amount to £4,000 per month.

**2021-22 Charge rate per transaction in %**

Transaction type	Commercial Visa	Commercial Mastercard	Mastercard Credit	Mastercard Debit	Visa Debit (inc Electron)	Visa Credit	Visa Business
RingGo Moto	2.871	2.38	1.413	0.416	0.359	1.321	0.482
RingGo - Ecommerce	2.871	2.38	1.143	0.416	0.359	1.051	0.482
Car Pound payments	2.419	2.38	1.243	0.416	0.369	1.161	0.492
Paye.Net - Moto	2.889	2.38	1.413	0.416	0.369	1.331	0.492
Touch Tone Payments	2.889	2.38	1.413	0.416	0.369	1.331	0.492
Internet Payments	2.419	2.38	1.143	0.416	0.369	1.061	0.492
Managed C & P	2.419	2.38	1.243	0.416	0.369	1.161	0.492

**2022-23 Charge rate per transaction in %**

Transaction type	Commercial Visa	Commercial Mastercard	Mastercard Credit	Mastercard Debit	Visa Debit (inc Electron)	Visa Credit	Visa Business
RingGo Moto	3.121	2.48	1.463	0.436	0.379	1.371	1.382
RingGo - Ecommerce	3.121	2.48	1.193	0.436	0.379	1.101	1.382
Car Pound payments	2.669	2.48	1.293	0.436	0.389	1.211	1.392
Paye.Net - Moto	3.139	2.48	1.463	0.436	0.389	1.381	1.392
Touch Tone Payments	3.139	2.48	1.463	0.436	0.389	1.381	1.392
Internet Payments	2.669	2.48	1.193	0.436	0.389	1.111	1.392
Managed C & P	2.669	2.48	1.293	0.436	0.389	1.211	1.392

Table.1

Transaction costs by comparison with other boroughs show LBTH are on a favourable rate. This is always under review and presently the council is contracted with Capita.

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The improvement in online services and more streamlined receipt of payments contributes to the Council's strategic priority outcome of being "A council that listens and works for everyone".

**Risks and Implications:**

This growth bid ensures that an appropriate level of budget is provided for transaction fees and that the Council's budget is sustainable for these unavoidable costs.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The use of self-service options for the booking of services and payment of bills has supported MTFs efficiency savings across the Council.



## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Levies</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / COP 001 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Corporate	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Corporate	<b>Strategic Priority Outcome:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Nisar Visram, Director Finance, Procurement and Audit	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Saied Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cost of Living

<b>Financial Impact:</b>	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	2,048	122	87	46	255

<b>Staffing Impact (if applicable):</b>	Current 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

The Greater London Authority (GLA) sets its own Council Tax requirement which is charged separately through Council Tax bills, however the Council is required to provide funding through its own resources to three levying bodies (Environment Agency, Lee Valley Regional Park Authority and London Pension Fund Authority).

These bodies set their own levy amounts for each financial year and they normally increase by an amount similar to inflation.

The Council is required to pay the notified levy amounts and therefore the corporate budget needs to allow for the estimated increases in the annual levies. The table below shows the estimated increases based on an estimated increases of 6% (2023-24), 4% (2024-25) and 2% (2025-26). It is expected that the increases will be higher in the next two years due to the currently high level of inflation but will reduce down to 2% by 2025-26 as the Bank of England and government aim to bring inflation down to the 2% Bank of England target rate.

Levy Authority	2019-20 Levy Charge (£000's)	2020-21 Levy Charge (£000's)	2021-22 Levy Charge (£000's)	2022-23 Levy Charge Budget (£000's)	Increase from 2021- 22 to 2022- 23 (%)	2023-24 Estimated increase (%)	<b>2023-24 Estimated increase (£000's)</b>	2024-25 Estimated increase (%)	<b>2024-25 Estimated increase (£000's)</b>	2025-26 Estimated increase (%)	<b>2025-26 Estimated increase (£000's)</b>
Environment Agency	224	234	241	255	5.8%	6%	<b>15</b>	4%	<b>11</b>	2%	<b>6</b>
Lee Valley Regional Park Authority	234	239	247	256	3.6%	6%	<b>15</b>	4%	<b>11</b>	2%	<b>6</b>
London Pension Fund Authority	1,434	1,463	1,482	1,537	3.7%	6%	<b>92</b>	4%	<b>65</b>	2%	<b>34</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,892</b>	<b>1,936</b>	<b>1,970</b>	<b>2,048</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>46</b>

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

The Environment Agency is a levying body for its Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Functions under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and the Environment Agency (Levies) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. The Environment Agency has powers in respect of flood and coastal erosion risk management for 5200 kilometres of main river and along tidal and sea defences in the area of the Thames Regional Flood and Coastal Committee. Money is spent on the construction of new flood defence schemes, the maintenance of the river system and existing flood defences together with the operation of a flood warning system and management of the risk of coastal erosion.

