CABINET
Agenda

Place
Rooms 4 & 5, Town Hall, Wellington Street, Woolwich SE18 6PW

Date
Wednesday, 20 March 2019

Time
5.30 pm

This meeting is open to the press and public and they are entitled to take photographs, film or record the proceedings.

Councillors

Danny Thorpe (Chair) Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Community and Corporate Services
David Gardner (Vice-Chair) Deputy Leader, Cabinet Member for Children’s Services and Schools
Christine Grice Finance and Resources
Denise Hyland Economy, Skills and Apprenticeships
Sizwe James Growth and Strategic Development
Chris Kirby Housing
Averil Lekau Adult’s Social Care, Health and Anti-Poverty
Denise Scott-McDonald Air Quality, Public Realm and Transport
Jackie Smith Community Safety and Integrated Enforcement
Miranda Williams Culture, Leisure and the Third Sector

Members are reminded that Officers’ contact details are shown at the end of each report and they are welcome to raise questions in advance with the appropriate Officer. This does not prevent further questioning at the meeting.

If you require further information about this meeting please contact the Corporate Governance Officer:

Nassir Ali
Telephone: 020 8921 6160
Fax: 020 8921 5864
Email: nassir.ali@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
1 **Apologies for Absence**
To receive apologies for absence.

2 **Urgent Business**
The Chair to announce any items or urgent business circulated separately from the main agenda.

3 **Declarations of Interest**
Members to declare any personal and financial interests in items on the agenda. Attention is drawn to the Council’s Constitution; the Council’s Code of Conduct and associated advice.

4 **Minutes**
To agree, as a true and accurate record, the Minutes of the Cabinet Meetings held on 20 February and 26 February.

No motion or discussion may take place upon the Minutes except as to their accuracy, and any question on this point will be determined by a majority of the Members of the body attending who were present when the matter in question was decided. Once confirmed, with or without amendment, the person presiding will sign the Minutes.

All Wards 5 **Short Breaks Grant Funded Activities 2019 - 2021**
To agree the funding recommendations for the 2019 – 2021 Short Breaks for Disabled Children Grant scheme, totalling £662,633 as detailed in paragraph 3.1
6 Multi Agency Safeguarding Arrangements
To note the legal requirement for the Royal Borough of Greenwich to replace the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board (GSCB) with new Multi-Agency Safeguarding Arrangements and to approve the Multi Agency Safeguarding Arrangements outlined in this paper for publication no later than 31st March 2019.

7 Contract Standing Orders - Exemptions / Variations
To note the summary of Exemptions to Contract Standing Orders reported for the period 1 September 2018 to 30 November 2018, detailed in Appendix 1. To note the summary of Variations under Contract Standing Orders reported for the period 1 September 2018 to 30 November 2018, detailed in Appendix II. To note the requirement to refer the report to Overview and Scrutiny as per paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 below.

8 Woolwich Estates Regeneration Scheme: Connaught Phases 2 and 3 Viability Approval Via Deed of Variation, Appropriation and Transfer of Land
To agree the Connaught Phases 2 and 3 Viability Approval Via Deed of Variation, Appropriation and Transfer of Land.

9 Cabinet Performance Report - High Level Objectives
To note the appendices to this report which provide an overview of the Council’s performance across its high-level objectives.
All Wards  10 Social Mobility Delivery Plan
To agree the Social Mobility Delivery Plan and its recommendations as listed at 4.5. To agree to the creation of the Social Mobility Board and its terms of reference as referred to in 4.10 and set out in Appendix C. To note that out of 26 recommendations, only 5 have a direct cost associated with them and that funding has been secured for the first year. To agree that officers will investigate the potential funding routes for the 2 options which have unfunded cost implications for future years (Recommendations 10 and 18), as set out in Section 4.8.

All Wards  11 Communities and Local Government Committee Report on the Effectiveness of Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees
To comment on the eight recommendations of the Communities and Local Government Committee Report on the Effectiveness of Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees. (Appendix A). To note the Government response to the Communities and Local Government Committee report recommendations. (Appendix B) and that new guidelines on Scrutiny were due to be published by Government in November 2018 but these are still awaited. To agree the request of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that Scrutiny should report directly to Full Council by presenting update reports from each panel on a rotational basis.
12 Options to amend charging for adult social care services

To note the options for changes to the charging policy in Greenwich for Adult social care services. To advise on the preferred options for changes to the charging policy. To agree to take forward a consultation process with borough citizens, with a focus on those who are current or future users of adult social care services, with regard proposed changes to the Adult Social Care Charging Policy.

13 EXEMPT ITEMS

It is proposed that, pursuant to section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they may involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in Schedule 12A of the Act, by virtue of the particular paragraph shown on the agenda and on the attached reports.

- Exempt Appendices 1, 3, 4 & 5 to Woolwich Estates Regeneration Scheme: Connaught Phases 2 and 3 Viability Approval Via Deed of Variation, Appropriation and Transfer of Land (Item 8).

Exempt by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended): Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person including the authority holding that information.

Date of Issue
Tuesday, 12 March
2019

Debbie Warren
Chief Executive
Filming and Recording Meetings

This meeting may be photographed (without the use of flash), filmed or audio recorded, except where the public is excluded because confidential or exempt items will be discussed. Any footage is likely to be publicly available.

By entering the room where the meeting is being held, you will be deemed to have consented to being photographed, filmed or audio recorded, and that will apply to any representation you make to the meeting. You will also be deemed to have consented to the possible public use of any images and sound recordings.

If you have any queries regarding the recording of meetings, please contact the Corporate Governance Manager on 020 8921 5134.

Safety

Fire and Emergency Procedures

Users of the Committee Rooms and the Council Chamber are asked to note the following fire and emergency procedures:

When you hear the continuous ringing of the fire alarm bells, please make your way out of the building in an orderly manner. The nearest exit from the Council Chamber and the Committee Rooms is through the main exit leading to Wellington Street (at the front of the building). Do not use the lift and do not stop to collect personal belongings. Once outside the Town Hall please make your way to the Assembly Point between Sainsbury’s and The Vista via Market Street or Polytechnic Street.
The Cabinet

The Cabinet is the part of the Council, which is responsible for most day-to-day decisions. The Cabinet is made up of the Leader and 9 other Councillors who are appointed annually by the Council.

When major decisions are to be discussed or made, a notice is published to the Council’s website 28 days in advance. Meetings of the Cabinet are open for the public to attend, except where personal or confidential matters are being discussed.

The Cabinet has to make decisions that are in line with the Council’s overall policies and budget. If it wishes to make a decision that is outside the budget or policy framework, this must be referred to the Council as a whole to decide.

A new Scheme of Delegation for the Executive came into effect on 1 July 2010 meaning that some decisions can now be taken by the Leader, the relevant Cabinet member and/or the relevant Chief Officer, without needing to be brought to a Cabinet meeting.

Meetings of the Cabinet

Meetings of the Cabinet take place each calendar month (excluding August). Additional meetings are sometimes arranged. A list of meetings and their dates can be found on the Council’s website. Alternatively you can contact the Corporate Governance Officer (details on the front of the agenda).

Outline of the Proceedings

The Leader chairs the meeting (or the Deputy Leaders in his/her absence). The Cabinet consists of Labour members. Council Officers (a Chief Officer from each Directorate) attend to present reports if required, and/or answer any questions Members may have. They do not take part in making the decisions.

The Leader oversees the meeting and controls the debate. All Members discuss the business on the agenda by addressing the Leader; this helps to keep the debate in an orderly manner. The Leader takes each item in turn and when he/she considers there has been sufficient debate, calls for a decision to be made or for the
information to be noted. The Cabinet may consider agenda items in a different order than they appear on the agenda.

The Agenda

The Agenda is made up of the items of business to be considered at the meeting. It includes reports that ask the Cabinet to make decisions and items for information.

Sometimes the agenda may information which has not been made available to the public. If the Cabinet wishes to discuss any confidential information members of the public will be asked to leave the meeting. However, this happens only very occasionally.

Declarations of interest

Members of the Council are required to declare any interests that they might have in an item on the agenda. In some cases the Councillor who has declared an interest may not take part in consideration of the item concerned, and must leave the Chamber whilst it is considered. However, depending on the nature of the interest, a Councillor may in certain circumstances, having declared an interest, speak and vote on an item.

Provision for Public Involvement

Members of the public may request to speak at a Cabinet meeting on an item that appears on the agenda. If a member of the public wishes to do this they should notify the Corporate Governance Officer as soon as possible prior to the meeting. It is at the Leader’s discretion to allow members of the public to address the Cabinet.

Decisions and Call-in

All decisions of the Cabinet are implemented on the fifth working day after the record of decisions is published.

Except in cases of urgency any decision taken by the Cabinet may be called-in by other non-Cabinet Councillors for reconsideration.

The rules relating to call-in are detailed in the Council’s Constitution.
Copies of Agenda and Minutes

A copy of the Agenda, and of the Minutes (which are the official record of the decisions made at previous meetings) are available for public use during the meeting.

The Agenda for the Cabinet can be viewed on the Council’s website and at the Woolwich, Eltham and Greenwich Centres a week before the meeting.

The Council will make every effort to provide a translated, Braille, audio or large print copy of an agenda item(s) if you request this from the Corporate Governance Officer named below, but this will take some time to prepare and may not be available in advance of the meeting.

Background Papers

Background Papers are listed at the end of each item. They are documents such as letters, memoranda, reports and previous items that the author has used to write the report. Members of the public can inspect and copy these documents by requesting a copy from the report author.

Disabled Access, Interpreters/Signers

Most meetings are held in the Town Hall, Woolwich, which has wheelchair access, good lighting and an induction loop system for the hard of hearing. Meetings held elsewhere are normally in wheelchair-accessible locations. Provided you give reasonable advance notice to the Corporate Governance Officer, the Council can usually arrange for an interpreter or signer to attend the meeting.

Your Views

The Chief Executive is responsible for the arrangements and presentation of agendas, for meetings of the Cabinet and its Member-Level Bodies. If you have any comments, complaints or questions about the meeting please contact:

Gurdeep Sehmi, Corporate Governance Manager         Tel: 020 8921 5134

Officer Advisers

Chief Executive         Debbie Warren
Director of Finance     Kevin Gibbs
Head of Legal Services  John Scarborough
CABINET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ITEM NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarations of Interests</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHIEF OFFICER</th>
<th>CABINET MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>Leader of the Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>FINAL DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Non-Key</td>
<td>To be made at this meeting on the recommendations in this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-exempt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Decisions Required**

   Cabinet is requested to:

1.1 Note the list of Councillors’ memberships (as Council appointed representatives) on outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies.

1.2 Request that Members orally declare any personal or financial interests, including those detailed, in specific items listed on the agenda as they relate to matters under discussion.

2. **Members’ Interests**

2.1 Appended to this report is a list of the outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies that each member of Cabinet has been appointed to by the Council or the Leader. The list does not include bodies with which a Member is involved in a personal or private capacity.

   **Personal interests**

2.2 A Member has a personal interest where any business is likely to affect:

   (a) them, or

   (b) a relevant person or a relevant body (where the Member is aware that they have the interest);

   more than a majority of those in the ward you represent.

ITEM NO: 3
A **relevant person** is defined as the member’s spouse or civil partner, a person who they are living with as husband and wife or as civil partners, or a person with whom they have a close association.¹

A **relevant body** is defined as (a) any organisation, school governing body or outside committee or trust which they have been appointed to by the Royal Borough or by the Leader, or (b) any other voluntary organisation, school governing body or commercial organisation where you are a management committee member, school governor, trustee or director.

2.3 Members must declare the existence and nature of any personal interest at the start of the meeting, or when the interest becomes apparent. Members must say which item their interest relates to.

2.4 A Member who has a personal interest may stay, speak and vote, except where the business:

(a) affects the financial position of the Member or any person or body described in paragraph 2.2 above, or

(b) relates to an interest that would be affected financially or relates to the determining to any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to the Member or any person or body described in paragraph 2.2 above

**Financial Interests**

2.5 A Member has a financial interest where any business relates to or is likely to affect an interest set out in paragraph 18 of the Code of Conduct, and which is the Member’s interest or the interest of a person described in paragraph 2.2(a) above.

2.6 Members must declare the existence and nature of any financial interest at the start of the meeting, or when the interest becomes apparent. Members must say which item their interest relates to.

2.7 A Member who has a financial interest must leave the meeting, but may attend to make representations, answer questions or give evidence relating to the business, provided that the public are also allowed to attend the meeting for the same purpose, and provided they leave the meeting immediately after doing so. The Member must not participate in the discussion nor the vote.

¹ See the guidance in Annex 1 of the Code of Conduct

ITEM NO: 3
General

2.8 The Code also requires Members to declare interests in relation to relevant bodies for six months after ceasing from being a member and take the appropriate action in relation to financial interests.

Background Papers

Agenda and Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Council – 23 May 2018

Report Author: Nassir Ali, Corporate Governance Officer
Tel: 020 8921 6160
Email: nassir.ali@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Gurdeep Sehmi, Corporate Governance Manager
Tel: 020 8921 5134
Email: gurdeep.sehmi@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Governorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Walpole Estate Management Board</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Thorntree Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>London Local Partnership</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>London Councils' Leaders' Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Godson Charity</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner</td>
<td>Woolwich and Plumstead Relief in Sickness Fund</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grice</td>
<td>London Councils' Leaders' Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>St Thomas More Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grice</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Halley Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grice</td>
<td>London Councils' Greater London Employment Forum</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grice</td>
<td>London Councils' Grants Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grice</td>
<td>Greenwich and Bexley Credit Union</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyland</td>
<td>DG Cities Limited</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyland</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyland</td>
<td>Greenwich Enterprise Board</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyland</td>
<td>South East Enterprise</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyland</td>
<td>Woolwich Creative District Trust</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, S</td>
<td>London Councils' Transport &amp; Environment Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, S</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td>Woodlands Farm Trust</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby</td>
<td>Shooters Hill Woodlands Working Party</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekau</td>
<td>Greenwich Clinical Commissioning Group</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekau</td>
<td>Oxleas Foundation Trust</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekau</td>
<td>Greenwich Pensioners' Forum</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekau</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekau</td>
<td>Environmental Protection UK</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation/Committee</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>London Councils' Transport &amp; Environment Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>London City Airport Consultative Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>Greenwich Peninsula Management Company</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>Greenwich Millennium Village Management Ltd</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>Environmental Protection UK</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>Destination Greenwich Tourism Management Company</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>London Road Safety Council</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>Charlton Athletic Race Equality Partnership</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>South East London Combined Heat &amp; Power Co</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-McDonald</td>
<td>South East London Waste Disposal Group</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, J</td>
<td>Safer Greenwich Partnership</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, J</td>
<td>Greenwich Young People's Theatre</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, J</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Greenwich Theatre Board</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kidbrooke Park Primary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>London Councils' Leaders' Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>LGA General Assembly</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>London Local Partnership</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>Shooters Hill Woodlands Working Party</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, M</td>
<td>Eltham Crematorium Joint Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, M</td>
<td>Greenwich &amp; Docklands International Festival</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, M</td>
<td>Greenwich Leisure Ltd - Libraries Board</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, M</td>
<td>London Councils' Grants Committee</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, M</td>
<td>Destination Greenwich Tourism Management Company</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, M</td>
<td>London Youth Games</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, M</td>
<td>Royal Borough of Greenwich Heritage Trust</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH
CABINET

WEDNESDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2019 AT 6.30 PM

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Members:
Councillors Danny Thorpe (Chair), David Gardner (Vice-Chair), Sizwe James, Chris Kirby, Averil Lekau, Denise Scott-McDonald and Jackie Smith

Officers
Chief Executive, Deputy Head of Legal Services, Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer (Finance), Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills, Senior Assistant Director - Communities Environment & Chief Operating Officer GS Plus and GSS, Assistant Director (Repairs & Investment), Director of Children's Services, Director of Health and Adult Social Care and Corporate Governance Officer

Other People in Attendance
Danny Hogan (Unite representative)

The Chair announced that after the standard business items he would take items 17 first.

Item
No.

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were presented on behalf of Councillors Christine Grice, Denise Hyland and Miranda Williams.

2 Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.
3  **Declarations of Interest**

**Resolved -**

That the list of Councillors’ Membership, as Council appointed representatives, on outside bodies, joint committees and School Governing bodies be noted.

4  **Minutes**

**Resolved -**

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 23 January 2019 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

5  **Determination of Admission Arrangements for Royal Greenwich Schools for the 2020/21 Academic Year**

The report was presented by the Director of Children’s Services.

Cabinet

**Resolved –**

That it be agreed to determine the Royal Borough of Greenwich admission arrangements for all mainstream community and voluntary controlled nursery, primary and secondary schools, including Post 16, for the 2020/21 academic year as set out in Appendix A; and

That it be agreed to participate in the Pan London co-ordinated admission system for Reception and Year 7 for the 2020/21 academic year as set out in Appendix B.
6  **Housing Revenue Account 2019/20 Budget, Rent and Service Charge Setting**

The report was introduced by the Assistant Director Repairs and Investment.

Cabinet

**Resolved –**

That the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget proposals detailed in the report be noted.

That the requirement to decrease rents by 1% for each of the 4 years commencing from April 2016 be noted, in line with the Government’s rent reduction policy as detailed in section 4.1.

That the overall reduction in the average weekly charge by £0.89 per week be noted.

That the variances in section 5 and the resulting balanced HRA 2019/20 budget position in section 5.1, Table 2 be noted.

That it be agreed to apply full cost recovery on Tenant Service Charges as detailed in 4.1

That it be agreed, with effect from 1 April 2019, the resulting average rent in Table 1, including the separation of a service charge as agreed by the Cabinet in December 2016.

7  **Development of the former Royal Hill Police Station Car Park**

The report was presented by the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills who highlighted and amendment to paragraph 4.6 of the report which should read:

“During the previous planning applications residents of the adjacent property named Linear House claimed a Right of Way across the site for the purpose of a means of access and escape. The claim was challenged by the Council and the claim was subsequently withdrawn. This report notes that a fence is to be erected to secure the site boundary in the location of the right of way claim.
The Director Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills summarised the details of the decisions to be taken and stated that the Capital Receipts from the future sale of the Ashburnham Grove site would support the Royal Hill development.

In addressing the meeting, a local resident explained that over 220 local residents had signed a petition to stop the closure of the community garden. She described the community garden as a vibrant dynamic space which had the support of all Greenwich residents and asked that Members delay the decision until further consultation had taken place. She stated that clearing the site before the feasibility study took place would be premature.

The Local resident stated that the cost of refurbishing the existing Ashburnham Grove site should be investigated further, as the Royal Hill site was both unknown and not suitable. She added that the costs for the architectural and feasibility work were significant and a large use of use of public funds prior to any care home being built. She stated that the community wanted to work with the Council and requested the decision be deferred until further consultation.

In addressing the meeting, Councillor Sizwe James, the Cabinet Member for Growth and Strategic Development stated it was with regret that the community garden had to be closed however, the aim was to incorporate a community element on the new site. He added that the Council was committed to consulting with residents and the decision was just the first step in securing funding.

In addressing the meeting, the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills stated that for the feasibility study and the required work to take place there was a need to clear the community garden.

In addressing the meeting, Councillor David Gardner, the Deputy Leader of the Council confirmed that the Ashburnham Grove site was not in good condition and the cost of refurbishing was significant. He stated the Development of the former Royal Hill Police Station Car Park presented the best opportunity to move residents to a site nearby and keep friendship groups together and close by.

Cabinet

Resolved -
That it be agreed that feasibility work is undertaken on the former Royal Hill police station car park site, to look to develop a scheme for adults with learning difficulties.

That a feasibility budget of £175k be agreed to undertake the design work and the necessary site surveys to complete the detailed planning application and for the Required Party Wall surveys, notices and building monitoring for the said site investigation work.

That it be noted that a scheme and estimate report will be presented to the Lead Member once the detailed design has been completed and a potential scheme has been designed.

That it be noted that the existing community garden unlawfully setup on the site will be cleared to undertake site surveys and construction.

That it be noted that a fence will be erected on the site to conclude a claim over right of way and to ensure site boundaries are clear.

That the disposal of Ashburnham Grove site subject to the feasibility of the development of the former police station car park be agreed.

That it be agreed to delegate authority to agree detailed terms for the disposal of Ashburnham Grove to the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills.

That it be agreed to treat the information presented at Exempt Appendices A and C as exempt under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A, paragraph 3 - Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

That it be agreed that the exempt information, presented at Exempt Appendices A and C is not subsequently released to the press or public.
8 Extension of the Term Contract for Highway Works

The report was presented by the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills.

Cabinet

Resolved –

That it be agreed to approve a modification to the existing Term Contract for Highway Works 2014 – 19 (the “Contract”) with JB Riney & Co Ltd (“Riney”), by extending the contract for a fixed two-years based on the performance, value for money and social value offered by the contractor, as set out in this report.

That it be noted that the contract was let for an initial period of five years at a contract value of £45-50m, with an option to extend annually for three years, at the sole discretion of the Council.

That it be noted that extending the contract for a fixed period of two years would provide the Council continuity of highway contracting services until 31 March 2021. In spring / summer 2020 a decision would then be made to either i) adopt the new Transport for London (TfL) pan London contracts (in whole or in part); ii) extend the Contract for a third and final year or iii) to commence a new highway contract procurement exercise.

That it be noted that the value of works during the fixed two-year term extension is anticipated to be in the region of £16-20m, with individual call-offs subject to separate decisions.

9 New Council Housing Delivery Programme

The report was presented by the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills and the Assistant Director Repairs and Investment.

In addressing the meeting, Councillor Chris Kirby, the Cabinet Member for Housing stated the decision was a testament to the hard work of Councillors and officers and was a radical change to the delivery of housing in the Borough.
Resolved –

That it be agreed to review the assessment of the five sites contained within appendix one of this report, and approve their inclusion in the new council housing delivery programme.