Lee Valley Regional Park is a unique leisure, sports and environmental destination for all residents of London, Essex and Hertfordshire. The 26 mile long, 10,000 acre park, much of it formerly derelict land, is partly funded by a levy. Details on how the budget is spent and the amount each council contributes can be found at [www.leevalleypark.org.uk](http://www.leevalleypark.org.uk). To find out more about hundreds of great days out, world class sports venues and award winning parklands, please go to the website [www.visitleevalley.org.uk](http://www.visitleevalley.org.uk).

The London Pensions Fund Authority (LPFA) raises a levy each year to meet expenditure on premature retirement compensation and outstanding personnel matters for which LPFA is responsible and cannot charge to the pension fund. These payments relate to former employees of the Greater London Council (GLC), the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) and the London Residuary Body (LRB).

**Risks and Implications:**

The Council has a statutory obligation to pay the levies on receipt of the notification from the levying bodies.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The levying bodies have a duty to ensure value for money in line with all public sector organisations.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Leisure Centre Energy Crisis Financial Support</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / COP 002 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Budget Pressure
<b>Directorate:</b>	Corporate	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Cultural and related services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Sport & Physical Activity	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Lisa Pottinger, Head of Sports & Physical Activity	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Iqbal Hossain, Cabinet Member for Culture and Recreation

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	-	698	-	-	698

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Proposal Summary:

The global energy crisis and price increases have been compounded by the wider economic challenges faced by all businesses through increased supply costs and other pressures including swimming pool chemicals, inflation, interest rate rises, pay awards and the general cost of living increases. However, whilst this is a cross sector national issue, leisure centres, in particular those with swimming pools due to high utility requirements, have been significantly impacted. To acknowledge the impact of the energy crisis, government has introduced The Energy Bill Relief Scheme to cap business energy prices effective from October 2022 to March 2023. However, the detailed implementation of the price cap and its financial impact has not been confirmed to date. It should also be noted that the energy market is still volatile and the lack of certainty regarding government financial support after March 2023, makes accurate financial projections for 2023-24 extremely challenging. The assumption has been made that a separate in-house leisure centre operational budget, which includes utility expenditure for future years, will be determined separately and has not been factored into this growth bid.

In 2022-23 GLL is projecting a circa £1.2 million utility deficit for all the borough's leisure centres. We have clear sight of GLL's budgets through open book accounting and accept that the current situation is unprecedented due to global events, and just as during Covid, the challenge of managing this pressure needs to be shared between the Council and GLL. The impact of the energy price increase is most pronounced at Tiller Leisure Centre where the cost of energy has increased 10-fold due to a change in tariff, which came into effect in October 2022. This tariff increase has resulted in a projected £244k overspend on energy in 2022-23 compared to 2019 levels. GLL has indicated that this financial position is unsustainable and has requested assistance to manage the deficit in year as this pressure is on top of an existing operational deficit at Tiller Leisure Centre. The energy price rise here is significantly above that for the other leisure centres and is an issue over which there is no option given the supply from the Barkantine District Heating Network.

A summary of the borough's leisure centre utility position compared to the 2019 year is outlined in Table 1 below, which illustrates increases in leisure centre energy costs by over 100% since 2019.

**Table 1: Tower Hamlets Partnership Utility Costs against 2019 Levels**

Leisure Centres	2019 Utility Cost (£)	2022/23 Utility Cost (£)	Increase 2019 v 2022/23 (£)	LBTH Growth Contribution 2020/23 (£)
John Orwell	48,928	105,482	56,554	28,000
Mile End	273,567	636,751	363,184	182,000
Tiller	97,146	340,845	243,699	244,000*
Poplar	136,147	348,128	211,981	106,000
Whitechapel	66,138	106,627	40,489	20,000
York Hall	257,742	463,729	205,987	103,000
<b>Total (all LCs)</b>	<b>879,668</b>	<b>2,001,563</b>	<b>1,121,895</b>	<b>683,000</b>

The Tiller Leisure Centre 2022-23 costs are based on actual spend Apr-Sept 2022, 45p rate Oct-Dec 2022 and 27p (price cap) Jan-Mar 2023. Financial data is calculated on LBTH financial year.