That it be agreed to approve the funding profile required to deliver the new council housing delivery programme, as detailed below.

- HRA Capital Resources: £22.2m
- Right To Buy (RTB) Receipts: £43.4m
- GLA Grant: £32.6m
- HRA Borrowing: £142.0m

That it be agreed to note the procurement process for contractors and employers agent, to deliver the Building Council Homes for Londoners programme.

That it be agreed to delegate to the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills authority to award contracts, following the procurement process, under this programme.

That it be agreed to funding as below, in addition to 1.2, to create a development budget for the acquisition of development opportunities which will contribute to the provision of new council housing as follows:

- HRA Borrowing of up to £58.0m
- RTB Receipts of up to £24.8m

That it be agreed to delegate to the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills in consultation with the Leader, Cabinet Member for Housing and Director of Finance, authority to make acquisitions under the development budget, subject to any proposal producing a business case demonstrating financial viability within the HRA 30 year business plan.

That it be noted that all feedback from resident consultation on the new council homes building programme, will be reported to the Cabinet Member for Housing for consideration.
That it be noted that a further report will be presented to Members which will detail the next phase of sites being considered to deliver the Building Council Homes for Londoners programme.

That it be noted that a further report will be presented to Members which may request a further increase in HRA borrowing, to fund investment in the existing housing stock asset.

10 Section 106 Financial Report

The report was presented by the Director Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills.

Cabinet

Resolved –

That the content of the Section 106 2017/18 Annual Financial Report (Appendix 1) and the updated complete list of Section 106 agreements (Appendix 2) be noted.

That the publication of the report on the Council’s website be noted.

That it be noted that future Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy annual reporting will follow the agreed reporting of the Capital Strategy, to be confirmed in a report to January Cabinet.

11 Greenwich Neighbourhood Growth Fund - Round Two Projects

The report was presented by the Director Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills.

In addressing the meeting, Councillor Sizwe James, the Cabinet for Growth and Strategic Development thanked officers for their hard work and stated that residents across the Borough were seeing the benefits of regeneration.

Cabinet

Resolved -
That the proposals that were received in the second round of Greenwich Neighbourhood Growth Fund, the shortlisted proposals and the outcome of the public vote be noted.

That the proposals that have been recommended for funding be agreed.

That the range of community benefits as set out in section 4.6 of this report be noted.

That it be agreed to delegate to the Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills authority to finalise funding documents and monitoring arrangements.

12 Discretionary Rate Relief

The report was presented by the Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer.

Cabinet

Resolved –

That the Council’s Retail Relief (Discretionary Rate Relief) Scheme for the 2019/20 and 2020/21 financial years as detailed at paragraphs 4.1 to 4.4 be agreed.

That be agreed to authorise the Director of Finance to determine individual levels of Retail Relief to qualifying businesses as detailed at paragraphs 4.1 to 4.4.

13 2018/19 Revenue Budget Monitor

The report was presented by the Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer.

Cabinet

Resolved –

That the revenue monitoring position based on period 8 (end of November 2018) data be noted.
That it be noted that management action will take place to contain expenditure pressures within existing resources wherever possible, to ensure that the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) remains on track, with particular focus of the top three areas of concern (para 5.2 refers).

That it be noted that after taking account of the currently planned management actions, at this stage of the year, the General Fund budget is reporting a:

- forecast overspend pressure of £10.0m
- corporate overspend pressure of £2.9m related to “No Recourse to Public Funds”.

That it be noted that the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) is reporting on target at this stage of the year.

14 Corporate Capital Strategy

The report was presented by the Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer.

In addressing the meeting, Councillor Jackie Smith, the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Integrated Enforcement thanked officers and Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources for creating a Capital Strategy that would lead to a more responsible authority.

Cabinet

Resolved –

That it be recommend that Council approves the 2019/20 Corporate Capital Strategy (Appendix A).

That it be recommend that Council approves the Capitalisation Policy (Appendix B).

That it be recommend that Council approves the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Policy (Appendix C).

That the adoption of the Property Asset Strategy (Appendix D) be agreed.
That the list of recommended disposals and revocations (Appendix E) be agreed.

That the inclusion of the following new items within the Capital Programme from 1 April 2019 (Appendix F) be agreed:

- Indicative 10 year front loaded Planned Maintenance Programme for corporate properties worth over £36m
- Ezra, Woolwich Common – Refurbishment of the building (£2.7m)
- Woolwich Old Library (GLLab – Calderwood) – Building rationalisation and improvement works (£0.75m)

15 Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2019/20

The report was presented by the Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer.

Cabinet

Resolved -

That it be agreed, after consideration, that the Treasury Management Strategy for 2019/20 be referred to full Council.

16 Budget and Council Tax Setting 2019/20

The report was presented by the Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer who referred Members attention to the supplementary agendas.

Councillor Danny Thorpe, The Leader of the Council stated the 2019/20 budget was the most challenging and a result of the impact of 9 years of austerity. He added that if funds became available services would be reinstated.

In addressing the meeting, Councillor Jackie Smith, the Cabinet Member for Community Safety commented on the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee stating there was a need to hire agency staff in some areas of the Council. She added that in terms of parking enforcement officers,
agency staff were hired to see how many were needed in the borough before making permanent appointments.

In addressing the meeting, Councillor Chris Kirby, the Cabinet Member for Housing stated there was a need to recruit agency staff in areas like social work where the Council was competing with the private sector.

Cabinet

**Resolved –**

That it be noted the authority’s Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) is balanced through to 2019/20 and acknowledge that significant pressures are being experienced across services (Section 5)

That the review of fees and charges undertaken by departments, from 2019/20, be agreed (Section 5 / Appendix F)

That the impact of the local government finance settlement, finalised on 5 February 2019, upon the Council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) be noted (Section 6)

That it be noted that, subject to the relevant decision making processes, the Council will extend its participation in the London Business Rates Pilot Pooling Arrangements by one year, with the government offering a reduced incentive of 75% retention (Section 6)

That it Agree to passport £3.6m of one off social care grant to adults and children’s services (Section 7)

That it be agree that £1.2m one off cash (Section 7) is used to:

- set up a serious youth violence reduction team to help combat and prevent youth and gang violence in the borough
- provide support and advice for residents who are moving across to Universal Credit
- provide training and support to help people return to work.

That it be agreed that £7.6m of resources are deployed to services in support of inflationary pressures (Section 7)
That it be agreed that directorates generate £2.25m of back office efficiency savings (Section 7)

That it be agreed to recommend to Council to agree a council tax rise of 2.99% in support of service delivery pressures, at a cost of 65p per week at Band D (Section 8)

That it be noted that the GLA precept for 2019/20 is due to increase by £26.28 per year at Band D, a rise of 8.9% (Section 8)

That it agreed to recommend to Council to agree the addition to the council tax in 2019/20 on the taxpayers in premises surrounding the garden in Gloucester Circus SE10 (Section 8)

That it be agreed to recommend to Council to approve the overall council tax level and the relevant statutory calculations and resolutions (Section 8 and Appendix B)

That it be agreed to recommend to Council to approve the schools funding formula for use in 2019/20 as presented to Schools Forum on 16 January 2019 (Section 9)

That it be noted that the level of Dedicated Schools Grant for Education purposes and that the budget proposals for 2019/20 were agreed by the Schools Forum on 16 January 2019 (Section 9)

That it be noted that the Prudential Code requires the setting and revision of the indicators to be carried out by the body that takes decisions in respect of the Borough’s budget.

That it be recommended to Council to agree the Prudential Indicators (Section 10 and Appendix C) for the period 2017/18 – 2021/22

That it be recommended to Council to agree that the indicators, other than the authorised borrowing limit, which must be set and revised by Council, are initially set each year by the authority as part of its budget setting process and are monitored and revised as appropriate during the year by Cabinet

That it be recommended to Council to agree the arrangements for determining the Minimum Revenue Provision (Section 10 / Appendix D) from 2019/20 onwards
That the comments on financial standing, future risk and robustness of the budget process, including those specifically relating to the risk posed by the Fair Funding Review be noted (Section 11 / Appendix E).

That the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 19 February 2019 be noted.

17 GS Plus Ltd and GSS Ltd - Annual Reports and Review of Operating Models

The Chair reminded Members that the item had exempt appendices and if there was to be discussion around this the meeting would have to go into closed session. He also referred Members attention to the Supplementary Agenda 2 which had comments from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The report was presented by the Chief Executive who advised that there had been intense work for over a year on the financial, legal and current trading models of GS Plus and GSS adding that in the current climate costs were continuing to increase and there was a reduction of income. She confirmed that a new business plan was required as there was a risk of insolvency and explained that a number of cleaning and catering contracts were being lost as a result of school funding cuts.

The Chief Executive advised that doing nothing to tackle issue was not an option and that Option B was the best choice in difficult circumstances.

In the addressing the meeting, the Unite representative advised that his colleagues, who were in attendance at the meeting, were proud to work closely with Greenwich Council. He stated that the current situation with GS Plus was a result of poor management from those in senior positions adding there was a moral duty to give the new managers a chance to turn things around.

The Unite representative explained that a number of cleaning and catering companies that win contracts with the schools did not look after their staff and some schools were calling to bring back GS Plus services. He paraphrased elements from the Labour Manifesto which supported “the many and not the few” and described the profile of the employees of GS Plus as predominantly single status women that of which should be supported by the Labour Party. He continued that as the Council had healthy finances the council should adopt a policy of insourcing and make that a driving factor.
The Unite representative stated he was proud of the standards of GS Plus and thanked Members on behalf of the workers. He requested that the decision be delayed until further consultation that would lead to proper management who can go forward with the excellent workforce.

In response to a question, the Unite representative stated that the GS Plus employees should be given the opportunity to come up with solutions to improve productivity and performance.

In addressing the meeting, Councillor Danny Thorpe the Leader of the Council confirmed that GSS and GS Plus were facing extremely difficult challenges that were not there when they were initially set-up and that austerity had had a massive impact. He explained that the threat of insolvency was a bigger threat then doing nothing and that protecting peoples jobs was a key driver when making difficult decisions. He added that school budgets had been drastically reduced and the market for school foods was moving in a downward direction leading to further instability in the cleaning and catering business models. He continued that Head teachers were having to make business decisions on how to save money.

Councillor Danny Thorpe, the Leader of the Council, advised that option B would also look at ways of improving the business models to get schools to take contracts back in house. He referred Members and those in attendance to the upcoming Budget and Council Tax item which highlighted the cuts, including the Emergency Support Scheme, the Council was having to make as a result of austerity.

Councillor Danny Thorpe, the Leader of the Council thanked those in attendance for coming.

Cabinet

Resolved –

That the Annual Reports and Audited Accounts 2017/18 and interim reports 2018/19 for the Council’s wholly owned companies be noted: –

- Greenwich Service Solutions Ltd (GSS); summarised in section 5.1 and attached to this report at Appendix 1.

- GS Plus Ltd (GSP); summarised in section 5.2 and attached to this report at Appendix 2.
That it be noted the information on contract losses and contracts at risk as detailed at Confidential Appendix 3.

That option B be agreed as the recommended future operating model for GSP/GSS to adopt as summarised in section 6 and as detailed at Confidential Appendix 4 (subject to clarification of all potential liabilities of the companies).

That it be agreed, subject to recommendation 1.3, that the Council accepts responsibility for the net assets / liabilities arising in respect of each company’s membership of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Pension Fund, as set out in Confidential Appendix 6.

That it be agreed to authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources, Director of Finance and the Head of Legal Services to take all necessary steps to implement the detailed arrangements for the agreed option, subject to full Council agreeing any necessary funding at the appropriate time which sits outside the Council’s approved budget.

That it be agreed to request the Chief Executive, Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources, Director of Finance and the Head of Legal Services to provide six monthly updates to a small Working Group of Councillors to be nominated by the Leader.

That it be agreed to authorise the Chief Executive to take all shareholder decisions on behalf of the Council in connection with the reserved matters or the future of the companies.

That it be agreed to treat the information presented at the Confidential Appendix 3, 4 and 6 as exempt under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A on the basis of “Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)”.

That it be agreed that the exempt information presented at the Appendix 3, 4 and 6 is not subsequently released to the press or public.
The meeting closed at 7.33 pm

___________________________

Chair
PRESENT:

Members:
Councillors Danny Thorpe (Chair), David Gardner (Vice-Chair), Christine Grice, Averil Lekau, Denise Scott-McDonald, Jackie Smith and Miranda Williams

Officers
Chief Executive, Director of Housing and Safer Communities, Senior Assistant Director - Communities Environment & Chief Operating Officer GS Plus and GSS, Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills, Director of Children's Services, Director of Health and Adult Social Care, Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer (Finance), Head of Legal Services and Corporate Governance Officer

Item No.

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were presented on behalf of Councillors Denise Hyland, Sizwe Janes and Chris Kirby.

2 Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.
3 Declarations of Interest

Resolved -

That the list of Councillors’ Membership, as Council appointed representatives, on outside bodies, joint committees and School Governing bodies be noted.

4 Special Urgency

The Cabinet noted the reasons for urgency and the agreement from the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny.

5 Budget and Council Tax Setting 2019/20 - Business Rates

The report was presented by the Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer (Finance) who advised Members on the London Business Rates pooling pilot and its first year arrangements. He highlighted the uncertainties around the previous model which had a number of caveats leading to a nil forecast. He confirmed that without notice new information had been received which included an up to date model allowing confidence to provide new projections. He added there were a number of threats and risks regarding this funding and as such should be treated as one-off.

The Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer (Finance) highlighted the comments from Overview and Scrutiny:

“if it transpired that any more money was forthcoming either this year or in 2019/20, the Leader’s priority would be to put any extra funds into the Emergency Support Scheme.”

In response to a question, the Assistant Director Corporate Finance & Deputy s151 Officer (Finance) stated that the information provided along with the new data model allowed Chief Finance Officers the freedom to budget this independently. He added there a mixture of views on how to do this and that some authorities had made quarterly projections which were higher than the revised model. He continued that officers did not want to set expectations too high and reviewed the information received and consider that a prudent sum of £2m could be factored in to the 2019/20 financial position, as a one off.
In addressing the meeting, Councillor Christine Grice, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources highlighted the upcoming spending review and stated the recommendation to treat as a one-off was sensible as there was risks around the funding.

In addressing the meeting, Councillor Averil Lekau, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Anti-Poverty shared her support for the decision to allocate the resources to the Emergency Support Scheme.

Cabinet

Resolved –

That it be noted that this report should be read in conjunction with the report considered by Cabinet on 20 February 2019

That it be noted that following receipt of new information relating to the pooling of business rates in London for 2019/20, an additional sum of circa £2m is proposed as one off resources available for 2019/20 (Section 4)

That it be agreed that £2m one off cash (Section 5) is applied in 2019/20:

- to ensure the continuity of the Emergency Support Scheme (£0.750m)
- held against overspend pressures (£1.250m)

That it be recommended to Council to agree the revised budget, including approval of the revised statutory calculation set out at Section 6 (Appendix 1).

The meeting closed at 7.42pm

___________________________
Chair
1. **Decision required**

Cabinet is requested to:

1.1 Agree the funding recommendations for the 2019 – 2021 Short Breaks for Disabled Children Grant scheme, totalling £662,633 as detailed in paragraph 3.1

2. **Links to the Royal Greenwich high level objectives**

2.1 This report relates to the Council’s agreed high level objectives as follows:

- A Healthier Greenwich
- A Great Place to Grow Up
- A Great Place to Be
- A Strong Vibrant and Well-run Borough
3. **Purpose of Report and Executive Summary**

3.1 This report seeks approval to award funding of £662,633 to the 9 organisations listed in Table 1 below to deliver short breaks activities for disabled children and young people from 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2021:

**Table 1: Recommended Grant Funding Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation / Scheme</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Funding per year</th>
<th>Total funding amount 2019-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHoy Centre</td>
<td>Activities on land, on the water, with a maritime and outdoor education theme</td>
<td>£24,966</td>
<td>£49,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Days Out</td>
<td>Outdoor Education/ Activities</td>
<td>£24,999</td>
<td>£49,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton Athletic Community Trust (CACT) Term Time Weekends</td>
<td>Activities, sports &amp; Outings in the community</td>
<td>£41,023</td>
<td>£82,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT Overnights</td>
<td>Overnight stays throughout the year</td>
<td>£14,560</td>
<td>£29,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) After School Provision</td>
<td>ASD club after school outings</td>
<td>£20,922</td>
<td>£41,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT Holidays</td>
<td>Holiday clubs including summer scheme</td>
<td>£43,700</td>
<td>£87,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions4Change</td>
<td>Boxing</td>
<td>£8,780</td>
<td>£17,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich and Lewisham Young People’s Theatre (GLYPT)</td>
<td>Theatre &amp; Dance</td>
<td>£9,900</td>
<td>£19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLL (Partnering All4One Swimming)</td>
<td>Splash session &amp; swimming lessons</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maypole Project</td>
<td>Outings, Activity Mornings, drum</td>
<td>£34,025</td>
<td>£68,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation / Scheme</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Funding per year</td>
<td>Total funding amount 2019-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lodge</td>
<td>sessions and Summer Scheme</td>
<td>£12,440</td>
<td>£24,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Kids Can</td>
<td>Horse riding lessons &amp; Pony mornings</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Kids Can</td>
<td>Secondary summer scheme, activities &amp; outings including 'sports camp'</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£331,317</strong></td>
<td><strong>£662,633</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td>Commissioning Budget Funding</td>
<td>£315,729</td>
<td>£631,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Disabled</td>
<td>Additional Disabled Children and Families Support Service Budget funding</td>
<td>£15,588</td>
<td>£31,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£331,317</strong></td>
<td><strong>£662,633</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 9 Royal Greenwich based organisations are recommended to deliver 13 different schemes/activities for disabled children and young people up to the age of 18 years. Further details can be found in Appendix B.

4. **Introduction and Background**

4.1 The provision of short breaks activities is in accordance with the Children Act 1989, section 6, and subsequently The Breaks for Carers of Disabled Children Regulations 2011.

4.2 The regulations define short breaks as the provision of a range of services which are sufficient to assist carers to continue to provide care or to do so
more effectively. In particular, the local authority must provide, as appropriate, a range of:

- day-time care in the homes of disabled children or elsewhere;
- overnight care in the homes of disabled children or elsewhere;
- educational or leisure activities for disabled children outside their homes.

4.3 The purpose of the short breaks grants programme is to support the Council’s duty under the Breaks for Carers of Disabled Children Regulations 2011 as described above.

4.4 The existing third sector commissioning arrangements for short breaks will end on 31st March 2019. Appendix A gives a summary of current providers.

4.5 In line with Priority 4 - *Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities* - of Greenwich’s Children and Young People Plan 2017-20, Children’s Services have allocated £315,729 per year, for a 4 year funding period to commission short breaks for disabled children and young people. This was the same level of funding as allocated for the 2015-2019 period. In addition to this, a contribution of £15,588 is available from the Disabled Children Family Support Service budget, ring-fenced for the delivery of summer schemes. In addition to the funding outlined within this paper, there are two further Short Break Complex Needs Summer Schemes provided by Willow Dene Primary School and as part of the Universal Youth Offer.

4.6 A short breaks project group was formed in early 2018 in preparation for recommissioning short breaks when current third sector funding arrangements end in March 2019.

4.7 During the previous commissioning of services in 2015, only 3 main providers were awarded contracts and there appeared to be a limited range of suitable support available in the borough. The uptake of direct payments had also been very low, with families reporting that they had nowhere to spend the budget that they had been given.

4.8 Since then, a Providers’ Forum was launched by the Children with Disabilities Project and Participation officer and the Lead Commissioner, supported by MetroGAVS, to develop capacity and capability within the sector, inviting both commissioned and non-commissioned providers to get an idea of what is available in the borough, to consult on how growth could be stimulated and what support organisations would need in order to be able to offer services to disabled children and young people.
4.9 It was found that many organisations simply required some ‘start up’ funding, or smaller amounts to build up on existing activities to be inclusive of disabled children and young people, and that rigid contracting arrangements were a significant barrier to providers working with the council.

4.10 Learning from this feedback, and in line with the Short Breaks Strategy 2019-2022 to stimulate growth so to create more choice for children and their parents, the project group decided to run a tiered grants programme for 2019-2021 to encourage a greater range of provision that could better meet the needs of disabled children and young people and their families. It was agreed to commission the short breaks programme separately to the 2019-2023 third sector commissioning to allow for it to be reviewed and adapted to meet the expected change in take up of personal budgets over the four-year period. The third sector commissioning framework for 2019-2023 agreed by Cabinet in September 2018, October 2018 and January 2019 therefore did not include short breaks for disabled children.

4.11 Following a number of consultation events with parents, children and young people and providers, the application process for short breaks grant funding opened on 1st November 2018 and ended on 9th December 2018. This co-production to develop the new service included:

- Face to face engagement with parents/carers, including events at Charlton Park Academy, Willow Dene Special School, Greenwich Toy and Leisure Library, Woolwich Town Hall and Hawksmoor Youth Hub.
- 44 parents/carers giving feedback through an online survey.
- Consultation with 30 young people with a range of Special Education Needs and Disabilities on Short Breaks provision and what they wanted.
- Discussions at Provider Forum meetings on how organisations develop and strengthen services with children, young people and parent/carer feedback.
- A presentation at the Provider Forum before the release of the tender setting out a summary of the consultation results from parents/carers and young people on what they are looking for in the new provision.
- A Parents’ Panel which reviewed the bids and the Officer Panel recommendations

4.12 The grant funding documentation also included a summary of the consultation to factor into the development of bid submissions.
### Table 2 Commissioning Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation period</td>
<td>1st August – 9th October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider Market Warming Event</td>
<td>31st October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Applications Open</td>
<td>1st November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Clarification Questions</td>
<td>30th November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Submission of Bids</td>
<td>9th December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Bids</td>
<td>10th December – 17th December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Interviews</td>
<td>17th December 2018 – 3rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Panels</td>
<td>20th December 2018 &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Moderation</td>
<td>3rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify Bidders of intention to make recommendation for funding</td>
<td>14th – 18th January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision taken at Cabinet</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidders notified of Cabinet Decision</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilisation meetings/ period</td>
<td>February 2019 – March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award of Grants</td>
<td>April 1st 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commencement</td>
<td>1st April 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13 Guidance notes, detailing the types of provision/ activities sought, in accordance to need and consultation findings were produced alongside a comprehensive application form. The opportunity was advertised on the council’s website and made available via the ProContract procurement portal.