\*LBTH to pay 100% of Tiller Leisure Centre Energy overspend due to its special circumstances and GLL to pay for the operational deficit. All other centres – the energy overspend to be split 50:50

**Table 2: Tower Hamlets Partnership 2023-24 Projected Utility Costs against 2019 Levels**

Leisure Centres	2019 Utility Cost (£)	2023/24 Utility Cost (£)	Increase 2019 v 2022 (£)	LBTH Contribution 2020/23 (£) *
John Orwell	48,928	114,184	65,256	33,000
Mile End	273,567	652,465	378,898	189,000
Tiller	97,146	481,525	384,379	192,000
Poplar	136,147	348,809	212,662	106,000
Whitechapel	66,138	109,550	43,412	22,000
York Hall	257,742	569,578	311,836	156,000
<b>Total (all LCs)</b>	<b>879,668</b>	<b>2,276,111</b>	<b>1,396,443</b>	<b>698,000</b>

\* Costs based on a 50:50 risk share for all leisure centres. Subject to review in January 2023.

Several mitigation measures to address the energy overspend have been explored. These include:

- S106 capital investment in sustainability measures such as LED lighting, new energy efficient plant equipment and machinery to reduce energy expenditure
- Increasing fees and charges (on all activities) in year 2022-23 & 2023 -2024
- Increased fees and charges above inflation levels of circa 10% from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023
- A surcharge on all swimming / aquatic activity in year and post 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023
- Closure of a leisure centre or several leisure centres
- Placing swimming pools in hibernation (essentially closing swimming pools in one or several centres)
- Reduced leisure centre operating hours via a winter schedule

s106 and grant funding can be used to improve leisure centre energy efficiency. This approach will reduce energy expenditure in the short and long-term, claw back the funding spent on energy reduction measures within 3 years, due to the energy cost saving, and assist in meeting the Council's net zero energy target for 2025. The leisure centres are some of the Council's least energy efficient buildings so this expenditure would be required anyway to meet carbon neutral operation. Furthermore, this expenditure would ensure that the leisure centres are as energy efficient and financially effective as possible in preparation for the transition to in-house leisure operation from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2024. All avenues to improve energy efficiency are being

explored and implemented as quickly as possible. However, s106 funding that has not already been subject to tender and signed contract is currently on hold. Preventing this option being deployed in 2022-23.

Increased fees and charges, and or a surcharge on swimming, would only raise a fraction of the money required to meet the £1.12 m overall energy deficit. There is also a significant risk that residents under considerable pressure as a result of the cost-of-living crisis, will eliminate non-essential expenditure, such as leisure centre memberships and leisure activity spend, creating an even greater financial pressure for the centres as a result of loss of income. As a consequence, these options were deemed to be inappropriate.

Leisure centre swimming pool closures have already taken place elsewhere in the country to mitigate increasing energy costs. However, the closure of St. George's & Tiller Leisure Centres and the York Hall swimming pools during the pandemic, illustrated how important leisure centres are to our local communities. They are a vital component of the physical activity regime required to keep residents healthy, which is of even greater importance due to the decline in physical activity during the pandemic. Consequently, the closure of a single or multiple leisure centres was deemed to be incompatible with meeting the needs of our residents. This is particularly true of Tiller Leisure Centre, which recently reopened in January 2022 following repairs to the swimming pool. A further closure of the only public pool in the area would disproportionately impact on residents on the Isle of Dogs where travel to the nearest local swimming pools at Poplar Baths and Mile End Park Leisure Centre has proved problematic for residents and school swimming lessons especially. In addition, closing one or several centres or swimming pools would result in a loss of membership to competition, which is challenging to get back. This could have a consequential impact when the centre(s) / swimming pool(s) reopens. It would also reduce the centre customer base, at a time when the Council would wish to retain as many members as possible to ensure an effective transition to the in-house leisure service operation in 2024. It should also be noted that keeping our swimming pools open is a strategic priority for the Council so closing facilities is not recommended.

Due to the special circumstances at the site, it is being recommended that Tiller leisure centre remains open until the end of the financial year with the Council paying for the unprecedented increase in energy costs (£244k) while GLL retains responsibility for the operational deficit at the site. Due to the volatile nature of the energy market and the uncertainty regarding the extension of the government's energy subsidy beyond 31st March 2023, it is also recommended that a review is conducted in January to determine the way forward in the 2023-24 financial year.

It is also recommended that the Council and GLL share the financial risk of the energy overspend at the remaining leisure centres on a 50:50 split basis, subject to the completion of current negotiations to secure best value for the council. This approach creates a budget pressure of **£683k** in year (made up of 244k in relation to Tiller and 439k in relation to all the other leisure centres) and **£698k** in 2023-24 which can only be funded by growth. It is important to note that the costs outlined in this document are indicative and includes the impact of a 27p price cap with no contingency. These are at this point in time one-off spend requests, although we will need to continue to monitor and evaluate the position for 24/25 and beyond.