4.14 A copy of the Guidance notes can be found at appendix C and D and a copy of the application form can be found at appendix E.

4.15 A total of 21 applications were received from 15 different organisations. The evaluation of the bids was carried out by a panel of professionals, with their recommendations approved by a panel of parents of children with disabilities who are currently accessing short breaks. The Officers’ Panel included:

- SEND Outreach Support Services Manager
- Head of SEND Social Care Services
- Projects and Participation Officer, Children’s Services
- Senior Team leader, Disabled Children Family Support Service
- Commissioning and Monitoring Officer
4.16 The Officers’ Panel evaluated the bids using the criteria and weightings published in the guidance notes. This included how closely the services were aligned to the feedback from parents/carers and children and young people. The Parents’ Panel reviewed a summary of each bid and provided feedback on whether they supported the officers’ moderated assessment and recommendations. The final set of recommended providers were agreed by both the Officer and Parent Panels.

4.17 The applications were evaluated using a 3 stage award criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Policies &amp; Key Practices criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicants had to provide satisfactory responses around insurances, policies etc. in order to progress to access the second stage. These responses will be subject to checks if awards are agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicants had to provide written evidence of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Previous experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Match to required outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How success will be measured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Geographical, Cost &amp; Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure an equitable offer across the borough the 3rd stage looked at proposed capacity, unit cost set against ward population and deprivation weighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bids with an overall score of 50% and more have been recommended for funding.**

4.18 As part of Stage 2, submissions were assessed against evidence of how they had used the views of parents/carers and children and young people to shape their proposals.

4.19 Social Value was also taken into consideration as part of the assessment, this included scoring providers on how their proposals linked with the local community, businesses and services to support and enhance their service delivery and how families would be supported to access local support in their community (see Appendix D). As part of the new grant agreements it is a requirement that all providers must pay London Living Wage.
4.20 Clarification interviews were held between Monday 17th December 2018 and Thursday 3rd January 2019, with all but 3 providers that made an application.

4.21 Two providers, who are currently contracted to deliver short breaks, scored highly and were therefore not interviewed because of their high scores and also there would be no changes to their service offer. Another further provider, scored very low in their initial application and was not considered suitable and was therefore not invited to interview.

4.22 Following the interviews, final scores were agreed by the Panel. Final scores for all bidders, as agreed by the Panel, are set out in appendix F. All bids that scored 50% and above have been recommended for funding. Eight bids scored below 50% and are not recommended for funding.

4.23 Providers will be expected to submit regular monitoring reports covering outputs, outcomes, finance and added/social value in order to measure performance in line with their application. The monitoring is proportionate to the provider’s level of funding, as detailed in part 1 of the guidance notes. All services will form part of a quality assurance framework and quality assurance visits, as well as qualitative feedback from families will also form part of this.

4.24 In comparison to our current short breaks offer, the new offer, if approved, will provide 500+ more short break places over the year, including an additional 172 places during the summer, a time which parents have informed us to be a particular pressure point for families in need of a short break.

4.25 If approved, the new short breaks offer will also cover a greater geographical area in the borough, with two providers delivering in every ward of the borough, and the remaining eight providers delivering in 10 wards. Maps can be found in Appendix H and I which displays the geographical spread of current provision and the proposed new offer for short breaks.

4.26 One provider currently commissioned to deliver short breaks for disabled children aged 5-12 has not been recommended for funding for 2019-2021, due to the scored assessment of the panel. This provider also made 3 applications to the Council’s Third Sector Commissioning programme, of which they were unsuccessful.

4.27 As with other currently commissioned providers, the organisation was issued a 6 month termination notice at the end of September 2018 detailing the expiry of their grant agreement in March 2019. Commissioners have been working with all currently commissioned short breaks providers to prepare for the possibility of not being funded from April 2019. Part of this exercise
was to ascertain their unit costing should a family wish to purchase a place for their child at full cost using a direct payment, modelled on the organisations being able to sustain their service through this method of funding. All organisations were directed to MetroGAVS to help complete this exercise.

4.28 All currently commissioned providers have also been encouraged to work with MetroGAVS in recent years in order to seek funding opportunities outside of the council and to prepare for personal budgets. Again, the intention was to help build up the organisations resilience to potential changes in available funding from the Local Authority. The unsuccessful organisation has been informed that they have not been recommended for funding; they have been provided with details of other opportunities that may be available and again encouraged to work with MetroGAVS to look for potential funding opportunities and to consider alternative business models.

4.29 The Disabled Children and Family Support Service, in conjunction with the soon to be appointed Short Breaks Co-ordinator will be looking at what services under the new short breaks programme will be suitable for children who currently access short breaks post March 2019, should the provider be unable to sustain their service after the expiry of the current funding agreement.

5. **Available Options**

5.1 Cabinet may choose to:

5.1.1 Accept the recommendation of the report and award funding to the 9 organisations and values listed in appendix B. This will support the delivery of a broader short break offer for families in the Royal Borough of Greenwich, offering greater choice and variety and offer more spaces to meet growing demand for these services in the borough.

5.1.2 Reject the recommendations of this report and agree to award grant funding to all organisations that applied. This would be contrary to the grant funding assessment completed by the Officers’ and Parents’ Panels.

5.1.3 Reject the recommendations of this report and spot purchase short breaks with no fixed agreements, charges or monitoring arrangements in place. Current funding agreements will expire on 31st March 2019 which will leave the Royal Borough of Greenwich with no commissioned provision for families to be referred to by the Local Authority as part of care packages for disabled children with an assessed need.
5.1.4 Do nothing. The Royal Borough of Greenwich will not meet its statutory obligation to provide short breaks to disabled children and their families in order to continue to care effectively for their disabled child, or meet the high level objective in the Children & Young People Plan.

6. **Preferred Option & Reason for Recommendations**

6.1 The preferred option is to award funding the 9 organisations as listed in appendix B. This will enable continuous delivery of short break activities for families in the Royal Borough of Greenwich, offer greater choice and variety for families and offer more spaces to meet growing demand for these services in the borough, as evidenced through the short breaks strategy. Maps showing the offer of short breaks under the current and the proposed programme are available at Appendices H and I.

7. **Consultation Results**

7.1 Prior to the start of the grant application process, multiple consultation events were held in a variety of settings, including coffee mornings at special schools and a parent consultation event held at Woolwich Town Hall on Tuesday 9th October 2018. The Parents’ Panel met on Thursday 20th December 2018 and Friday 18th January 2019 to read bids and comment on the panel’s scores.

7.2 Children and young people, including Greenwich Young People’s Council and ACE (Action, Change, Equality - our children with disabilities consultation group) have also been consulted on the types of activities they would like on offer.

7.3 A report detailing both parent and children and young people consultations can be found in appendix C: Short Breaks Guidance notes part 1, which was given out to providers as part of the grant application pack.

7.4 Short Breaks have been the focus of the quarterly SEND Providers’ Forum, Continuous feedback from this forum has been used to develop of the new offer. On Wednesday 31st October 2018, the Lead Commissioner gave a presentation on our commissioning intentions. A copy of this presentation can be found in appendix G.
8. **Cross-Cutting Issues and Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Sign-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal including Human Rights Act</td>
<td>This report is asking Cabinet to approve SLA funding to voluntary organisations including commissioning for the delivery of the short break scheme for 2019-2021. The proposals in this report are consistent with the Council’s duties under Schedule 2, paragraph 6 of the Children Act 1989. This places a duty on every local authority to provide services designed to minimise the effect on disabled children within their area of their disabilities; to give such children the opportunity to lead lives which are as normal as possible, and, to assist individuals who provide care for such children to continue to do so, or to do so more effectively, by giving them breaks from caring. The proposals are also consistent with the Breaks for Carers of Disabled Children Regulations 2011. These provide that in so far as is reasonably practicable in assisting individuals that provide care as above, a local authority must provide a range of services sufficient to assist carers to continue to provide care or to do so more effectively. In particular they must provide a range of specified services including educational or leisure activities for disabled children outside their homes, and services available to assist carers in the evenings, at weekends and during the school holidays. The approval of this request has no Human Rights Act implications.</td>
<td>John Scarborough, Head of Legal Services, 8 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance and other resources including procurement implications</strong></td>
<td>This report requests the Cabinet to agree the funding recommendations for the Short Breaks Grant Scheme for 2019 – 2021. In addition, to note the applications for funding as listed in Appendix B of the report. Resources to fund the recommendations of this report will be met from the Children Services’ Commissioning revenue budget, and from the Disabled Children and Families Support Service Budget.</td>
<td>Carolyn Knowles, Head of Accounting and Business Change 01/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equalities</strong></td>
<td>The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no apparent equality impact on end users. If agreed, the recommendations of this report will result in a broader and increased range of short breaks provision for children with disabilities across the borough, reflecting what children, young people and their parents/ carers have told us they want and need.</td>
<td>Michael Mackay, Lead Commissioner, 01/02/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **Report Appendices**

9.1 The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:

- **Appendix A:** Current Third Sector Grants – Short Breaks 2015-19
- **Appendix B:** Summary Details of Recommended Grant Applications
- **Appendix C:** Short Breaks Grants 2019-2021 Guidance Notes part 1
- **Appendix D:** Short Breaks Grants 2019-2021 Guidance Notes part 2
- **Appendix E:** Short Breaks Grants 2019-2021 Application Form
- **Appendix F:** All Grant Applications 2019-2021 final scores
- **Appendix G:** Provider Forum Grants Programme 2019-2021 Presentation
- **Appendix H:** Maps displaying the geographical spread of the current offer for short breaks 2014-2019
- **Appendix I:** Map displaying the geographical spread of the proposed new offer for short breaks 2019-2021

10. **Background Papers**

   **RBG Children and Young People Plan 2017-2020**
   **RBG & CCG Children & Young Peoples Short Breaks Strategy 2019 - 2022**

Report Author: Michael Mackay – Lead Commissioner, Children’s Services  
Tel No. 020 8921 4239  
Email: Michael.Mackay@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Olajumoke Hemsley – Joint Commissioning Team leader  
Tel No. 020 8921  
Email. Olajumoke.Hemsley@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Florence Kroll - Director of Children’s Services  
Tel No. 020 8921 8065  
Email: Florence.Kroll@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Activity period</th>
<th>Funding per year</th>
<th>Total funding amount 2015-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CACT</td>
<td>Weekend activities, Easter scheme, 4 x overnight stays</td>
<td>13 - 25</td>
<td>Term Time after school, weekend, Easter</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT</td>
<td>ASD Club After School and Term Time Weekends</td>
<td>13 - 25</td>
<td>Term Time after school &amp; weekends</td>
<td>£45,889</td>
<td>£183,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lodge</td>
<td>Horse riding lessons and Pony mornings</td>
<td>5 - 25</td>
<td>Term Time after school &amp; weekends, Easter</td>
<td>£12,300.00</td>
<td>£49,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTLLA</td>
<td>TT weekend outings and playdays, summer scheme, easter scheme, 2x overnight stays</td>
<td>5 - 12</td>
<td>Term Time weekends, Easter, Summer</td>
<td>£142,537</td>
<td>£570,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£315,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,262,904</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

#### Successful Short Breaks Grants Applications 2019-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Activity period</th>
<th>Funding per year</th>
<th>Total funding amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHOY Centre</td>
<td>Activities on land, on the water, with a maritime and outdoor education theme</td>
<td>8 to 17</td>
<td>All Holidays</td>
<td>£24,966</td>
<td>£49,932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Days Out</td>
<td>Outdoor Education/ Activities</td>
<td>8 to 17</td>
<td>All Holidays</td>
<td>£24,999</td>
<td>£49,998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT TT Weekends</td>
<td>Activities, sports &amp; Outings in the community</td>
<td>13 to 17</td>
<td>All Holidays, After school, Term Time weekends &amp; Overnights</td>
<td>£41,023.46</td>
<td>£82,047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT Overnights</td>
<td>Overnight stays throughout the year</td>
<td>13 to 17</td>
<td>8 x overnights a year</td>
<td>£14,560</td>
<td>£29,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT ASD After School</td>
<td>ASD club after school outings</td>
<td>13 to 17</td>
<td>Term Time after school</td>
<td>£20,922.50</td>
<td>£41,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT Holidays</td>
<td>Holiday clubs including summer scheme</td>
<td>13 to 17</td>
<td>All Holidays</td>
<td>£43,700.65</td>
<td>£87,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions4Change</td>
<td>Boxing</td>
<td>8 to 17</td>
<td>Term Time Weekends</td>
<td>£8,780</td>
<td>£17,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GYPT</td>
<td>Theatre &amp; Dance</td>
<td>4 to 17</td>
<td>Term Time Weekends &amp; Summer</td>
<td>£9,900</td>
<td>£19,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLL (partner All4One Swimming)</td>
<td>Splash session &amp; swimming lessons</td>
<td>4 to 17</td>
<td>Term Time Weekends</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maypole Project</td>
<td>Outings, Activity Mornings, drum sessions, Summer Scheme</td>
<td>0 to 17</td>
<td>Holidays, Summer &amp; TT after school</td>
<td>£34,025</td>
<td>£68,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lodge</td>
<td>Horse riding lessons &amp; Pony mornings</td>
<td>5 to 17</td>
<td>Term Time after school, Easter &amp; Summer</td>
<td>£12,440</td>
<td>£24,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Kids Can</td>
<td>Secondary summer scheme, activities &amp; outings including 'sports camp'</td>
<td>11 to 17</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Kids Can</td>
<td>Activities &amp; Outings</td>
<td>11 to 17</td>
<td>Holidays &amp; Term Time weekends</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£331,317</td>
<td>£662,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commissioning Funding: £315,729 / £631,458
Additional Funding DCFS: £15,588 / £31,175.22

Total Funding available: £331,317 / £662,633
1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Royal Greenwich Children’s Services is looking to award a number of small grants for the delivery of short break activities for children and young people with disabilities (up to the age of 17 years\(^1\)) and resident of/ under the care of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.

1.2 These guidance notes have been provided to:
   - Part 1: Set out what RBG Children’s services wish to provide grants for
   - Part 2: Support you to make an application for the grants

1.3 The provision of short breaks activities is in accordance with the *Children Act 1989*, section 6, and subsequently *The Breaks for Carers of Disabled Children Regulations 2011*. For the purpose of this programme, the definition of disability is taken from the *Children and Families Act 2014 (c. 6PART 3 Section 20)*. Where a child or young person has:

   a) *a significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of others of the same age,*

   or

   b) *a disability which prevents or hinders him or her from making use of facilities of a kind generally provided for others of the same age*

1.4 For clarity this includes children & young people whose disability is related to:

   - Learning &/or physical Disability
   - Deafness or hearing impairment
   - Blindness or visual impairment
   - Neurodevelopmental disorders e.g. Autistic Spectrum
   - Life limiting or life threatening conditions
   - Children & young people for whom the Local Authority are required to provide welfare services in accordance with *The Chronically Sick & Disabled Persons Act 1970*, who fall within *section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948*

1.5 Further information of the levels & type of need can be found in *RBG Children with Disabilities Service Eligibility Criteria 0-17 years* (appendix 1)

\(^1\) This includes up to their 18\(^{th}\) birthday
1.6 Short Breaks activities are a range of **clubs or schemes that are offered for children and young people with disabilities and that offer appropriate leisure and social opportunities.**

2. **Context:**

2.1 We think Greenwich is a great place to grow up but we know that for some children, life can be more challenging. Family background and circumstances can have an impact on how well they achieve, how healthy they are, how secure they feel and how safe they are.

2.2 Children, young people, parents and carers and those whose job it is to support them have told us that that they want children and young people in Greenwich to:

- Be happy
- Be supported and secure
- Be high achieving
- Be healthy, well and active
- Have equal opportunities
- Be included
- Be safe
- Be ambitious

2.3 Our **Children and Young People Plan 2017-2020** aims to help all children, regardless of their background or circumstances, to have a childhood where they enjoy school and family life, learn, belong, grow and achieve so that they enter adulthood ready, willing and able to reach their highest potential.

2.4 Our plan is built around four fundamentals, which is our approach to working with all children:

- Resilience and Good Mental Health
- Strong Foundations
- Prevention
- Safe and Secure

2.5 And four priorities to overcome the barriers that some children face to having the kind of childhood they deserve:

1. **Strong Foundations for children from disadvantaged backgrounds**
2. **Supporting disadvantaged boys and engaging well with men**
3. **Healthy relationships, tackling violence and exploitation**
4. **Improving outcomes for children with special educational needs and disabilities**

2.6 Our short breaks offer will support RBG’s strategic outcome, “**that children who face the most challenges in life get the right education and right support to**
achieve their full potential”. It also supports Priority 4 of the Children and Young People’s plan; to “understand the experiences of and improve outcomes for children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND)”.

3. Population profile

3.1 As of January 2018 there were 6,643 children and young people in Greenwich Schools with some form of identified special educational need and disability (SEND). This is approximately 15% of the population. Of the 6,643, a total of 1,648 had an Educational Health and Care Plan (EHCP). Of this group around 600 attend special schools and around 780 have additional provision to attend mainstream schools, with 117 of these pupils in Designated Specialist Provision (DSP). How RBG enables this to happen is set out in the RBG Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Partnership Strategy 2018-2021. Details of SEN provision available to RBG pupils is available here: https://search3.openobjects.com/mediamanager/greenwich/fsd/files/sen_provision_in_royal_greenwich1_1.pdf

3.2 Fig 1. SEN Support for RBG pupils by primary need

3.3 The proportion of children and young people with an EHCP has been stable since 2011 at around 3% of the school population and our children and young people resident population. The 0-17 population is projected to increase by around 5.6% during the period 2018 to 2022.

3.4 Boys, those from a white British background and children eligible for pupil premium are over represented in the SEND pupil population making up 68%, 40% and 40% respectively of all SEND pupils.
3.5 The most frequently recorded primary need for children and young people with EHCP in the resident and school population is for having Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) at 44.6% of EHCPs.

3.6 Fig 2. Primary need of RBG pupils with an EHCP

3.7 Since 2013 the proportion of children with an EHCP recorded with ASD has increased by 13% points among the pupil population to stand at 44.6% as of January 2018 (from 31% to 38%). ASD is more prevalent among young people with EHCPs in Royal Greenwich schools than in England (27% as of Jan 2017).
### 3.8 Fig.3 Child population & children living in low income families by ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of 0-17yr olds living in Ward</th>
<th>% of 0-17yr olds in ward</th>
<th>&amp; of children in low income families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Wood</td>
<td>4953</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackheath Westcombe</td>
<td>2516</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>3846</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldharbour &amp; New Eltham</td>
<td>3033</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham North</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham South</td>
<td>2621</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham West</td>
<td>2939</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyndon</td>
<td>5001</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich West</td>
<td>4011</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidbrooke with Hornfair</td>
<td>3397</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Park and Sutcliffe</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>3648</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumstead</td>
<td>4623</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooters Hill</td>
<td>3187</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesmead Moorings</td>
<td>6665</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Common</td>
<td>5222</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Riverside</td>
<td>5401</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67397</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.74%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONS 2016 Population estimates

### 3.9 DfE statistics show a clear link between SEND and children living in poverty. Of the pupils who are eligible for free school meals in England, 28.7% are identified as having SEND (DfE, 2015a). Thus, SEND is more prevalent among disadvantaged pupils than among their less disadvantaged peers. Nationwide data suggests a clear relationship between the Index of Multiple Deprivation overall score and SEND (2015). In general, as levels of deprivation rise, so do SEND levels.

### 3.10 Further demographic detail can be found at:


### 3.11 In 2017 there were 3,579 children accessing universal short breaks, 232 accessing targeted breaks and 208 accessing specialist short breaks.

### 3.12 There is no definitive figure of those children who are eligible for a funded short break. The figures below on estimated need is based on the following combination of indicators:

- Indicators of potential prevalence
• Young People accessing current commissioned provision

3.13 These figures are estimates for 2018/19. The figures are not used to determine eligibility, which is done on a case by case basis

3.14 **Fig.4 CYP eligible for Short Breaks in 2018**

3.15 On the basis that disability prevalence will remain relatively constant but population will grow by approximately 5.6% between 2018/19 to 2022/23, the likely demand is set out below.

**Fig 5. Table of projected demand for future provision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>5,923</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>6,044</td>
<td>6,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist overnight</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,365</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,444</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,507</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,576</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,722</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Current provision**

4.1 Within Royal Greenwich we deliver our short breaks under different categories based upon need. The Council recognises that not all disabled children and young people and their families will require the same level of support. Therefore short break services are delivered under the following categories:

* **Universal Services** – services that are provided or routinely available to children, young people and their families*
• **Targeted Services** – services that are aimed at disabled children and young people that require additional support, or who may need groups and services that are specifically designed to meet their needs

• **Specialist Services** – services for disabled children and young people and their families following a social care assessment and are part of an individual care plan.

4.2 Disabled children and young people may access a combination of universal, targeted and specialist services at any one time or move between them according to their age, support needs and family circumstances.

4.3 The majority of disabled children and young people will be supported to have their individual needs met by their family and will be able to access short break services directly without the need for a social care referral or assessment. These services are universal and targeted services.

4.4 Disabled children and young people and their parents and carers in receipt of direct payments may choose to purchase short breaks from any of the above categories in order to meet their assessed needs.

4.5 A summary of the different tiers of provision and how they are accessed can be found at Appendix 2.

5. **Consultation with children, young people and families**

5.1 During the summer of 2018, and following the end of both the primary and secondary summer schemes, RBG Joint Commissioning and Children with Disabilities Team ran various consultation sessions with families that have used RBG funded short break services.

5.2 Parents have told us that:

- their greatest need for a short break from caring is during school holidays with the greater need being during the latter part of the summer holiday period.
- regular club activities during term time are also important, both after school and especially at weekends.
- they want short break services they can feel confident in, that are reliable with appropriately trained staff equipped to care for the needs of their child(ren).
- short break services need to be affordable.
- they would like to be able to access short breaks without the need for a social work assessment.
they want a greater variety of providers in the borough, especially for younger children
they want to be able to use their direct payments more effectively, and to be able to refer themselves when in receipt of a direct payment.
they would like the option to ‘buy more’ for their child through private income, or have the option to privately fund.
they would like information available in a timely manner and clear schedules of activities available before the commencement of any club or scheme in order to make informed choices for suitable activities with/for their child.
they want opportunities for their child to make friends, to have the same opportunities as their non-disabled peers and participate in a variety of age appropriate activities while being safe and having fun

5.3 A comprehensive analysis of parent consultation feedback can be found at appendix 3

5.4 During a consultation session with 30 CYP with a range of special educational needs and disabilities, they told us that they would like to:
- Young people shared that they want to;
- To go out in the community more
- Take positive risks
- Learn how to get on the bus and train – be more independent
- Make friends and go to activities for people their age
- Spend time with and without their families
- Not just attend specialist activities
- Be more active and do more sports, singing, dance and drama

5.5 A full list of the types of activities that CYP would enjoy is included in appendix 3.

6. Royal Borough of Greenwich Short Breaks Offer

6.1 Funding will be available during the period covering the 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2021 and applicants can apply for grants for up to two years.

6.2 We are looking for a diverse range of high quality, age and need appropriate provision that families want to access; helps children to achieve their full potential and improves outcomes for children and their families.

6.3 We are interested in services that support the inclusion of children and young people through:
- building on existing activities to increase participation by disabled children and young people
• enabling disabled children or young people to participate in activities within their local community empowering them to build local networks alongside their non-disabled peers.

6.4 As well as supporting children and young people to engage in fun activities, we also expect services will;
• Consider the needs of those carers who would be unable to continue to provide care unless breaks from caring were available to them;
• Consider the needs of those carers who would be able to provide care for their disabled child more effectively if breaks from caring were available to them.
• Assist parents and families to continue to care for their disabled child in the home as part of their family and local community, ensuring that the disabled child does not come into Local Authority Care.
• Ensure that disabled children and young people are supported to optimise their physical and emotional wellbeing by having fun in a safe, supportive environment, whilst having opportunities to increase and support new skills to reach their optimum level of independence, and participating in activities within their local community.

6.5 A Short Break is any service or activity outside of school hours which gives the family of a disabled child or young person a break from their caring responsibilities, and gives the disabled child or young person an enjoyable experience. Eligible provision therefore includes both targeted and specialist provision and mainstream activities outside school hours.

6.6 Funding will contribute to an affordable programme of activity that offers regular short breaks across the year in particular during the school holidays, with a greater number of hours provided during the summer holidays. A schedule of Greenwich school’s term dates can be found in the link at https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/info/200285/about_our_schools/448/school_term_dates

6.7 It is expected that activities will be provided at a local venue in an accessible and safe environment. Given that activities will be run from a venue within the locality it is envisaged that this will enable the children and young people to become familiar with local community services and build networks within their own community.

6.8 Grants are not available to support holidays for individual children and young people.

6.9 Activities could include, but are not limited to:
• Play Services – Group based activities for children aged 0-11*
• Youth Services – Group based activities for young people aged 12-17*
• **Overnight activity breaks** – Group based experiences for young people aged 10-17*

• **Sports activities** – Group based activities for children and young people aged 0-17

• **Transition services** – Group based services for young people preparing for adulthood aged 15-17

• **ASD specific services/ activities** – Group based activities/services for both primary and secondary school aged CYP with a primary diagnosis of ASD. Due to the high need and demand in the borough, RBG require at least 1 ASD specific service in each of the categories listed above, spread across the borough. Whilst we require provision for all levels and types of disability, ASD remains, and is projected to be the highest need within RBG.

* The specified ages can be used as a guide to design age appropriate services

6.10 Short break provision can range from a few hours a month, to an allocated number of overnight breaks per year. They can include day, evening, overnight and weekend activities and usually take place in a community setting.

6.11 RBG are aware of a number of examples of families who now use community facilities after either first attending a short break family event or their child using the facility with a short break service, this supports the inclusion agenda as well as enabling parents to continue to care for their disabled child in the home as part of their family and local community.

6.12 This grant is to ensure that local community involvement is supported for disabled children and young people to transition into universal services where possible.

6.13 All the grants will be administered under condition 6.19 of this document (Fig 6). Services and activities funded from this grant will need to be delivered before the 31st March 2021.

6.14 All projects must be ready to take referrals and/or commence activities/services as of 1st April 2019. This is especially the case for after school and weekend activities/services and Easter Holiday schemes. Summer schemes should be ready to advertise places from 1st April with a programme of events available to families and begin to accept applications during the Easter school holiday and participate in a joint allocation meeting including RBG commissioners and social care/disabled children family support service leads.

6.15 Families are to be notified of their allocation to any scheme, service or activity at the earliest opportunity, and by no later than 6 weeks than before the commencement of
summer holiday schemes. Social care may request the reservation of a number of places, and these may fall outside of the timeframes indicated.

6.16 There is funding available to provide an equitable and consistent offer across the Greenwich borough.

6.17 Bids may be made for any ward of the Royal Greenwich borough area or any subdivision of age range or disability.

6.18 RBG will use the following to inform decisions.
- Population analysis
- Levels of deprivation
- Level of needs

6.19 Bids will be in the range of £250 - £50,000 per year, for the financial periods 2019/20 & 2020/21, and will be available via 3 funding streams as described in the table below:

**Fig 6. Grants available**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants available</th>
<th>Applications welcome in the region of:</th>
<th>Indicators of suitability for level of grant funding</th>
<th>Conditions/reporting requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANT A</strong></td>
<td>£250 - £9,999 p.a.</td>
<td>Suitable for new or small groups/ organisations, or larger organisations to support the additional staffing element to universal or targeted services and activities, or for organisations to deliver a specific scheme/schemes (e.g. an after school club, and/or holiday scheme). All applicants are welcome to apply for this level of funding.</td>
<td>50% of grant paid at beginning of year one, 50% of grant paid following 1st annual report, meeting, monitoring data and feedback have been completed and submitted for year 1 in the timeframe requested and any plans/ changes for year 2 have been agreed and approved with RBG commissioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANT B</strong></td>
<td>£10,000 - £24,999 p.a.</td>
<td>Grants within this region will be considered for all types of provision and would be expected to provide a holiday scheme in addition to any other project proposed in their application. This could be used to fund the</td>
<td>50% of grant paid at beginning of year 1, 40% paid upon submission of 1st 6 monthly report, feedback &amp; meeting. 5% of grant paid at beginning of year 2 as long as all requested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional staffing element to enable children with disabilities access universal services, or support a greater number of short break hours for targeted and specialist groups. If only 1 scheme is bid for under this grant, it would be expected to provide a greater number of short breaks hours (e.g. summer scheme) to a larger number of disabled CYP. This may also be suitable for specialist services providing more intensive 1:1 support/ higher staffing ratios.

**GRANT C**  
£25,000 - £50,000 p.a.

For larger, more established organisations that can provide a multiple range of targeted/ specialist short break activities and schemes that may require higher staffing ratio’s, including, but not limited to: School holiday schemes, weekend activities, overnight stays, after school clubs. Providing a greater number of short break hours throughout the year and helping to meet outcomes as identified in CYP EHCP’s.

35% of grant paid at the beginning of year 1, 5% paid upon successful completion and submission of each requested termly (3x per year) monitoring data submission and subsequent monitoring meeting to discuss performance against the grant/ project objectives. 35% of the grant paid at the beginning of year 2 upon submission of all data and feedback requested in year 1, and any plans/ changes approved for year 2. 5% paid upon successful completion and submission of each requested termly (3x per year) monitoring data submission and subsequent monitoring meeting to discuss performance against the grant/ project objectives.
6.20 You can bid for more than one grant but you will need to complete a separate application for each grant applied for.

6.21 RBG expects that any project will collect a parental contribution towards the cost of the service and a good service will show how this is applied.

6.22 If we are unable to award the full amount requested for your project we may talk to you about how much we can award from the money available.

6.23 The only age split taken into consideration within this process will be upon the need for **Ofsted registration to provide care for under 8’s.**

6.24 If **personal care** is provided services **must register with the CQC** and comply with the relevant standards. A definition of personal care can be found in *the Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2010, Regulation 2.*

6.25 RBG would like to see a programme of activity that offers **regular short breaks across the year** with the **greatest number of hours provided during the summer holidays,** in all localities.

6.26 Within the age range we will be looking as to how you support individual’s taking into consideration their age and level of need.

6.27 When awarding the grants consideration will be given to:
   - What the level of need is for the locality
   - What is already available in the locality
   - The age group or specific needs of the group
   - The type of activity being offered.

6.28 It is important that there is clear information available to parents and young people about how they can access the project, and that information is supplied for and kept up to date on RBG’s Local Offer. This should also be available in ‘easy read’ format.
RBG’s Local Offer is to be promoted to all families enquiring about or using the service. RBG’s Disabled Children’s Family Support Service may also refer.

6.29 Places available directly via the grant funding for targeted services will be undertaken via a single point of access within RBG. The project/activity will also take referrals directly from families who wish to pay the full cost of a placement not supported by this grant, or from families in receipt of direct payments.

6.30 A recruitment process or staff and volunteers will be in place that follows a recognised national model such as the NSPPC Safer Recruitment.


6.31 Those working with or providing activities for children, young people and vulnerable adults must ensure that staff and volunteers working with children, young people and vulnerable adults have a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check, copies of which must be kept on file. For more information visit www.disclosuresdbs.co.uk

6.32 The individual needs of the children and young people may include:
- personal care
- medication
- communication
- mobility
- sensory needs
- behaviours that challenge

6.33 The provider will ensure that staff and volunteers will have the appropriate level of on-going training to meet the identified needs of individual children and young people, included in this will be Safeguarding (inclusive of Prevent and Child Sexual Exploitation), disability specific training (e.g. ASD), administration of medication, delivering personal care and managing behaviours that challenge. Further guidance can be found in the Children’s Workforce Development Council, short breaks carers standards and workbook.

http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/10516/7/Short_break_care_workbook_Redacted.pdf

6.34 In line with good practice the grant is to support a Care Planning process that involves the young person and parent. The staff child ratio will be based on dependency rating, risk assessment and where appropriate a Positive Behaviour Plan. Social care will share individual support plans with providers, with clear outcomes and how they can be achieved. Providers will be engaged in reviews of plans where appropriate.
6.35 Again within the staff team there will be appropriately trained team members to assess and meet the identified needs of individual children and young people, and the training needs of staff and volunteers supporting the sessions.

6.36 The staff team will also need to include members who have an awareness of a range of individual communication needs and promote the use of various methods of communication as appropriate and applicable, e.g. BSL, Makaton, PECS, electronic/talking books, and make appropriate links where necessary with school based settings in order to gain further information.

6.37 Where appropriate communication passports detailing the communication needs of each child or young person will be used.

6.38 Use of Communication diaries will show evidence that information about the activities participated in is shared with the family, ensuring parental engagement and helping to create positive memories.

6.39 There will be appropriate levels of supervision and line management will be in place to ensure good practice.

Transport

6.40 These grants will not cover transport costs. Families are responsible for providing transport for their child to and from the service venue and picking them up. However, providers are at liberty to run transport schemes which we expect parents to be made aware how this is funded either e.g. full cost recovery from parents or subsidised from other fund raising sources.

7. Who Can Apply?

7.1 We will fund:
  • Registered charities
  • Voluntary or community organisations
  • Companies limited by guarantee
  • Community Interest Companies
  • Social enterprises
  • Parent Teacher Friends Association

7.2 All applicants must be:
  • Based within the Royal Borough of Greenwich
Based outside the Royal Borough of Greenwich but applying for a project that will take place within the Royal Borough and/or involve and benefit local residents

7.3 Joint bids between collaborative partners and consortium bids are also welcome, but each application must be for a stand-alone grant only.

7.4 We will not fund:
- Individuals
- Projects and activities that do not meet the criteria for short breaks
- Activities that have already taken place (we do not fund projects retrospectively)
- Activities that have no public benefit for the residents of the Royal Borough of Greenwich
- Activities which promote a particular political, religious or extremist view
- Activities placed in a formal education setting as part of the core curriculum.
- Finance related to core running costs, loan repayments, budget deficits or endowments.
- Fundraising events, activities for private gain, or that result in profit being made.

8. Cost and Unit Cost

8.1 As with all public funds the principles of Best Value will be applied within the evaluation process. Further information can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/5945/1976926.pdf

8.2 The grants offered by RBG are to provide funding for the additional staffing element required to ensure a disabled child is able to access a club/activity and is not excluded due to their disability.

8.3 RBG is an Accredited Living Wage employer and is therefore committed to paying the London Living Wage to all paid staff, which is a requirement that we ask of all projects/activities funded by RBG. Further information on the Living Wage can be found at www.livingwage.org.uk

8.4 A disability specific project will demonstrate how they will use the grant offered by RBG to support the provision of the project/activity and provide the appropriate level of staffing required to ensure a disabled child is able to access a club and is not excluded due to their complexity of need.
8.5 If the project/activity is inclusive, open to disabled and non-disabled children and young people, then any funding secured through this grant process must be used to provide the additional support required to enable disabled children and young people attending to be included in that environment and not for any universal or mainstream element of the service. This also applies to any activities that include siblings of the disabled child/young person.

8.6 RBG expects the project to collect a parental contribution towards the cost of the service and a good service will show how this is applied. This could be from private income or the use of direct payments. The current rate for direct payments is £12.94 an hour.

8.7 To establish equity across the borough it is advised a parental contribution of at least £2.50 per child, per hour must be levied by the provider for the service. This is under the Outer London average hourly cost for a childminder (£8.83) or after school club (£5.32) Family & Childcare Trust: Childcare Survey 2018.

8.8 RBG advice is that the full costs of running the activity is available to reassure parents that their contribution is in line with activities available to non-disabled children/young people.

8.9 The provider is at liberty to have concessions available to cover extenuating situations, and it is advised that there is a clear criteria process in place to ensure transparency and clarity.

8.10 RBG anticipates that providers will collect a minimum of 66% of parental contributions.

9. Application process

9.1 Details of how to make an application can be found in the FAQ section in part 2 of the guidance notes. Applications for funding will commence on 1st November 2018 and end on 9th December 2018.

9.2 All applicants are encouraged to read part 1 & 2 of these guidance notes prior to completing an application for funding, taking note of the need within RBG and giving consideration to parent and children feedback to recent short breaks consultation sessions as detailed in this guidance note.

9.3 If we are unable to award the full amount requested for your project we may talk to you about how much we can award from the money available.
9.4 **Successful applicants will be required to:**

- Attend a mobilisation meeting in early February 2019
- Attend an annual review meeting (as a minimum) or upon completion of a project (e.g. school holiday scheme) or as detailed under the conditions of the grant applied for.
- Submit data monitoring in respect of common KPI outputs (process to be agreed & supplied in accordance with level of grant funding)
- Submit a report in respect of common KPI outcomes (template to be agreed & supplied in accordance with level of grant funding)
- Participate in the quarterly RBG SEND CYP Community Providers Forum
- Acknowledge RBG’s support in all printed and online communications in line with the communication guidelines that will be provided. All print and press release must be submitted to RBG for approval prior to release. Access details for disabled children and young people should also be stated on all publicity materials.

9.5 **Please note:**

- You must not make any commitment to spend the grant funding until you have been officially notified of the outcome of your application.
- Your project will be monitored by RBG and access to the project and any related services/activities must be granted.
## Appendix 1

### RBG Children with Disabilities Service Eligibility Criteria 0-17 years

**Summary of Eligibility Need**

The table below sets out a summary of additional needs eligibility.

- If your child fits any of the descriptions in lines A or B then a specialist service short breaks service may be appropriate for your family.
- If your child fits any of the descriptions in lines B or C then a targeted short breaks service may be appropriate for your family.
- If your child doesn’t fit any of the descriptions in lines A, B or C then your family should be able to access short breaks from caring through mainstream or universal activities or services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional needs</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends either a special school or pre-school for children with severe or profound learning difficulties or ASD</td>
<td>Attends a mainstream setting with significant support or a specialist provision. Likely has an EHCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends a mainstream school or pre-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it difficult to express their needs and wants. This may include technological aids to support communication or those who use no formal language or system.</td>
<td>Uses a specialist communication system which those around them need to be trained to understand. They likely need 1:1 support in order to make their needs known.</td>
<td>Can express some of their needs, needs some support to check they understand/ are understood</td>
<td>Makes clear their needs, wants and wishes without support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has complex health needs that prevent them from participating in social and educational activities without</td>
<td>Has health needs that have a significant impact on their development and learning and requires daily</td>
<td>Has health needs that may limit their ability to perform everyday tasks, this can be managed by</td>
<td>Has a known controlled health condition which causes minor disruption to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional health and wellbeing</td>
<td>on-going specialist health care support</td>
<td>interventions</td>
<td>training or minor adaptations.</td>
<td>daily tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has severe challenging behaviours that impact on all aspects of their functioning or poses a significant risk to themselves or others</td>
<td>Has challenging behaviours that impact significantly on their life in the community and require specialist provision to enable their safety and wellbeing</td>
<td>Has frequent behaviour management difficulties that require advice and or support</td>
<td>Has behaviours that can be difficult to manage at times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Friendships | Needs intensive, specialist support to keep in touch or make relationships with others. Have extremely limited contact with children their age | Need constant support while with other children. Does not tolerate other children being near | Needs support of others to join in with activities or play with other children. Needs support for new environments or experiences | Enjoys other children’s company. May not seek friendships but tolerates being near other children |

| Safety | Needs constant supervision and doesn’t perceive danger to themselves or others | Regularly needs greater levels supervision than other children of the same age, may seek out risk to self or others | Needs some supervision at times and has a limited perception of danger to themselves or others | Occasionally requires more supervision than children of the same age |
## Appendix 2

### Summary of Provision and How to Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>How to access</th>
<th>Is an assessment needed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Activities available to all children and young people in RBG whether they are disabled or not</td>
<td>All disabled children and young people should have access to these services but may need reasonable adjustments to support their inclusion.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td>Activities specifically suitable for disabled children and young people</td>
<td>Parents/carers contact a single referral point.</td>
<td>Yes, through a short breaks assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Specialist and Specialist Overnight | Activities for disabled children and young people with the most complex needs who are unable to access universal or targeted provision | Due to their specialist nature, there is an assessment completed to determine level of need and most suitable provision.  
This can be done by the Disabled Children Social Work Team or the Mainstream social work service. | Yes, a statutory social work assessment |
Appendix 3

Short Breaks 2019 Parent/ Carer Consultation

Below is a summary of the whole consultation process for Short Breaks 2019 undertaken by RBG with parents/carers;

A complete breakdown of parents/ carers comments is provided further in the document.

Summary of all responses

44 parents completed the survey monkey

16 parents attended face to face consultation events

Total allocation of where parents feel RBG should prioritise spending on Short Breaks 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekend activities</th>
<th>After School activities</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>School holiday activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top activities that parents choose: All forms of physical activity including swimming and football, horse riding, drama and life skills.

Top qualities that parents want to see in providers:

Providers have high aspirations for CYP

Staiffs are trained and have DBS checks

Interesting and varied program of activities

Consistency of staff members

Providers spending time to get to know child/ young person and their needs

Themes arising from feedback:

More choice of providers

Inclusive sessions just as important as specialist

Importance of providers having the right equipment and being accessible including the times that sessions are put on.
Making friends is very important, parents felt that during activities/ clubs was the only social interaction their CYP had.

Collaboration between providers/ schools/ colleges and parents needs improvement.

**Hawksmoor Youth Club 3rd October 2018**

4 parents attended

- Primary needs of CYP parental attendance:
- Age range of CYP parental attendance: 10-14

**Parents were asked to do some blue sky thinking about what activities they would like their child to take part in:**

| Cooking and experiencing new foods          |
| Music including music therapy               |
| Sessions with animals                       |
| Horse Riding                                |
| Lego clubs using Lego therapy approaches   |
| Arts and Crafts                             |
| Drama                                       |
| Fitness and exercising                      |
| Football                                    |
| Wheelchair sports                           |
| Social clubs (within age range and for those with a learning disability) |
| Homework clubs                              |
| Group sleep overs/ slumber parties          |
| Swimming (with accessible facilities)       |
| Girls only club (to have a space to talk about female only issues and di fun girl activities) |
| Tech activities                             |

- Parents expressed the importance of children being able to have fun with friends and the need for a range of activities
- Parents expressed they would be happy to pay for additional services if they would benefit their child.

**Parents were asked what would make them trust a provider to support their child:**
• Professionals need to have heart in their delivery. They need to know what they are doing and love it!
• Understanding of the communication needs of our Children and Young People - Be able to explain activities to children especially using visual support. Providing information in enough time for those that need structure.
• Have respect for our children
• Vision - What do CYP want to achieve
  - Have outcomes/ goals
  - take the time to understand
  - believe in our children
  - Have aspirations
• Just work with us to understand our son’s needs and have patience to listen and understand him.
• Familiar staff
• Communication is the key
• Training of staff so they are effective; numbers alone will not do that. 1 to 1 where needed. And the trust that is built up over the years with a particular provider.

Ideally, they would need to have a connection with the school and see how other members cared for my child and how he responds to them. I would not let someone take my son out in public, for instance, the park, if they hadn't cared for him in an indoor environment.

• I am happy to leave my child in their care if I know the person, people, and know that they know my child's needs
• Lots of communication

• A letter before the club starts and your child to meet there carer before they start. What your child is doing and going. So you know exactly who they are and there number.

• My only experience of provisions my son has accessed is through the clubs. The approach, details planning behind the scenes and striving for perfection of this gives me confidence.

• Through good communication.

• I'd like to meet key staff members in charge of looking after my son and see evidence they are qualified / CRB approved to work with children with disabilities. Also get feedback / review from parents who used the service before.

• By communicating with me every time and having a listening ear and not telling my child any bad words or do something bad in front of my child that the child can copy etc.

• Take the time to ask questions about your child and visit for a short
The provider has to understand my child's personal needs, his challenging behaviour, medical needs and be trained to administer medication.

By adapting to their individual differences and understanding them.

I would like to be allowed to attend one or two sessions with and/or without my child, to meet with staff especially the one(s) assigned to support my child. I would like them to be friendly and professional. Support workers ought to familiarise themselves well with my child’s profile. Where my child requires a 2:1 support and is accompanied to the centre by his carer, I would not want staff at the centre to discuss me and/or my child to the carer, nor ask them questions about how much I pay them or how they should cease working with my child because of his anxiety and challenging behaviour. I would like the provider to make me feel assured that any complaints/concerns that I put forward will be dealt with in an unbiased manner.

When the provider seems to understand my child diagnosis and introduces activities that work toward developing my child's abilities.

Staff to be fully trained. Help the service users and parents to meet with staff beforehand and parents to be able access a few sessions helping their child with the transition. Parents and siblings should be able to join in as well at some of the services provided out in the community e.g.: days trip, short breaks

One to one talk before so that we are confident that they know our child's needs and challenges as much possible.

Have shadow sessions from time to time when they've not been with the child with certain complexities

Parents need to be listened to and respected when making decisions and informed of everything along the way and parents need to feel in control in the care of their child

By showing an understanding of my child’s needs and that meltdowns are not necessarily bad behaviour to be punished by asking me to collect early.

Providers could allow taster sessions in which parents/carers could initially stay for a short period of time until full confidence is gained.

Home visit, sharing of information, introduction to staff who would be working with my child.

Have qualified trained staff, have ample amount of staff to be able to provide one to one support if required, transport facilities, infrastructure that is equipped for my child’s interest as well as safety, session hours that make it possible for me to do my errands while the child is away.
• Get to know him very well first

• Employ by the local council through DBS check

• The institution service provision need to be reliable, certified by the local authority and a provision of tracking record of positive feedback from previous or current customer

• Safe and happy environment, with enriching activities

• Come into the school and spend time with the kids and get to see what they require

• Build up a relationship over time or free to choose person known by family

• The carer has to prove that he/ she can meet the needs of children with special needs. Has to be fit enough and see what the child needs through the child’s eyes.

• Someone my child knows

• Making sure he is safe and meets his needs and knows how to feed change and knows how to calm him when he gets upset

• By letting me know that my child would be safe very well looked after

• Offer a chance for the children to meet care givers prior to leaving them

• If they trained

• Proper background checks on staff and training

**Parents were asked to allocate money to each heading in terms of where they would invest local authority money.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekend activities</th>
<th>After School activities</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>School holiday activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Parent comments: educational trips, Opera, painting club</td>
<td>4 Parent comments: Could be in the community as well as taking place in a school.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Parent comment: Music Sports Fitness Tech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AOB;
Parents commented that they would like to see more services for children and young people with SEND advertised in RBG publications.

Parents commented that they do not receive the DCR newsletter even though they are on the register.

Short Breaks 2019 Parent/ Carer Consultation

Woolwich Town hall 9th October 2018

No parents attended: 12

- **Primary needs of CYP parental attendance**: ASD, Global developmental delay, complex medical needs, cerebral palsy, non-verbal

- **Age range of CYP parental attendance**: 5-19

Parents were asked to do some blue sky thinking about what activities they would like their child to take part in:

More locations for horse riding
Bowling
Drama
Cycling
Swimming (independent)
All types of sports
Disco
Trampoline
Roller Disco
Sensory gardens
Targeted groups
Life skills
Transitions (but not on school level as could cause conflict)
Support for parents to socialise – need a space to meet
Outdoor activities
Music therapy classes
Sessions for complex needs
Provide for all disabilities
Autism Café
Fun
Make friends
Singing
Anything if with the right provider
Activities to help achieve EHCP outcomes
Age appropriate
Dancing
Day trips e.g. zoo
Suitable times for sessions (mainstream)
ASD sessions
More for younger children
Special needs sessions at leisure centres/ activities

Parents were asked what would make them trust a provider to support their child:

Physically able to work with children
Must have appropriate skills/ training
More choice and variety of providers
More providers who accept direct payments/ private funds
Specialised staff where required
Flexibility
Lack of options for funding
Positive staff attitude
Consistency with staff so to build trust
Services need more publicity
Appropriate safe premises/ facilities/ equipment and adaptations
Experienced and trained volunteers – not just good will
Medical training and ability to store medication (epi-pen, suctioning etc.)
Registered with Ofsted and CQC
DBS checked
Positive reviews from other parents
Advance activity schedules

Parents were asked to allocate money to each heading in terms of where they would invest local authority money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekend activities</th>
<th>After School activities</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>School holiday activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AOB:
• Parents commented that there is not enough choice in providers or activities for commissioned services
• Parents commented that some mainstream services offered SEND sessions that were at unsuitable times for example swimming sessions on a Sunday morning.

Survey Monkey responses

Parents were asked to allocate money to each heading in terms of where they would invest local authority money. Parents were asked to rank between 1-4 to show what they think is more important to them.

*numbers of parents who voted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1ST</th>
<th>2ND</th>
<th>3RD</th>
<th>4TH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School holiday provision</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend activities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents were asked to comment on their choices above;

• Having some alternative holiday activities for my child would be of most benefit to us as a family and to increase my sons independence as well
• Holidays are such a struggle; transport is part of the experience and routine too.
• Holiday provision is of paramount importance us. My son needs opportunities to socialise and take part in supported activities with his peers; otherwise he becomes socially isolated and depressed, especially over the summer break. Because of his disabilities there are no other opportunities for him to access other mainstream schemes. We are not able to provide opportunities for him to do this as he needs the specialist support the previous schemes have provided. As a family we also need the respite these schemes offer.
• School holidays are the hardest to find things to do because it's a large space of time to fill
• Personally we find length of holidays difficult. Want to do things with our other children. Weekends ditto plus good to have another structured day. Afterschool clubs 3rd because we are lucky to have cover to collect at 3pm. Transport last as we
live really close plus our boy hates transport and it is stressful trying to get ready on time.

- My son gets bored in school holidays and needs activities to make him happy
- Saturday clubs worked really well for us, it gave my son a chance to socialise and take part in activities that I can't manage to do on my own with him. This also applies to my second choice. After school clubs are too much for my son to take part in after his day at school, so this is not a priority. I put transport third because I can drive my son to and from school if needed.

- My daughter need to be in routine every day to keep her happy and calm, which stops if there is no school holiday clubs and half term clubs. I am single mum with two kids, why is very hard to keep my daughter active on my own. Clubs makes a massive difference in our lives. And transport is very important too , because my daughter is not able to travel by public transport, because of her needs

- School holidays are so long for my child. And I find it so hard at home with him. I cannot take him out on my own because I can't cope with him. So it helps him a lot to go club in the school breaks because otherwise he would be stuck at home. We need transport because my child cannot and won't go on public transport. Because will not cope. Weekend activities would help a lot because he would miss out a lot of activities. After school clubs help and encourage him in more activities.

- Holidays are a really difficult time for my child. Not having the consistency of going to a place of stable activities he finds so distressing and it to be frank s ods up everything from his sleeping to eating. Trying to take someone with additional needs anywhere in public can be a frustrating and scary time, the risk of them having a melt down and members of the public at the least staring is horrible to the worst fear calling the police and having the thought of them intervening is petrifying. Staff should be creative in their thinking of places and planning takes all this away for not only the young person but parents. After school club gives the young person a social life outside of school which they don't have. It's fun just a fun time for the young person and has given me a chance to continue to work and not be dependant in the benefit system.

- After school clubs and transport can be essential for working parents.
- Meets our specific needs
- It would be most beneficial to have a short break during school holiday.
- I choose after school break as my first choice because I believe children should be given a short break after school to burn their energy before going home.
- The holidays are the time when I most appreciate having short breaks provided. Also my child really enjoys attending sessions and benefits from it. Transport is not so important, as I drive and can take her to places.
- It gives them independence and safety being able to travel by bus by themselves.
- My child suffers with anxiety and challenging behaviour and dos not tolerate travelling on public transport. He is very active and needs to be out often as being
indoors makes him bored and can trigger negative behaviour and challenges. He doesn’t like getting ready early on Saturday mornings as this probably reminds him of weekday school routines.

- I like to spend a quality of time with my child in the weekend, after school club is more important as my child get to learn more and gain new skills without me in a safe familiar environment. Again holiday are vital as all children services and parks are full and not designed for children with SEND. Special holiday activities are very much needed to survive the holiday.
- Transport is important especially to access activities in the community. Parents might more than one disabled children or other younger siblings or no access to transport. Most service users are not able to use public transport dues to their complex needs. Services need to easier to access this way.
- My husband and I work so whilst so we have much needed time to catch up. The main reason though is because v hard to engage our son at home, he benefits greatly to be with his peers and independent from family. The same with holiday schemes
- It’s always hard to get help during holidays and weekends for working parents. After school and transport is a lot easier to arrange that longer term care
- There are currently no places you can take a complex needs child to for them to enjoy as well as give breaks to parents caring for them
- it's good to be able to access activities over the weekend
- Weekend activities would be better suited, my child would require transport to be able to attend these activities due to their disability
- Covering school holidays is difficult for parents. Having transport is important as we do not have access to a car and having a child with special needs makes it difficult to access public transport.
- Good for the child and parent to have support during holidays and over the weekend
- There are few clubs that our disabled son is able to attend
- I want holiday free activities pick up and drop off
- Children have routine within their school environment, which makes it difficult for family to keep up during break period, therefore organised weekends activities can be very good for the children
- Respite for holidays & weekends is so helpful
- Transport I feel is vitally important for the children. Also the holidays can be long and kids tend get bored easily so would be my 2nd choice.
- More weekend offerings would benefit other siblings quality time with parents.
- Children and parents need socialise and fill as a part of community by getting engaged with other people. Is difficult to make friends when you have child with special needs that why we need more activities to be organised
- It will help with my son
- Gets bored easily
• Because there is hardly anything for my child in the Borough.
• Because of health difficulties affecting my mobility it is very difficult for me to take my son out.
• I find it difficult to find activities, especially exercise based that my child can access
• I think my child needs to spend more time in community activities
• I get no break at the weekend or holiday if there are no clubs. More spaces are needed
• Holidays are the pressure points. Would like to have access to many more “things to do” mainstream and specialised so that long (getting longer plus all the inset days) holidays don’t tip us all over the edge

Parents were asked to describe their child’s perfect short break;

• Being collected by bus, day at beach with their friends.
• Having fun activities to do outside the home and away from the parents!
• Lots of interaction/socialisation with peers in the community, supported fun and varied activities tailored to his needs, provided by caring, knowledgeable and supportive staff
• Transportation somewhere then food
• Cycling climbing (trees) trampolining most activities; sailing kayaking travelling. But he himself would not be able to tell you
• Out on fun day out with friends
• Being around friends and adults that he can talk with. Doing activities such as football and other ball games and just simply being part of a group and doing stuff such as going to the park together.
• Keeping her routine, with being active. For example, after breakfast, bus is collecting her, going on day trip, on a rainy day a pay day in, music activities and being out with friends and people who she knows. But most important to meet new people, see different things, than 4 walls at home
• Lots of activities to keep them occupied
• He loves going out doing lots of activities and helping him mix with he's peers and other children.
• A day doing something fun with people who don’t judge or are so stressed thinking about what others think a day where they’ve been thought about from the off to the end.
• Exciting opportunities experienced with peers.
• Lots of exciting activities Time to chill out with friends
• It would involve wheelchair-accessible interesting activities: funfair visit, open day at fire fighters’ or ambulance station, football match (with possibility to meet the players & try kicking football), London Eye ride etc.
• Doing something fun. Being able to get a space at commissioned providers services
• Able to go out in the community, visit places, enjoy himself and have fun with a group of his friends
• A place where there is a lot of different scenery and environments like trips to Brighton, Margate, Southend etc.
• With small group of children for few hours, doing art and craft with occasional movements or even a physical activity with few complicated instructions.
• To be able to go out and access services out in the community and be supported by trained staff members. To be around peer groups and build friendship. To give siblings access to the services too. I find that Siblings are always left out so this will a great opportunity to meet other young/carers in their situation and also be role model to the service user from mainstream settling
• Spending time with others on transport. Ending up at a theme park or on a train or something to do with water!!
• Combined relaxation as well as stimulation activities
• One to one support to give them individual help and support
• Somewhere I can learn new skills, have fun and make new friends.
• My child would be extremely happy to be out in the community, so long as there is provision for transport.
• Plenty of activities to include movement and dance and opportunities for physical outdoor play as we only have a small garden.
• Activities involving outdoor areas, parks, soft play sensory room etc. It would be perfect if he could have one to one support throughout with meaningful adult interaction to help him access the entire experience
• Holiday
• We cannot tell, but we can see when she is happy, she enjoys their organised school trips, she enjoys using the slide and the pool
• Lots of fun trips in the community, creative & sensory play
• A trip to the beach/seaside.
• Not too far from home and familiar staff
• If child had a access to everything he like to do
• Lots of activities
• Things he likes that would be perfect would be sensory room places that light up
• It is very fun and I made new friends
• Probably going somewhere fun.
• Lots of fun and lots of food, lots of other children to play with
• relaxing and away from home
• Time spent with their friends trying new things or doing their favourite things
• With other young people same age not just SEN - active fun, trips and new things to experience. Complex needs so lots of support so can join in everything as far as possible
Parents were asked what RBG could improve on within short breaks - this is listed by most popular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number of parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of activity</td>
<td>72.09%</td>
<td>31 parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session times</td>
<td>46.51%</td>
<td>20 parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff ratios</td>
<td>34.88%</td>
<td>15 parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/ publicity</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
<td>13 parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>27.91%</td>
<td>12 parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Don’t always get to hear about the options available. And there is not always the choice that would be suitable.
- Could be longer if they are collect at 9-10 then dropped home at 2pm gives little time to take siblings out for quality time.
- Longer session times in the summer holidays - 2 weeks is not enough. Also more provision over Easter break and half terms.
- To be honest, I don’t think there is much to improve. The short Breaks we received was amazing.
- Would like to tick all but realistically we would make the effort to tie in with times and locations as long as they were safe.
- I feel there are not enough staff to support these activities.
- More sessions in the holidays for our children to attend, it seems that there is a shortage of staff to be able to provide this. I am confident with leaving my son with a provider that knows my son well. So that puts my mind at rest.
- More was thinking not the times, but more chance of days to use the short breaks.
- So they can experience different activities.
- The activities should be for each child’s ability.
- As a parent it’s only by chance you get to hear about what’s going on to be honest it’s never been the LA who have told us about the clubs or activities a provider has done it’s always been by chance through knowing other parents whose children have gone.
- More opportunities for children who need higher staffing ratios such as 1:1.
- Don’t know what else is on offer.
- My son hasn't been on a short break yet so I can't comment on the provision - would be good if there was something for him on Monday or Friday after school + some weekends.
More activities should be introduced to the short break to attract more families and more communication and awareness should be improved on.

Having more sessions available. She gets a block of Saturdays every now and again. It’s not easy having a child with ASS not knowing when she can next go.

It would be wonderful if they could increase the time they end the sessions. Able to inform parents or communicate with parents.

It enables them to have options and more opportunities

I would like to be consulted more often and be made to know what’s happening at all times with regards to short breaks and activities for my child. It would be more beneficial for my child and family if I could have a say in the kind of staff that are assigned to my child on the day, as there have been times when he’s come back home behaving in a more anxious and agitating manner. This puts a lot of pressure and stress on my family as he is non-verbal and so we have to try and figure out with a lot of difficulty as to what might have happened while he was out there on the short break. Also, it would be great for the hours to be extended so I could spend more time with my second child who suffers with a severe medical condition.

To design activity for targeted children, which mean not all disabled children have the same needs. Children with ASD and learning difficulties need big spaces, well trained staff and special resources. Not only a room with wheelchair ramp and play assistant.

Activities should be community based with lots of opportunity for physical play. Family trips, outings and holidays away – with a provider who can provide staff and volunteers. Provides resilience, opportunity for families to do fun things with support,

I feel not enough type if activities around for those on the more severe end if the disability spectrum

The allocated time is usually cancelled due to staff and most times never rearranged

The amount of times is very important as well as one to one support to children with complex different needs

Not many people know how to access short breaks or whether they are entitled to access them.

It would be good for there to be a wider choice of places to visit and to allow families to accompany children on occasion.

Wider activities would require more staff.

There are hardly any viable choices for varied levels of special needs in the borough and most lack the quantity and quality of staff required to meet the children’s needs

My child needs a 1to1.

Visit to the theatre or Lego land.

Specialist staff recognised the need of the children and They are in better position to provide some good time to the children therefore children with special need can be
difficult to manage, indeed a good number of staff need to be allocated for a certain number of children

- Would be good for the kids to try something they wouldn’t normally do.
- Better facilities and qualified staff
- Is important for child to experience and try different things in life
- Different activities
- So gives more options what the kids likes
- Activities must be tailored to the needs of the children and age appropriate
- There aren’t enough things for disabled children in west Greenwich.
- My child will benefit from support from the service provider and also not to travel long distance
- You missed an option. Number of spaces available for specialised schemes. There isn’t enough.
- More info needed and mainstream providers need to offer more for SEN so that we have more choice and stay nearer home
PART 2: Guidance Notes (Short Breaks Grants)
The Application and Evaluation

The evaluation process will be carried out in 2 stages

Stage 1

1. Panel Member sign Declaration of Interest
2. Panel members read applications
3. Panel discussion of individual applications with scores awarded
4. Scores over 60% transferred to final scores sheet to be taken into stage 2.

Assessment criteria are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting ‘Outcomes’, consisting of:</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Previous Experience</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Project Details</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Management of the Project</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Meeting outcomes of the DCFS</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Measuring Success</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sustainability</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following scoring schedule will be used by the evaluation panel when assessing responses to the grant application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Answer is irrelevant or there are no essential requirements included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most essential requirements are missing and/or the answer demonstrates a lack of evidence around key requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some essential requirements are not adequately covered with no evidence to support the response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All the essential requirements are covered with evidence in some cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All of the essential requirements are covered with good evidence in each case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All requirements are covered with consistently strong evidence in every case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 2

Panel discussion to award grants with consideration given to:

- unit cost
- capacity proposed
- stage 1 score
- equitable offer across the borough
- potential impact on families
- potential impact on the local or wider community
- current provision within the locality.

Application

Within the application you will be asked a number of questions. The following pages have been provided to assist you with your application. Please read them as they are an indication as to how the answers will be scored.

Guidance Note 1

Given the vulnerability of the children and young people using the services that these grants cover RBG require the following will to be in place:

- Public Liability Insurance
- Employer Liability Insurance
- Professional Indemnity Insurance
- Motor Vehicle Insurance (if a vehicle is available to the project)
- Safeguarding Policy
- Complaints Procedure
- Health & Safety Policy and/or Statement that includes Risk Assessment
- Equal Opportunities Policy and/or Statement
- Child Sexual Exploitation Policy
- Anti-Radicalisation Policy
- Recruitment & Selection Policy/Procedure
- Enhanced DBS checks for staff/volunteers
- Supervision and appraisal process
Appendix D

- Induction Programme for new staff and volunteers
- Training Programme for staff and volunteers
- Training programme includes Safeguarding
- Training programme includes Child Sexual Exploitation
- Training programme includes Anti Radicalisation

Further information on Safeguarding & related topics can be found at:

https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/safeguardingchildrenboard/

Guidance Note 2

Contact Details for your organisation. Please make sure the correct details are inserted here as this is how we will be contacting you following the evaluation process.

Guidance Note 3a

Organisation details

This section provides us with key information about your organisation and helps us to build an overview of what you currently provide, your previous experience of delivering services and the potential impact of local authority funding across the borough. Please note we retain this information on our database which is maintained in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018.

The only element of this section that is scored is the overview of previous experience.

You will need to give a brief overview of what you organisation does. You will have 250 words so it does not need to be detailed. This is not scored.
Guidance Note 3b

Previous Experience – An overview of what you already do or have done in the past.

Fig.7. What RBG are looking for and scoring guidance for panel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of previous experience (350 Words)</th>
<th>Possible score of 25</th>
<th>Weighting 15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What We Are Looking For</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Scoring Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience of offering a range of activities both venue and community based that reflect need and age appropriateness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they given examples of how they have worked previously in respect of where, how and what activities they offered? Has it been traditional, creative, inclusive, age appropriate etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of community relationships used to promote the inclusion of disabled children &amp; young people</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they given examples of working with local community groups to promote inclusion for disabled children &amp; young people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have they given examples of how they currently recruit staff? Do they know what skill set they are looking for, DBS process used, children &amp; young people or parents involvements in recruitment, links to local colleges/social care course to support recruitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they demonstrated experience of recruitment, creatively working with colleges and other services to assist with their recruitment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of using parent feedback to inform service development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they given an example of the use of parent feedback to inform service development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of using children &amp; young peoples feedback to inform service development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they demonstrated the use of children and young peoples feedback to inform service development?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a possible score of 25 for this question which equals 15% of the overall score

There is a limit of 350 words for this question.

Example answer. 266 words

Started in 1995 our organisation has provided a range of activities for disabled C&YP e.g. Clubbing nights for over 18yr olds in partnership with a local venue, a swimming club run at the local leisure pool, film nights for teenagers in partnership with the local cinema, cooking for independence course in partnership with adult education, Stay & Play for under 8’s. We are able to offer this range of activity due to our links with the local Adult Ed, Leisure centre & cinema etc. Last year we linked with the local drama group on a coproduction pantomime & a mini music & drama festival. During these activities disabled & non-disabled are paired up to work together & friendships & understanding are developed, not only amongst the C&YP but also parents, as we encourage them to help with making scenery, costumes & make up. Our recruitment process is run with another local provider so we benefit from a second opinion as well as shared costs. The recruitment process follows NSPCC Safer Recruitment & where possible parents &/or C&YP are included in the informal element of the interview process. In addition to advertising locally we link with the nearby college to recruit students, using flexible contracts. Most of our staff started as volunteers. Last year disabled teenagers told us that they wanted to have time to play on game consoles, parents told us they didn’t want their children to so to compromise we have allocated a 30 minute session at their club for this to happen, everyone knows it will happen, how long it is for.
Guidance Note 4a

Where and Who For.

This section is not scored but will inform stage 2 of the evaluation.

Question: Name of your project/activity (or working title).

The name of your project

Question: Is your project aimed at, or relevant to, any of the following groups?

Please tick the age group your project is for. If your project is for a more specific age range than please include this information in your project details answer.

Question: In which Ward of the Greenwich borough will your project take place?

Please could you give an indication as to which areas of Greenwich your project will serve.

Within Royal Greenwich there are 17 wards and 1 CCG area. RBG are aware that some organisations are guided by their constitutions as to which children/young people they can offer a service to. It would be useful to be made aware of any boundaries your organisation works to.

Question: Address of venue project will run from.

RBG needs to know where the project will be run from to assist with its planning in ensuring that there is an equitable offer across the borough.
**Guidance Note 4b**

**Project Details** - This is a description of the project/service you wish to provide with this grant funding.

Fig.8. What RBG are looking for and scoring guidance for panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What We Are Looking For</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Scoring Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates analysis to show need</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is there any reference to data provided about how they have decided upon the programme of activities they propose to run?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a programme of activity that complements what parents have told RBG - prioritise summer holidays</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is the programme they are offering prioritising the summer holidays?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a programme of activity that complements what parents have told RBG - provide pro-rata during other holidays</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is there an offer of activity in the Easter holiday?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a programme of activity that complements what parents have told RBG - provide regular activity outside of school holidays</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is there an offer of regular activity during the term time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities on offer - range and appropriate to age group and need</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Are they able to offer a range of activities to meet what is required for the age group they are offering the service to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue information - is it/ how is it appropriate and safe to age group and need.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they provided evidence that they have a venue to use as a base that they have risk assessed in respect of health and safety and appropriateness of the venue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria - is this clear and how is it presented to potential customers?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they said how they are setting up their criteria? i.e. geographical area, definition of disability from C&amp;F act 2014, or how and where will the project be promoted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral process - is the process set out clearly with how outcomes will be given to referee and a timescale for dealing with referrals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they referenced LO, special schools, disabled children’s groups, social media as places to advertise the activities on offer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care planning - does this involve CYP and parents? Will it be agreed &amp; signed?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they spoken about format of care plan, who they will get the information from, who will sign the plan, does it cover personal care, medication etc.? Reference EHCP’s, flexibility for those CYP who may not have an EHCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff child ratio based on dependency rating &amp; risk assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they said how they will be allocating staff resources to ensure best practice, i.e. using a dependency rating &amp; risk assessment outcome to show what level of support they need for each activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is there a reference to community involvement in the answer? Are they working with another local group? What safeguards are in place?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a possible score of 55 for this question, which equals 25% of the overall score
There is a limit of 750 words for this question.

Example answer: 609 Words

We know that there are 20 disabled young people living in Plumstead who would like to attend a social club. This was from our membership survey last year. The project would run 20 x 6hr session during summer school holidays, 8 x 6 hr sessions during the Easter holiday & 12 x 4 hour Saturday sessions a year. There will be charge of £2.50 an hour. With a strong emphasis on learning through play & fun we will offer a range of venue based activities such as no cook cooking sensory based arts & crafts, singing, sensory toys, imaginative play (dressing up & home corner) easy play games/sports. In addition to this we will access community based activities such as the local park & play area, swimming & soft play at the leisure centre, trip to the cinema visit to a local restaurant/cafè all these are within walking distance of our base. We have joined up with the local football club & for the Saturday sessions we will be able to support disabled youngsters who wish to play football to attend the football sessions for an hour. At the end of the summer holiday sessions we aim to run a family based picnic so parents have the opportunity to speak with the staff as well as have a social activity to join in with. The venue we hire has accessible access & changing facilities. There is also a secure outside space for games. The venue is risk assessed & strategies are in place such as no children allowed in kitchen unsupervised. Equally the football clubhouse has accessible & secure indoor & outdoor space & there is an accessible changing room that has a hoist & changing tables. Our criteria for access to the activities are guided by C&F Act’14 & the RBG Disabled & C&YP criteria. When talking to parents who apply the conversation is steered by what is appropriate for the child/young person we are clear that the child’s needs in respect of their disability is the priority. E.g. if a child has ADHD with no other diagnosis they may be more able than the peer group so the activity may not be appropriate for them. In the past we have always discussed any queries with our allocated commissioning officer. All support to children will be informed by gathering information from parents & the child/young person about their needs – care & behavioural support – which will be written into a Care Plan which will be signed by parents. It will also include what activities they would like to try. This will also include any risk assessments & will inform the level of support each child will require for each activity they attend for. Where a parent informs us of behaviours that challenge we always request a copy of the programme being followed at school so we can provide a consistency for the child. In order to ascertain levels of support required by C&YP we employ a dependency rating/assessment. Core areas of need are considered & level of support assigned. All our publicity will include an outline of the programme we will be offering closing dates for applying (if applicable), contact details (phone & email) so that parents can contact us direct to book & how we respond to their application. The project will be advertised through our connections with SENCO’s & FLO’s at special schools The option of us attending a school meeting to speak to parents will also be offered. The project will be advertised on our website & we will have a limited number of flyers printed. These will be placed at the 2 local GP surgeries.
### Guidance Note 5

**How the project/activity will be managed** – this is what you are proposing to provide.

Fig 9. What RBG are looking for and scoring guidance for panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What We Are Looking For</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Scoring Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What governance is in place?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is there a trustee’s, management board? Is there an example of how business decisions are made in respect of the organisation and this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What line management is in place in respect of day to day running of the project?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they given examples of as to how roles &amp; responsibilities are set out i.e. staff not volunteers responsible of personal care or medication, volunteers mentored by staff, clear line management pathways and supervision. Is there a training programme in place that includes safeguarding and is this appropriate to the needs of the service?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the project supported in respect of administration i.e. processing referrals, responding to enquiries by parents?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they demonstrated that allocated time has been identified to respond to administrative tasks to ensure the smooth running of project telephone/social media/email responses, payroll &amp; invoicing, booking places on the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the project will ensure best practice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they identified what training will be available, how this will be tested to ensure implementation, will they be linking up with other organisations to offer best value through shared costs or sharing of best practice. Have they include any reference to keeping up to date with best practice via national or local groups or forums?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a possible score of 20 for this question which equals 15% of the overall score

There is a limit of 500 words for this question.

Example answer: 296 words characters
Our organisation is overseen by a Board of Trustees who is responsible for the business decisions plus we have an Ethical Committee who report to the Board. This committee is responsible for developing policies & procedures & is made up of Trustees, staff rep & parent members. Only staff trained in personal care or the administration of medicines will be permitted to carry out these tasks. Volunteers are not expected to carry out personal care tasks or the administration of medication but there are permitted to assist a member of staff. Each member of staff is responsible for up to 2 volunteers whilst at the sessions in turn the project leader will provide supervision & day to day management of staff at the project. The project leader reports directly to the Board of Trustees & one of the Trustees is responsible for their supervision. We are fortunate to have a number of volunteers who provide admin support to our organisation & they man the telephones & email calls/enquiries & bookings to the project. Payroll support to the organisation is a purchased service. In order to ensure best practice we are members of the Council for Disabled Children & the RBG SEND Provider Forum so we can be aware of current practices. We also work in conjunction with another local organisation to provide core induction & ongoing training for both groups of staff enabling an economy of scale. Our induction training is based on the Children’s Workforce Development Programme for short break carers. We have staff who are trained trainers in Safeguarding, Manual Handling & BSL. In addition we have offered placements to students on the Social Care course at the nearby college in return we can access a number of one off training sessions on specific subjects.
### Guidance Note 6

**How the project/activity will meet Outcomes** – this is how you will demonstrate what you proposed to provide will support the outcomes RBG wants to meet.

#### Fig.10. What RBG are looking for and scoring guidance for panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What We Are Looking For</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Scoring Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Children and Young people attending to have the best start in life. Children and young people who face the most challenges in life get the right education and right support to achieve their full potential.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they described how the project will support CYP to have the best start in life, is there a philosophy of care that supports development of skills, confidence, relationships with peers, knowledge of local area, relationships with local community e.g. Active support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Families are empowered to continue to care for their disabled child in the home as part of their family and local community, ensuring the family does not go into crisis and the disabled young person does not come into Local Authority care.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they described how parents will be supported by the project to continue to care, are the breaks planned/booked in advance, are their opportunities to network with other parents. How will the project/service ensure parents have confidence to leave their child/young person in their care?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Carers are empowered to care for their disabled child more effectively</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they described what opportunities parents will have to discuss/share with staff information about local accessible facilities, how to manage behaviours that challenge, communication, continence management and other care issues or discuss if there are opportunities to offer a listening ear for parents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled CYP are supported to optimise their physical and emotional well-being by having the opportunity to develop their skills and independence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they described how disabled CYP will have the opportunity of fun whilst being safe, opportunities to take safe risks, actively supported to participate, supported to do things at own pace, no pressure to do, opportunities for thrills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled CYP are supported to optimised their physical and emotional wellbeing by having the opportunity to develop their skills for independence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they described how CYP will be offered opportunities to develop new skills to reach their optimum level of independence e.g. are there any examples of supporting toileting, feeding or behaviour programmes? What type of new experience will CYP be offered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled CYP are supported to optimised their physical and emotional wellbeing by having the opportunity to develop networks within their local community/</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they described how CYP will be offered opportunities to network within their local community? are their links to local schools, leisure centres, local restaurants, cinemas, soft play venues, special interest clubs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a possible score of 30 for this question which equals 26% of the overall score.

There is a limit of 600 words for this question.
We believe that providing opportunities to try new things develop skills & have fun supports disabled C&YP to have the best start in life. Relationships with peers are a core principle for the project. Whilst we recognise that some C&YP will have difficulties relating to each other our staff/volunteers are expected to encourage sharing & involving everyone in the conversation during activities. E.g. when we shop for cooking ingredients staff will ask for the child’s opinion, direct shop assistants conversation to involve the child. In the past we have developed community relationships with local shops so that C&YP are discreetly supported to go shopping, handing over the list, money etc. As C&YP live locally this has meant that these relationships continue outside of the club, skills learnt are continued to develop within a local environment, this in turn supports confidence & self-esteem. It is important that we use & build relationships with local services such as the local leisure centre, whether learning skills such as buying a drink independently at the café or feeling safe being hoisted into the pool are built by routinely doing the same activity, in a familiar space, at a pace that suits the individual. One young girl with learning & physical needs had never been swimming & would hit out when we first started to attend the pool. Slowly building her confidence over several sessions she now knows what to expect & is far calmer when being hoisted into the pool. This has continued as her family now take her swimming at the pool as having seen & accompanied staff on a couple of sessions they now feel able to attend as a family. This is an activity that she really enjoys particularly the anticipation & excitement of splashing is clearly expressed in her face & screams/giggles. We plan to run at some of the sessions the opportunity for parents to stay in an adjoining room to have coffee & chat with other parents. One of these sessions we have had the offer of a talk by a psychologist about active support. Another one of the sessions we are talking to about a local restaurant for families to have a discount voucher for a meal at the same time as the club is running. However, we also recognise the importance of parents having a break, one parent has told us that the break enables her to spend time with her other children, doing things they want to do, another parent tells us she is able to use the time to have a ‘coffee, chill & get ready to start again’
Guidance note 7

Measuring Success – how will you know you are meeting the outcomes?

Fig. 11. What RBG are looking for and scoring guidance for panel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What We Are Looking For</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Scoring Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of online customer surveys/feedback forms to assess impact against identified outcomes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they demonstrated how they will report on impact against outcomes? How will they ask CYP &amp; families, and how will they collate &amp; present the data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they able to demonstrate how safe and fun will be measured - how CYP asked &amp; actively supported to develop confidence to try new things, risk assessments, parental confidence in staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they demonstrated how they will evidence how safe &amp; fun will be measured risk assessments number of incidents etc. How they will actively support CYP to develop skills and confidence. How will they convey this to parents to ensure parents have confidence in the staff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they able to demonstrate how families are supported to continue to care of their CYP at home &amp; within their local community - families confident to visit activities following CYPs use of facilities with project, facilitate support networks &amp;/or family friendships</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they demonstrated how they will enable parents to access local community services E.g. communicate with parents which services they have used, given tips about which local businesses are accessible/disabled friendly etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How the impact of community engagement will be demonstrated - links to local business &amp;/or services to champion the project.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>have they said how they are going to build local community networks - get volunteers from local community groups etc.?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a possible score of 20 for this question which equals 13% of the overall score.

There is a limit of 600 words for this question

Example answer 516 words

All the groups & activities we run we seek feedback from C&YP & their parents/carers from. The feedback forms are in easy read format &/or use widget symbols are used on the C&YP’s forms. We can also adapt our forms to any format that is needed and are open to integrating our reporting system to RBG requirements for ease of seamless reporting. In addition to this if somebody needs support to complete these staff can help. To find out if C&YP have enjoyed the activity we use a simple symbol 😊😊😊 based voting cards to get the overview. There is also a more personalised feedback where individuals are spoken with to find out what it is they liked, didn’t like, would like. In the past we have also run group sessions to ask C&YP what a good worker look likes, this is a bodyshape drawn on a large piece of paper & the C&YP are guided through a talk about what they think a good staff person i.e. On time, smiles, smells nice, makes me feel safe etc. These words are written on the picture which is then hung on the wall as a reminder to everyone. Parents have said they like this approach as they feel we are not just asking opinions to tick a box but
listening. We are fortunate to have a large wall which we can post photos & comments e.g. photos to show C&YP enjoying an activity or comments to say if something could be done better or what could make it better. Our aim is to let everyone have their say but it is clear that to include everyone here is a need for compromise. For each session time is made for parent to speak to staff when dropping off or picking up & occasionally the activity we run is to make cakes which mean that parents are invited to arrive early to pick up their child & have tea & cake with us. It is important to us that parents build a relationship with staff. Staff are guided to deal with any issue promptly & whilst we have a formal complaints process we prefer to problem solve to prevent niggles becoming issues. Our board is also used as a voting platform about activities, pictures of what is on offer are pinned up & everyone has a sticky star to put on the activity they want to do. To ensure safety all activities are risk assessed as well as considering behaviours that may increase the risk. C&YP are supported to try new things at their own pace to ensure their safety & build confidence. We have a small group of families who now meet together outside of the organised activities to go bowling together. Initially this was an activity we provided, which parents were then invited to a session to play with us & now they feel confident to attend without us. They have built on the good relationships our staff had with the staff at the bowling alley & feel that the staff are able to help them when necessary.
**Guidance Note 8**

**Sustainability** – how do you view the future of this project?

**Fig. 12. What RBG are looking for and scoring guidance for panel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What We Are Looking For</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Scoring Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How will places be able to be purchased directly by parents?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>have they described a process that sets out how they will collect parental contributions &amp; how they might enable parents to purchase full cost places?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is their capacity within the organisation to access other funds?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>have they identified an allocated amount of time to apply for external pots of funding or self funders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there capacity to link to a local business to secure sponsorship?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they identified potential sponsorship from local business &amp; how this could be sourced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there capacity to link with a local community group to develop economies of scale?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have they demonstrated a potential for joining together with other local community groups to maximise economy of scale?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a possible score of 20 for this question which equals 6% of the overall score.

There is a limit of 250 words for this question.

Example answer: 177 words

*This service seeks to become less dependent upon local authority funding to continue past March 2020, however we will be looking to follow up a possible sponsorship arrangement with Michael’s Book Store that is looking to work with a local charity as their community project. We have also allocated some admin time to pursue applications for the Big Lottery Fund & other more local grants. We are also hoping that once we have established the project parents will be more willing to pay an increased voluntary contribution plus we plan to try & start a parent association, similar to a PTA to support fundraising activities. For some of the more costly activities e.g. music therapy sessions we have had discussions with another similar organisation as to how we can work together to benefit from economy of scale. We are also looking at how we can accept card payments to streamline our administrative support & cost. In addition to this we will consider making the option available for parents to purchase at full cost using their Direct Payment.*
**Guidance Note 9**

**Unit Cost and Capacity** – this where RBG will look at the value for money

The answers to this section will be considered during phase 2 of the evaluation

The questions are self-explanatory but please be aware we will be using these figures to work out the hourly unit cost, per child place, to RBG

When setting out the programme on offer please make at clear as possible and make sure it matches what you already answered in respect of number of sessions etc.

If you choose to provide transport, please note, as set out in 6.39 of the specification, grants will not cover transport costs. The time for travel should also not be included as part of your offer for short breaks when setting out the number of short break hours per session.

Example answer: programme on offer. *Please note that we have used a mixture of examples in the tables below and are aware that some providers may be providing a single service from the funding applied for, duplicated throughout the year, or multiple services delivered at the same or different times of the year. This can be explained further in the narrative below each table.*

**Please complete the table for both years of delivery.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holiday</th>
<th>Number of sessions</th>
<th>Hours per session</th>
<th>SEND CYP Places per session</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer (Term 6 holiday, 6 wks)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5 week programme of activities, weekdays only, beginning the first week of Summer holiday for secondary aged CYP, all disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter (2 wks)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 week programme of activities, 4 days per week (excluding bank holidays) for children aged 5-12, all levels of disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas (Term 2 holiday, 2 wks)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5 activity days over the 2 week holiday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1 holiday (Autumn half term)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fun sport activities for CYP with learning disabilities aged 12-17 inc trampolining, basketball, football etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3 holiday (Winter half term)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 sessions delivered over half term of sport activities for physically disabled CYP of all ages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Example answer: programme on offer. Please note that we have used a mixture of examples in the tables below and are aware that some providers may be providing a single service from the funding applied for, duplicated throughout the year, or multiple services delivered at the same or different times of the year. This can be explained further in the narrative below each table.*
Running 2 groups per day for each weekday of the holiday. AM sessions for primary CYP with ASD of play activities out in the community, including a day of outdoor learning for both groups and PM sessions for secondary CYP offering life skills such as travel training, money management and outdoor learning experiences.

Then please expand on your offer in the narrative, as below. There is a limit of 1500 words for this additional narrative.

We will offer 25 sessions of 5hrs during summer school holidays and 12 sessions of 4hours during term time i.e. 2 sessions per term (6 terms) for secondary aged CYP at all levels of disability. This will be run from the acme building in Greenwich Peninsula, with a mixture of day trips and in-house activities such as………….. The focus of the project will be……………. and staffing ratio’s will be dependent on…………. We do/ do not require Ofsted registration for this activity as…….. etc etc

PLEASE PROVIDE AS MUCH DETAIL ABOUT YOUR OFFER AS POSSIBLE WITHIN THE WORD LIMIT IN ORDER TO GIVE US THE FULLEST PICTURE OF THE SERVICE THAT YOU WILL OFFER. PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE.

Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Term</th>
<th>Number of sessions</th>
<th>Hours per session</th>
<th>SEND CYP Places per session</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term 1 (Sept/Oct*)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Twice weekly after school club (Tues &amp; Thurs) for CYP with ASD aged 11-17. Social activities led by CYP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2 (Nov/Dec*)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Weekly wknd group based transition service incorporating life skills lessons with peer social opportunities for CYP with profound learning disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3 (Jan/Feb*)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Weekly swimming lessons for 2 age groups (5-9 &amp; 10-15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with physical disabilities delivered on separate weekday evenings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 4 (Feb-Apr*)</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Twice weekly horse riding lessons delivered after school &amp; on wknds for CYP aged 5-17 for all disabilities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term 5 (Apr/May*)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wknd activities for Deaf CYP of secondary school age throughout the year (*note, if throughout the year, please complete table for each term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 6 (June/July*)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Running a ‘wknd’ club on both days of play activities for Children aged 5-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then please expand on your offer in the narrative. There is a limit of 1500 words for this additional narrative.

With regards to parental contribution we need to establish a level of equity across the borough and it is imperative that your project follows the guidance minimum hourly charge of £2.50 per hour.

We have asked if you are applying for other funding external to RBG so you are able to evidence how you will be funding the total cost of running the project.

There is a limit of 100 Words for this section.

FAQ’s

If you have any questions with regards to your application please email them to childrens-commissioning@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

The answers will be circulated to all applicants and providers registered on the circulation list for the RBG SEND Children & Young people Community Providers Forum.

The last date for questions will be 12:00pm on Friday 30th November 2018.

How to apply:

Completed forms will need to be submitted via the online portal by 11:59pm, on Sunday 9th December 2018.

Online application
To complete the Short Breaks Grant 2019-21 application form you first need to sign up for a website account with ProContract, https://procontract.due-north.com/Login

You'll then be able to download the guidance notes and application document which you can complete offline and uploaded back onto the system before the submission deadline.
Short Breaks Grant Application Form

In accordance with RBG's Voluntary and Community Sector Strategy, RBG’s Short Breaks Strategy and with regard to the Children Act 1989, section 6, and subsequently The Breaks for Carers of Disabled Children Regulations 2011, RBG Children’s Services wishes to make available a number of strategic grants for short break activities for Greenwich disabled children and young people aged 0-17 years.

Further guidance can be found in the attached guidance notes.

*We advise that you read the guidance notes before completing this application form to help you understand the type of activity RBG wish to support with this funding.*

When answering please note the number of words available in the narrative boxes. We are happy to accept applications that are not set out in paragraphs. Any words counted over the available limit will not be considered as part of your response.

**Contact Details**

*Please refer to guidance note 2*

- **Contact name:** Click here to enter text.
- **Position/title in organisation:** Click here to enter text.
- **Contact telephone number:** Click here to enter text.
- **Email address:** Click here to enter text.
- **Website address:** Click here to enter text.
- **Organisation address:** Click here to enter text.
- **Postcode:** Click here to enter text.
Note: Pre-requisites for applying for funding to deliver services for disabled children & young people on behalf of the Royal Borough of Greenwich. This section is not scored, however, if you answer no to any of the questions your application cannot progress further as the items listed are requirements for delivering a service for Disabled Children & Young Person’s Service on behalf of/or in partnership with RBG.

*Please refer to guidance note 1*

**All Applicants must complete the table below**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Liability Insurance</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Liability Insurance</td>
<td>Yes/No/No staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Indemnity Insurance</td>
<td>Yes/No/No staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Insurance</td>
<td>Yes/No/No available vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Policy</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints Procedure</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Policy and/or Statement that includes Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities Policy and/or Statement</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Sexual Exploitation Policy</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Radicalisation Policy</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment &amp; Selection Policy/Procedure</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced DBS checks for staff/ volunteers</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision and appraisal process</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction Programme for new staff and volunteers</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programme for staff and volunteers</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme includes Safeguarding</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme includes Child Sexual Exploitation</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programme includes Anti Radicalisation</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further information on Safeguarding & related topics can be found at: [https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/safeguardingchildrenboard/](https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/safeguardingchildrenboard/)
**Organisation details**

*Please refer to guidance note 3a*

It provides us with key information about applicants and helps us to build an overview of the impact of our funding across the borough. Please note we retain this information on our database which is maintained in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018.

- **Name of your organisation:** Click here to enter text.

- **Status of your organisation:** *Please select below*

  - [ ] Limited Company
  - [ ] Registered Charity
  - [ ] Other *(Please state below)*

  Status of organisation if ‘other’: ……………………………

- **Ofsted number:** Click here to enter text.

  Note: Please type “N/A” if not required for the delivery of this type of project

- **CQC reference number:** Click here to enter text.

  Note: Please type “N/A” if not required for the delivery of this type of project

- **VAT registration number:** Click here to enter text.

- **Please tell us your organisation’s overall turnover in the last financial year. This gives us an idea of the scale of your operation:** Click here to enter text.

- **Are you currently in receipt of any other RBG funding, either contract or grant or received funding from RBG for this particular project in the past year? Please select below:**

  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **Are there any RBG officers or elected members are on your governing boards? Please select below:**

  - [ ] Yes
  - [ ] No

- **What does your organisation do?**

  *250 word limit*

  Click here to enter text.
Please give an overview of your previous experience

*Please refer to guidance note 3b*
There is a possible score of 15 for this question.
There is a limit of 350 words.

Click here to enter text.

**Project Details**

*Please refer to Guidance note 4a*
This section is not scored but will inform stage 2 of the evaluation

- **Name of your project/activity (or working title):** Click here to enter text.

- **Is your project aimed at, or relevant to, any of the following groups/Activities?** Complete the check box for any/all that apply. Please refer to guidance note
  - ☐ Disabled children under 8 years
  - ☐ Disabled children 8 years – 17 years
  - ☐ Play Services
  - ☐ Youth Services
  - ☐ Overnight Activity Breaks
  - ☐ Sports Activities
  - ☐ Transition Services
  - ☐ ASD Specific Services/ Activities

- **In which ward of Royal Greenwich will your project take place?** Please Complete the check box for all that apply.
  - ☐ Abbey Wood
  - ☐ Blackheath Westcombe
  - ☐ Charlton
  - ☐ Coldharbour & New Eltham
  - ☐ Eltham North
  - ☐ Eltham South
☐ Eltham West
☐ Glyndon
☐ Greenwich West
☐ Kidbrooke with Hornfair
☐ Middle Park and Sutcliffe
☐ Peninsula
☐ Plumstead
☐ Shooters Hill
☐ Thamesmead Moorings
☐ Woolwich Common
☐ Woolwich Riverside

▪ What is the Address (including postcode) of the venue that the project will run from? Click here to enter text.

▪ Project Details

Please refer to guidance note 4b
There is a possible score of 25 for this question.
You will have 750 words.
Click here to enter text.

▪ Please give details of how the project will be managed.

Please refer to guidance note 5
There is a possible score of 15 for this question.
You will have 500 words.
Click here to enter text.

▪ How will your project/activity support RBG’s Strategic outcome for children & Disabled Children & Young People service outcomes.

Please refer to guidance note 6
There is a possible score of 20 for this question.
You will have 600 words.
Click here to enter text.
• How will your project measure its success against the outcomes? 

*Please refer to guidance note 7*

There is a possible score of 13
You will have 600 words.
Click here to enter text.

• Please give an indication as to the future sustainability of the project. 

*Please refer to guidance note 8*

There is a possible score of 6
You will have 250 words.
Click here to enter text.

**Funding – Unit Cost & Capacity**

*Please refer to Guidance note 9*

• What level of grant funding are you applying for? *Please select below*

☐ Grant A

☐ Grant B

☐ Grant C

• What is the value of the grant you are applying for? Click here to enter text.

• What is the total cost of the project/short break activities you are proposing? 

Click here to enter text.

• In respect of short break activities during School Holidays, please complete the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holidays</th>
<th>Number of sessions</th>
<th>Hours per session</th>
<th>SEND CYP Places per session</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer (Term 6 holiday, 6 wks*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter (2 wks*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas (Term 2 holiday, 2 wks*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1 holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Autumn half term*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3 holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Winter half)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEM NO: 5 (Appendix E)
**Holidays Year 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holiday</th>
<th>Term Details</th>
<th>Year 1 Number of sessions</th>
<th>Year 1 Hours per session</th>
<th>Year 1 SEND CYP Places per session</th>
<th>Year 1 Additional Information</th>
<th>Year 2 Number of sessions</th>
<th>Year 2 Hours per session</th>
<th>Year 2 SEND CYP Places per session</th>
<th>Year 2 Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term 5 holiday (Spring half term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer (Term 6 holiday, 6 wks*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter (2 wks*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas (Term 2 holiday, 2 wks*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1 holiday (Autumn half term*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3 holiday (Winter half term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 5 holiday (Spring half term)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* to be used as a guide only. A schedule of school term dates can be found at [https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/info/200285/about_our_schools/448/school_term_dates](https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/info/200285/about_our_schools/448/school_term_dates)

You may supply an additional narrative to this question below. There is a limit of 1500 words allowed for this section. If not applicable, please type “n/a”

Click here to enter text.

- In respect of short break activities during term time, please complete the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Term Year 1</th>
<th>Number of sessions</th>
<th>Hours per session</th>
<th>SEND CYP Places per session</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term 1 (Sept/Oct*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2 (Nov/Dec*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3 (Jan/Feb*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 4 (Feb-Apr*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 5 (Apr/May*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 6 (June/July*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Term – Year 2**

| Term 1 (Sept/Oct*) |                    |                   |                             |                        |
| Term 2 (Nov/Dec*)  |                    |                   |                             |                        |
Term 3 (Jan/Feb*) |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
Term 4 (Feb-Apr*) |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
Term 5 (Apr/May*) |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
Term 6 (June/July*) |   |   |

* to be used as a guide only. A schedule of school term dates can be found at [https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/info/200285/about_our_schools/448/school_term_dates](https://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/info/200285/about_our_schools/448/school_term_dates)

- **You may supply an additional narrative to this question below.** There is a limit of 1500 words allowed for this section. If not applicable, please type “n/a”

Click here to enter text.

- **Are you applying for any other grants external grants from other funding bodies, (not RBG) to support this project?**
  
  - □ Yes
  - □ No

- **If yes, please provide details below.** There is a limit of 100 words for this section.

Click here to enter text.
Data protection

We will use this application and other information you give us, including any personal information, for the following purposes:

- to decide whether you are eligible for a grant
- to provide copies of your application to other individuals or organisations who help us to assess and monitor grants
- to hold in our database, and use for statistical and analytical purposes
- if we offer you a grant, we will publish information about you relating to the activity we have funded, including the granted amount and the activity it funded. This information may appear in press releases, printed collateral, online publications and on websites
- if we offer you a grant, you will be expected to support our work, contributing (when asked) to important publicity activity during the period for which we provide funding
- signing our standard terms and conditions will signify your agreement to us using your images and other materials for publicity purposes.

All information will be kept in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018.

Declaration

☐ I confirm that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is true and correct and that I have the authority to apply on behalf of the organisation named above.

☐ I confirm that, to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is true and correct and that I have the authority to apply on behalf of the organisation named above.

☐ I confirm that, if successful, the organisation will provide a final evaluation by the end of the 2019/20 financial year, using the templates provided for outputs & outcomes setting out clearly how the grant was used and what was achieved as a result of the funded activity (If your project is not due to complete by the end of the financial year, we will ask you for an interim report).

☐ I confirm that, if successful, the organisation will provide a final evaluation by the end of the 2020/21 financial year, using the templates provided for outputs & outcomes setting out clearly how the grant was used and what was achieved as a result of the funded activity (If
your project is not due to complete by the end of the financial year, we will ask you for an interim report).

**Name:** Click here to enter text.

**Position in organisation:** Click here to enter text.

**Date:** Click here to enter a date.

**Counter signature’s name:** Click here to enter text.

**Position:** Click here to enter text.

**Date:** Click here to enter a date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Evaluator 1</th>
<th>Evaluator 2</th>
<th>Evaluator 3</th>
<th>Evaluator 4</th>
<th>Avg Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CACT Overnight</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td><strong>79.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT Holiday</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td><strong>76.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT ASD</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td><strong>75.75%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACT Saturday</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td><strong>74.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MayPole Project</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td><strong>70.50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHOUY Centre</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td><strong>70.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Days Out</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td><strong>69.50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lodge</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td><strong>64.25%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions 4 Change</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td><strong>58.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLYPT</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td><strong>55.25%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Kids Can Summer</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td><strong>54.50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Kids Can</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td><strong>54.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLL</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td><strong>50.25%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Bid A</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td><strong>49.50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Bid B</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td><strong>48.50%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Bid C</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td><strong>46.25%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Bid D</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td><strong>44.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Bid E</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td><strong>44.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Bid F</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td><strong>44.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Bid G</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td><strong>42.25%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful Bid H</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td><strong>34.75%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- **Recommend for funding**
- Do not recommend for funding
Short Breaks
Grant Funding
2019 - 2021
Michael Mackay

Lead Commissioner (Inclusion, Learning & Achievement)

Jummy Hemsley

Joint Commissioning Team Leader

Alex Levey

Commissioning & Monitoring Officer
Overview

- Applications for funding go live from tomorrow, 1st November 2018 and will close on Sunday 9th December 2018. Please register with ProContract/ DueNorth.

- Funding will be for 2 years and the next round of applications will not open again until about 2 years from now.

- We have been fortunate to have the same level of funding as in previous years, but we need to do a lot more with the money.

- Everything is included this time – summer schemes are not separately commissioned.

- Demand is high and families want more choice and opportunities for their children, we have a duty to meet this need.

- We have been listening to the market, professionals and families – and learning from elsewhere.

- Our intention is to have more providers delivering a variety of short breaks in the borough – we know that you are out there, and want to break down any barriers to working with the council in the best interest of our disabled CYP and their families.
Intention of the grants

• Meet growing demand

• More providers

• Give families more choice and variety

• Break down barriers for collaboration

• Encourage innovation & sustainability

• Increase the uptake of families using direct payments – currently £12.94 an hour

• Support our disabled children & young people, and their families to have the same access and opportunities as their non-disabled peers
Needs of disabled CYP and their families in Royal Greenwich

![Bar chart showing the distribution of Statement / EHCP pupils by primary need type for England and Greenwich. The chart includes categories such as Multi-Sensory Impairment, Visual Impairment, Hearing Impairment, Specific Learning Disorder, Physical Disability, Moderate Learning Difficulty, Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulty, Other, Severe Learning Difficulty, Social, Emotional and Mental Health, Speech, Language and Communication Needs, and Autistic Spectrum Disorder. The chart compares the percentages of pupils across the two categories, with Autistic Spectrum Disorder showing the highest percentage.]
Needs of disabled CYP and their families in Royal Greenwich

**Universal Services** – services that are provided or routinely available to all children, young people and their families

**Targeted Services** – services that are aimed at disabled children and young people that require additional support, or who may need groups and services that are specifically designed to meet their needs.

**Specialist Services** – services for disabled children and young people and their families following a social care assessment and are part of an individual care plan.
### Needs of disabled CYP and their families in Royal Greenwich

*Projected demand for future provision*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>5,923</td>
<td>5,981</td>
<td>6,044</td>
<td>6,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist overnight</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,365</td>
<td>6,444</td>
<td>6,507</td>
<td>6,576</td>
<td>6,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Needs of disabled CYP and their families in Royal Greenwich

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Number of 0-17yr olds living in Ward</th>
<th>% of 0-17yr olds in ward</th>
<th>&amp; of children in low income families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Wood</td>
<td>4953</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackheath Westcombe</td>
<td>2516</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>3846</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldharbour &amp; New Eltham</td>
<td>3033</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham North</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham South</td>
<td>2621</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham West</td>
<td>2939</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyndon</td>
<td>5001</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich West</td>
<td>4011</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidbrooke with Hornfair</td>
<td>3397</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Park and Sutcliffe</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>3648</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumstead</td>
<td>4623</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooters Hill</td>
<td>3187</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamesmead Moorings</td>
<td>6665</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Common</td>
<td>5222</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich Riverside</td>
<td>5401</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67397</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.74%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Needs of disabled CYP and their families in Royal Greenwich

- In addition to specialist and universal services, we are currently offering targeted services under 5 contracts to 6 organisations;
  - Secondary aged CYP ASD activities (term time weekend & after school)
  - Secondary aged targeted activities (includes weekends, holiday breaks, summer scheme)
  - Horse Riding Lessons (term time evening and weekends, Easter & ½ term holiday club)
  - Activity & Play days both in-house & out in the community for primary aged children, term time weekends, school holidays (including summer scheme)
  - Secondary aged summer scheme
  - Primary aged summer scheme
Consultation feedback

families have told us:

- Greatest need is during school holidays - greater need during the latter part of the summer holiday period.
- Followed by regular club activities during term time, after school and especially at weekends.
- They want services they can feel confident in, reliable with appropriately trained staff.
- Short break services need to be affordable.
- They would like to be able to access short breaks without the need for a social work assessment.
- They want a greater variety of providers in the borough, especially for younger children.
- They want to be able to use their direct payments more effectively.
- Have the option to ‘buy more’ for their child through private income/ privately fund.
- Information in advance of activities in order to make better choices for their child.
- They want opportunities for their child to make friends, to have the same opportunities as their non-disabled peers and participate in a variety of age appropriate activities while being safe and having fun. They want their children to be more active, safe & have fun.
Consultation feedback

Consultation with 30 young people with a range of Special educational needs and disabilities

Young people shared that they want to;

• To go out in the community more
• Take positive risks
• Learn how to get on the bus and train – be more independent
• Make friends and go to activities for people their age
• Spending time with and without their families
• Not just attend specialist activities
• The list of activities they wanted to do is too big for this slide! Our Children and young people are ambitious, and want to do the same things like any other child.
What’s available from the grants

• 3 tiers of funding – organisations can apply for more than 1.

• Activities delivered by March 31st 2021, commence 1st April 2019.

• Funding is for 2 years, between £250p.a. - £50,000p.a.

• Opportunities for collaboration & innovation

• Meet the needs of CYP and their families in RBG

• Weekends & holidays priority
What are we looking for?

- **Play Services** – Group based activities for children aged 0-11*
- **Youth Services** – Group based activities for young people aged 12-17*
- **Overnight activity breaks** – Group based experiences for young people aged 10-17*
- **Sports activities** – Group based activities for children and young people aged 0-17
- **Transition services** – Group based services for young people preparing for adulthood aged 15-17
- **ASD specific services/ activities** – Group based activities/ services for both primary and secondary school aged CYP with a primary diagnosis of ASD. Due to the high need and demand in the borough, RBG require at least 1 ASD specific service in each of the categories listed above, spread across the borough. Whilst we require provision for all levels and types of disability, ASD remains, and is projected to be the highest need within RBG.
Process & Timetable

- Access documents via ProContract from 1st November 2018 until 9th December 2018
- Download, read all documents, complete (in word), save, upload to portal before deadline
- We will answer queries up until 4pm, Friday 30th November regarding the application
- Assessing bids Monday 10th December – Friday 14th December
- Interviews Monday 17th December – Thursday 20th December
- Moderation Panel before Christmas – Friday 21st December
- Outcome date – mid to late January 2019
- Mobilisation Period – late Jan til 31st March 2019
- Service/ Referral Commencement – 1st April 2019
- Summer schemes / Easter schemes – Be ready to begin advertising and taking applications asap
Application
Monitoring & Feedback

• We will want to know how the service is going and how well our children are doing

• Aim to make ‘monitoring’ less onerous – as a minimum we would want to know what’s being used against what we have bought, and how satisfied families are with the service

• What do you collect and how?

• How do you respond to feedback?

• How do you propose we do this?
Questions?

Childrens-commissioning@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
Thank you
Please note: CACT and Maypole Project are borough wide provisions, and Maypole Project is for all age groups.
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1. **Decision required**

Cabinet is requested to:

1.1 Note the legal requirement for the Royal Borough of Greenwich to replace the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board (GSCB) with new Multi-Agency Safeguarding Arrangements.

1.2 Approve the Multi Agency Safeguarding Arrangements outlined in this paper for publication no later than 31st March 2019.

1.2.1 Delegate responsibility and authority for ensuring full participation with the new Multi-Agency Safeguarding Arrangements to the Director of Children’s Services.

1.2.2 It is recommended that the geographical footprint for the new arrangements should be based on local authority boundaries. However, in line with work undertaken as part of the DfE Early Adopter Programme Greenwich would be prepared to align some processes, procedures and priorities with other Multi Agency Safeguarding Partnerships if it promotes more effective use of resources and a shared approach to learning and development leading to better outcomes for children and young people.

1.2.3 It is recommended that the Independent Chair of the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board be asked to undertake the role of Independent Scrutineer and that the Partnership Group be chaired by one of the lead representatives from the statutory safeguarding partners in yearly rotation.

1.2.4 It is recommended that the funding from each of the partners and relevant agencies should remain the same in 2019/20 with a review in 2020/21.
1.2.5 It is recommended that a tri borough (Greenwich, Lewisham and Bexley) Child Death Review Panel be agreed and become operational by 29th September 2019.

2. **Introduction and Background**

2.1 In 2015, the Government commissioned Alan Wood CBE, a former President of the Association of Directors of Children’s Services and ex-Director of Children’s Services in Hackney, to lead a review of the role and function of Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCBs) within the context of local strategic multi agency working. This was to include the child death review process, and consideration of how the intended centralisation of serious case reviews (SCRs) would work at local level. This review took place between January and March 2016. The review team consulted a number of leaders and experts in children’s services including Lord Laming and Baroness Jay and in total, the review considered over 600 responses.

2.2 The report concluded that although there were highly effective LSCBs, the ‘duty to cooperate'\(^1\) was not a sufficient vehicle to bring about effective collaboration between the key agencies of health, the police and local government. It recommended that Local Safeguarding Boards should be replaced by a stronger statutory partnership of the key agencies (police, NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG) and local authorities) who would in turn determine local safeguarding arrangements.

2.3 The intent was to:
- Introduce a more effective statutory framework to focus the arrangements of child protection and to ensure key agencies collaborate to deliver more effective services
- Move away from an-over prescriptive system to one that encourages and authorises local areas to determine how they organise themselves to improve outcomes for children

2.4 The government response in May 2016 endorsed the findings of the report and stated that the goal was to support and enable local agencies to work together in a system where:
- Excellent practice is the norm
- Partner agencies hold one another to account effectively
- There is early identification of ‘new’ safeguarding issues
- Learning is promoted and embedded
- Information is shared effectively

\(^1\) Section 10, Children Act 2004
• The public can feel confident that children are protected from harm

2.5 The Children and Social Work Act 2017 received Royal Assent in April 2017. Section 30 of the Act removes the requirement for local areas to have Local Safeguarding Children Boards. Sections 16 – 23 introduce a duty on three key partners (local authorities, police and CCG) to make arrangements with other partners as locally determined to work together to protect and safeguard children. These arrangements must identify and respond to the needs of children in the area and also identify and review serious child safeguarding cases which raise issues of importance in relation to the area.²

2.6 Where a case is reviewed under the supervision of the safeguarding partners, they must:
• Ensure that the reviewer provides a report on the outcome of the review
• Ensure that the reviewer makes satisfactory progress
• Ensure that the report is of satisfactory quality
• Provide the report to the Secretary of State and the Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel.

2.6.1 Other key elements of the duty are:
• The safeguarding partners must publish the arrangements
• The arrangements must include the provision of a scrutiny function by an independent person of the effectiveness of the arrangements. This role does not replace and should not be conflated with the separate requirement for overview and scrutiny within the local authority as set out in the Local Government Act 2000 and described in the Council’s Constitution.
• The child death review partners for a local authority area in England must make arrangements for the review of each death of a child normally resident in the area.

2.7 The DfE issued the revised version of Working Together to Safeguard Children in 2018. This statutory guidance sets out the requirements for the three safeguarding partners, while allowing them freedom to determine how they organise themselves to meet those requirements and improve outcomes for children locally.

2.8 In May 2018, the statutory partners (local authority, police and CCG) in the three London boroughs of Greenwich, Lewisham and Bexley submitted a joint bid to the Department for Education (DfE) for ‘early adopter’ funding to

² The full wording of Sections 16 – 31 are set out in Appendix A
move to new children’s safeguarding partnership arrangements in line with changes made within the Children and Social Work Act 2017 and new statutory guidance. The application was successful with initial notification being made in July 2018.

2.9 The bid sought to identify ways that the three boroughs might work together to explore how multi-professional strategic oversight in a geographical region where children move between local areas might reduce duplicated effort in the three areas and result in better outcomes for children. This work began in August 2018 and will conclude in March 2019. There is an expectation by the DfE that any borough that was an Early Adopter site will publish their borough multi agency safeguarding arrangements by 31st March 2019, three months in advance of the national deadline. Full implementation is required no later than 29th September 2019.

2.10 Discussions have been undertaken between the Royal Borough of Greenwich, Greenwich CCG and the police as well as relevant agencies about the most effective way of meeting the statutory requirements and improving safeguarding while retaining the strengths of the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board.

3. **Available Options**

3.1 New multi-agency safeguarding arrangements are required by legislation, therefore no change to the existing arrangements is not an option.

3.2 Local arrangements can cover two or more local authorities. Where more than one local authority joins together, the local authorities can agree to delegate their safeguarding partner duties to a single authority. This option is not recommended.

3.3 New local authority safeguarding arrangements can be developed to build upon the strengths of the Local Safeguarding Children Board. This is the preferred option as outlined below.

4. **Proposed Structure and Arrangements**

4.1 It is proposed that the new arrangements be called the Greenwich Safeguarding Children’s Partnership. An appointed Independent Scrutineer will meet regularly with the Local Authority Chief Executive, the Leader, the Lead Member for Children and Schools, the Managing Director of Greenwich
CCG and the Borough Commander for the Police South-eastern Basic Command Unit.

4.2 Responsibility for strategy would sit with an Executive Group comprising the lead representatives and a senior advisor from each of statutory partners with flexibility to co-opt other relevant professionals where appropriate. The Executive would be a strategic leadership group responsible and accountable for the effectiveness of safeguarding arrangements in the Royal Borough of Greenwich.

4.3 A Partnership Group with representatives from key relevant agencies (as defined in The Child Safeguarding Practice Review and Relevant Agency (England) Regulations 2018) will have a strategic role, working closely with the Executive Group and subgroups to agree strategic priorities, monitor, challenge and provide leadership to ensure that their agencies meet their statutory responsibility to safeguard children. The Lead Member for Children and Schools will be a participant observer of the Partnership Group.

4.4 There will be four subgroups, each chaired by a member of the Partnership Group:

- **Audit** – responsible for involving frontline operational leads, managers, staff and parents and children (where appropriate) in multi-agency audits to determine what is working and what needs to improve in multi-agency safeguarding practice. Makes recommendations for change to the Executive and Partnership Board.

- **Learning from Incidents** – responsible for recommending when notifications to the National Child Safeguarding Practice Review Panel should be made, undertaking rapid reviews and reviewing cases locally that raise issues of importance in relation to safeguarding in the area.

- **Strategic Multi Agency Child Exploitation (SMACE)** – responsible for working collaboratively to provide oversight of the Greenwich response to child sexual exploitation (CSE), sexually harmful behaviour, exploitation by criminal gangs, modern day slavery and county lines, online abuse and extremism.

- **Schools Safeguarding Network** - responsible for providing a communication channel between all schools and the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Partnership and acting source of peer support for schools in meeting safeguarding responsibilities. The purpose of the Schools Safeguarding Network is to communicate the need to safeguard and promote the welfare of children to all schools within the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
4.5 Task and finish groups, drawing upon multi agency expertise, will be convened to drive forward agreed priority objectives and emerging themes.

4.6 The chart below details the proposed structure of the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Partnership:

4.7 The above arrangements will be subject to the formal decision making arrangements of the individual organisations. Therefore, the Council will need to take any formal decisions in accordance with the Functions & Responsibilities section of the Constitution.

4.8 Royal Greenwich will maintain and be responsible for its own safeguarding arrangements. However, in recognition of the borders of the police Basic Command Unit, movement of children and families across borough boundaries and similar safeguarding issues, a Tri Borough Strategic Executive group composed of representatives from the Greenwich Executive Group, the Lewisham Executive Group and the Bexley Working Group will meet twice a year to develop shared priorities and approaches.

5 Key Issues, Requirements and Recommendations

5.1 The statutory guidance names the chief executive as the local authority’s lead representative for the new safeguarding arrangements but allows for the delegation of this function to a senior officer in the local authority who will have responsibility and authority for ensuring full participation with the
It is recommended that this responsibility be delegated to the Director of Children’s Services.

5.2 The geographical footprint for the new arrangements is based on local authority areas, but two or more local authorities can join together and delegate their safeguarding responsibility if they choose to do so. It is recommended that the local authority, police and CCG in Royal Greenwich should retain full responsibility for the safeguarding arrangements within the borough. However, in line with work undertaken as part of the DfE Early Adopter Programme Greenwich would be prepared to align some processes, procedures and priorities with other Multi Agency Safeguarding Partnerships if it promotes more effective use of resources and a shared approach to learning and development leading to better outcomes for children and young people.

5.3 LSCBs were previously inspected by Ofsted as part of the Single Inspection Framework and in the 2016 Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board was rated as ‘good’. Under the new legislation, there are no national or formal inspection regimes for the new safeguarding arrangements. Instead, the partners are required to satisfy themselves of the effectiveness of the arrangements through scrutiny by an independent person. While the decision on how best to implement a robust system of independent scrutiny is to be made locally, safeguarding partners should ensure that the scrutiny is objective, acts as a constructive critical friend and promotes reflection to drive continuous improvement. In practice, this role may be filled by a single individual, or may be a combination of a ‘Scrutineer’ working with peer reviews and other methods of measuring effectiveness. The corporate statutory scrutiny arrangements for each responsible agency are not compromised nor should they be replaced or conflated by the role of the Safeguarding Scrutineer which has a separate function.

5.4 Under the new legislation, the role of Independent Chair has been abolished and a new role of Independent Scrutineer established. It is recommended that the Independent Chair of the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board be asked to undertake the role of Independent Scrutineer. The Partnership Group will chaired by one of the lead representatives from the statutory safeguarding partners in yearly rotation.

5.5 Guidance states that the three safeguarding partners should agree the level of funding required to safeguard children in the area. The amount should be
equitable, proportionate and cover all costs including local child safeguarding practice reviews. During the next year, the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Partnership will seek opportunities to increase the efficiency and efficacy of the safeguarding arrangements in the borough and ensure that they are cost neutral for the Council. **It is recommended that the funding from each of the partners and relevant agencies should remain the same in 2019/20 with a review in 2020/21.**

5.6 Because over 80% of child deaths have a medical or public health cause and it is estimated that only 4% require a serious case review, ownership of child death reviews was moved from the Department for Education to the Department of Health. In order to ensure that information from the Child Death Review process is systematically captured and to enable learning to prevent future deaths the Department of Health has recommended that a minimum of sixty child deaths per year should be reviewed. The legislation allows CCGs and Local Authorities to combine to deliver the Child Death Review function. In 2017/18 RBG recorded thirty-five child deaths so it would be unable to operate independently. Together Bexley, Lewisham and Greenwich recorded seventy-five deaths during that same period. **It is recommended that a tri borough (Greenwich, Lewisham and Bexley) Child Death Review Panel be agreed and become operational by 29th September 2019.**

6. **Reasons for Recommendations**

6.1 Although the Wood report recommended the abolition of Local Safeguarding Boards, it did recognise that there were a number of effective ones. The Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board was rated as good in 2016 and in the recent JTAI (2018), inspectors wrote “There is strong partnership working in Greenwich and a shared commitment to improving services for all children at risk of harm... The effective work of the Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB), strong leadership in many agencies and a shared belief in a partnership approach provide fertile ground for practice to further evolve and improve.”

6.2 A key feature of effective partnership working in Greenwich is that the culture is not complacent. There is unanimous commitment to the first sentence of Working Together “Nothing is more important than children’s welfare”. This underpins a recognition that even if arrangements are ‘good’ there is room for improvement. Consequently, the opportunity offered by the new legislation to have a greater say over the remit of the partnership, promote innovation and deliver better efficiency has been welcomed.
6.3 However, we believe that evolutionary and incremental change is most likely to deliver improvements. These recommendations have been developed to ensure that Greenwich complies with its legal requirements and lay the groundwork for further improvement without destabilising effective arrangements and past success.

6.4 We believe that the proposals outlined in this paper are the most effective arrangements for the present, but will, where necessary, adapt to ensure that we continue to develop an environment in which leaders know what is necessary and are able to deliver a system to ensure that practice leaders and practitioners have the knowledge, judgment, skills and support necessary to protect children.

7. **Consultation Results**

7.1 A working party comprising the Director of Children’s Services, Senior Assistant Director of Children’s Social Care, Director of Quality and Integrated Governance at Greenwich Clinical Commissioning Group, the Designated Nurse for Safeguarding, the Head of Safeguarding for the Police Basic Command Unit and the current Chair of the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board have met to agree outline proposals which were discussed at the Executive Board on 24th January 2019.

7.2 All current members of the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board Executive Group as well all members of existing sub groups were asked to participate in an on-line consultation (Appendix B) to identify positive aspects of the current arrangements as well areas for improvement. Open questions were asked to ensure that respondents had freedom to focus on areas that were most important to them.

7.3 The response was overwhelmingly positive. Existing arrangements were highly valued and respondents indicated a desire to ensure that areas of good practice were retained. Respondents were positive about the opportunities offered under the new arrangements including the focus on joint ownership and accountability across the partnership. Responses have shaped the specifics in the development of the new arrangements.

8 **Next Steps: Communication and Implementation of the Decision**

8.1 Following approval by Cabinet, the proposed new arrangements will be submitted to the DfE for a final compliance check.
8.2 Upon receipt of their approval, the new safeguarding arrangements will be published by 31st March 2019 with an implementation date of 29th June 2019.

9. **Cross-Cutting Issues and Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Sign-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal including Human Rights Act</td>
<td>Sections 16–23 of the Children and Social Work Act 2017 set out the arrangements for local multi-agency safeguarding partnerships to replace the previous model of local safeguarding children boards (LSCBs). The safeguarding partners for a local authority area (named as the local authority, clinical commissioning group and police) are required to make arrangements for themselves and relevant agencies to work together in exercising their functions for the purpose of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the area. The Act also makes further provisions regarding local child safeguarding practice reviews, including enabling the Secretary of State to make regulations which provide for enforcement and requiring the safeguarding partners to prepare and publish a report on their work at least once every 12 months. There is provision in the Act, Section 21, which enables the safeguarding partners for two or more local authority areas in England to agree that their areas are treated as a single area and to allow those authorities to arrange for one of them to carry out the functions on behalf of the other. The arrangements set out this report will ensure that the safeguarding partners are</td>
<td>John Scarborough, Head of Legal Services, 6 March 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
able to identify and respond to the needs of children in the area and also identify and review serious child safeguarding cases which raise issues of importance in relation to the area.

Under the Responsibility for Functions section of the Council's Constitution, Cabinet is authorised to take the decisions set out in paragraph 1 of the report.

| Finance and other resources including procurement implications | This report requests that Cabinet Committee note the legal requirement for the Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board be replaced by new multi-agency safeguarding arrangements. Resources to meet the cost of the proposed change in arrangements are currently cost neutral, but may be affected by changes in borough or other external contributions. | Carolyn Knowles, Head of Accountancy and Business Change 13th February 2019 |
| Equalities | The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no apparent equality impact on end users. | Henrietta Quartano Senior Assistant Director 13th February 2019 |
| Staffing establishment | There are no staffing implications. | Henrietta Quartano Senior Assistant Director 13th February 2019 |

10. **Report Appendices**

10.1 The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:

- **Appendix A**: Consultation with current members of Executive and Sub Groups on Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board
Appendix A – Consultation with current members of Executive and Sub Groups on Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board

Question 1:
What agency do you represent?

Question 2:
What do you value most about the work of the current Greenwich Safeguarding Children Board? (Please give examples of positive impact on practice and improvements to safeguarding that benefit children, young people and families if possible)

Question 3:
How can we use the new Multi Agency Safeguarding Arrangements to improve?

Question 4:
If you currently sit on one or more of the subgroups, what do you value most about its/their contribution to safeguarding children? (Please give examples where possible)

Question 5:
Thank-you for taking the time to complete this survey. You may add any additional comments you would like to make in the space below
1. **Decision required**

1.1 To note the summary of Exemptions to Contract Standing Orders reported for the period 1 September 2018 to 30 November 2018, detailed in Appendix I.

1.2 To note the summary of Variations under Contract Standing Orders reported for the period 1 September 2018 to 30 November 2018, detailed in Appendix II.

1.3 To note the requirement to refer the report to Overview and Scrutiny as per paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 below.

2. **Links to the Royal Greenwich high level objectives**

2.1 An effective procurement framework helps to facilitate the smooth running of council services and to facilitate policy objectives.

3. **Introduction and Background**

3.1 Contract Standing Orders (Section 7, 12 & Section 28) require the Chief Executive and Chief Officers to submit a report containing a summary of Exemptions and Variations granted to Cabinet and Overview & Scrutiny.
4. **Exemptions and Variations**

4.1 **Contract Standing Orders**, requires the Chief Executive and Chief Officers to keep a register of Exemptions and the reasons they were granted, and must summarise these in a report to Cabinet and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

4.1.1 The summary of Exemptions from Contract Standing Orders for the period 1 September 2018 to 30 November 2018 are:

**Directorate of Housing & Safer Communities**

**C&E1** - To award a contract to Sail Greenwich Ltd for the delivery of the Tall Ships 2018 event at a cost of £20,000.

**H&SCI** - To award a contract without competition to Jewson Ltd/TA George Boyd Ltd for the supply and fit of solid timber 30 or 60 minute fire rated flat entrance door-sets, at a cost of £46,360.

4.2 **Contract Standing Orders**, requires the Chief Executive and Chief Officers to keep a register of Variations and the reasons they were granted, and must summarise these in a report to Cabinet and to Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

4.2.1 The summary of Variations under Contract Standing Orders reported for the period 1 September 2018 to 30 November 2018 are:

**Directorate of Health and Adult Services**

**HASV1** - A variation of the contract with METRO Ltd to integrate website management with the HIV Prevention and Sexual Health Promotion provision to allow for an improved service model, at a cost of £83,427.

**HASV2** - Variation to existing contract with MCCH for a 6-month extension to deliver accommodation-based care and
support for people with learning difficulties, at a cost of £2,043,016.62.

**HASV3** - Variation to existing contract with *Advocacy for All* for a 12-month extension to deliver Independent Mental Capacity Advocate (IMCA) service, at a cost of £65,000.

**HASV4** - Variation to existing contract with *Greenwich Advocacy Partnership* for a 12-month extension to deliver Independent Mental Health Advocacy (IMHA) service, at an approximate cost of £53,013.70.

**HASV5** - Variation to existing contract with *Advocacy for Older People* for a 12-month extension to deliver Independent advocacy service, at an approximate cost of £25,000.

**HASV6** - Variation to existing contract with *Greenwich Advocacy Partnership* for a 12-month extension to deliver Independent advocacy service, at an approximate cost of £75,000.

**Directorate of Housing & Safer Communities**

**H&SCV1** - A variation to the contract with Farrer Huxley for the additional landscape works in Barnfield Estate at a cost of £261,975

**Directorate of Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills**

**CON1079** - A variation to the contract with Iceni Projects Ltd to provide consultancy services for design development and determination of planning approval for the demolition and part retention of the listed huts in Gordon primary school, at a cost of £29,697

**CON1095** - A Variation to existing contract with *Glenman Construction*, for £1,745,268, *Currie & Brown* £116,256, and *Perfect Circle JV Ltd* for £50,288 for the expansion works at Plumcroft.
Primary School (Vincent Road SE18). The total variation amount is £1,911,812.

5. **Cross-Cutting Issues and Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Sign-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong> including Human Rights Act</td>
<td>The report raises no legal issues</td>
<td>Azuka Onuorah Deputy Head of Legal Services 4th February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong> and other resources including procurement implications</td>
<td>The Director of Finance has authored this information report and there are no further financial implications to consider</td>
<td>Damon Cook Assistant Director - Corporate Finance and Deputy S151 Officer March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equalities</strong></td>
<td>The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no apparent equality impact on end users.</td>
<td>William Jabang Head of Corporate Procurement January 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Report Appendices**

6.1 The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:
   - Appendix I: Exemptions
   - Appendix II: Variations

7 **Background Papers**

None
## Directorate of Communities and Environment (CE)

**Exemption Description: CE1**

To agree, in accordance with contract standing order 7, an exemption from Contract Standing Orders in order to award a contract to Sail Greenwich Ltd (hereafter SGL) for up to 900 school children and local residents to have free access to ships visiting the borough as part of the Tall Ships 2018 event at a costs of £20,000. The contract also included a contribution to a Fireworks event in Woolwich, during the event. No contribution was made to the Fireworks event in Greenwich World Heritage Site.

**Name of Contractor:**

Sail Greenwich Ltd (hereafter SGL)

**Reason for Exemption (please include details of all dates/timelines and timetables where applicable):**

Sail Greenwich has a longstanding association with the Royal Borough of Greenwich and is uniquely placed to offer a service to the Borough in terms of community access to the Tall Ships. No other provider has the unique capability of access to the Ships and understanding of the Borough’s need to provide community and schools access.

**Date of Exemption:**

16th October 2018

**Brief Summary of any action taken:**

A contract for services was awarded to Sail Greenwich in relation to a small Tall Ships event that took place in RBG from 4th-8th July 2018.

**Value/Cost of the Exemption:**

£20,000

**In the case of works awarded without competition to this provider in the previous 2 years, provide details and amounts**

In 2016, this supplier was appointed to provide ships and river tours for a mini Sail Royal Greenwich and for consultancy, ships and river tours as part of the Rendez Vous Tall Ships Regatta in 2017.
ITEM NO: 7 (Appendix 1)

**Financial Implications:**

The total spend with this supplier is £106,471

---

**Directorate of Housing & Safer Communities**

**Exemption Description: H&SCI**

The supply and fit of solid timber 30 or 60 minute fire rated flat entrance door-sets

**Reason for Exemption (please include details of all dates/timelines and timetables where applicable):**

*(THE LEVEL OF DETAIL HERE MUST BE AT LEAST THE SAME AS THE DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT)*

Approve an exemption from Contract Standing Orders 12.1, under the provisions of Contract Standing Order 7, for a single tender award and appoint Jewsons Ltd, trading as George Boyd Ltd, at a cost of £46,360.

**Date of Exemption:**

4th September 2018

**Brief Summary of any action taken:**

Following an announcement that the manufacturers of GRP fire rated doors have ceased manufacture with immediate effect, arrangements for urgent provision to meet immediate needs have been put in place through this single tender award, pending longer term procurement, to ensure the authority continues to meet its fire safety obligations to residents.

**In the case of works awarded without competition to this provider in the previous 2 years, provide details and amounts (£):**

No previous awards from Housing & Safer Communities Directorate.

**Financial Implications:**

Award value is £46,360 funded from an agreed Housing Capital Allocation of £3m.
### Directorate of Health & Adult Services

**Contract Name/Description:** HASV1  
HIV Prevention and Sexual Health Promotion

**Contract Value (Tendered):**  
£775,348  

**Name of Contractor:**  
METRO Ltd.

**Contract Period (Please state start/finish dates):**  
1st October 2015 to 31/07/2018

**Variation Description:**  
Metro Ltd are currently commissioned to provide a non-judgemental up-to-date, comprehensive and relevant sexual health service for gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men (MSM) enabling them to feel safer and supported as they develop their sexual identity. The service also supports service users to live well through support provided in making healthier choices about their lives and supports HIV positive people in the same way enabling them to feel respected and valued whilst ensuring they lead longer healthier lives and receive appropriate health and social care support. Whilst this work area is still a priority for the Public Health department and the wider council, departmental cost pressures have led to some contract streamlining and a reduction of 10% has been proposed as an acceptable reduction going forward which utilises cost efficiencies made through successful contract management over the initial 3 years. In line with the decision to ensure cost efficiencies are achieved, a variation approval was sought to integrate website management to allow for an improved service model. The variation period is for 18 months and it is aligned with the main contract, which allows for