It also needs to be understood that the energy market is extremely volatile, with significant increases in energy costs occurring month on month. As a result, the costs quoted in this growth bid are projections indicative at a moment in time, and may be subject to change (increases), depending on market conditions. No decision has been made by government to extend The Energy Bill Relief Scheme business, beyond 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023. As a result, the financial projections for 2023-2024 are based on the flat tariff rate (27p) without a price cap, which increases overall energy costs in 2023-2024 to an estimated £1.4 million, with the Council paying 50% of this cost.

#### **Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

This proposal contributes to the Council's strategic plan objectives

- To boost culture, business, jobs and leisure and
- A clean and green future

It will improve energy efficiency, reduce utility costs for our leisure assets and make the leisure centres more financially efficient.

#### **Risks and Implications:**

There are several risks associated with not meeting the utility overspend created by the energy crisis

- If financial support is not provided, then the leisure centres will once again deliver an operational deficit that places the future of the leisure service at risk, with at least one swimming pool closure (Tiller Leisure Centre) highly likely.
- There is the risk that with no opportunity to retender for the leisure service in 2024, the leisure operator may view the already circa £2 million debt with more to come as untenable and return the keys of the leisure centres to the Council. Due to an inability to mobilise quickly, there will need to be a break in service with the leisure centres closed for at least 6 months while the Council puts in place the necessary requirements to operate the service in-house

- If a growth bid is not successful, then other mitigation measures will need to be implemented (listed above) all of which will have a detrimental impact on Tower Hamlets residents and leisure provision in the borough.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The introduction of mitigation measures will reduce utility costs and improve leisure centre energy efficiency, assisting in meeting the Council's net zero target. The money spent to introduce mitigation measures will also be clawed back within three years making the expenditure good value for money.



## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments:

# GROWTH PROPOSAL

<b>Proposal Title:</b>	<b>Energy Price Increases – Corporate Property</b>		
<b>Reference:</b>	GRO / COP 003 / 23-24	<b>Growth Type:</b>	Unavoidable Growth
<b>Directorate:</b>	Corporate	<b>Growth Service Area:</b>	Central services
<b>Directorate Service:</b>	Cross-directorate	<b>Strategic Priority:</b>	5. Investing in public services
<b>Lead Officer and Post:</b>	Sian Pipe, Energy Manager	<b>Lead Member and Portfolio:</b>	Cllr Saied Ahmed, Cabinet Member for Resources and the Cost of Living

Financial Impact:	Current Budget 2022-23	Growth 2023-24	Growth 2024-25	Growth 2025-26	Total Growth
Budget (£000)	2,207	3,540	109	117	3,766

Staffing Impact (if applicable):	Current FTE 2022-23	FTE Increase 2023-24	FTE Increase 2024-25	FTE Increase 2025-26	Total FTE Increase
Employees (FTE) or state N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Proposal Summary:**

This growth bid is for ongoing growth to cover the estimated increases over the life of the MTFS. Indications from our suppliers suggest an increase of 79% for gas, and 58% for electricity for 2023-24. Increases beyond 2023-24 are based on estimated CPI rates (1.9% 2024-25 and 2.0% 2025-26).

**Budgeted Outcomes / Accountability (focus on improved performance):**

Failure to award this growth would result in a large unavoidable overspend in the General Fund for energy.

**Risks and Implications:**

An overspend pressure on budgets if this growth was not agreed.

**Value for Money and Efficiency:**

The Council enters into spot contracts with energy suppliers to ensure it secures the best price for a fixed period.

## GROWTH PROPOSAL – BUDGET EQUALITY ANALYSIS SCREENING TOOL

Trigger Questions	Yes / No	If Yes – please provide a brief summary of how this impacts on each protected characteristic as identified in the Equalities Act 2010. This will need to be expanded in a full Equality Analysis at full Business Case stage.
Does the change reduce resources available to address inequality?	No	
Does the change reduce resources available to support vulnerable residents?	No	
Does the change involve direct impact on front line services?	No	
<b>Changes to a Service</b>		
Does the change alter who is eligible for the service?	No	
Does the change alter access to the service?	No	
<b>Changes to Staffing</b>		
Does the change involve a reduction in staff?	No	
Does the change involve a redesign of the roles of staff?	No	

Summary:	
To be completed at the end of completing the Screening Tool.	
Based on the Screening Tool, will a full EA be required?	No

Additional Information and Comments: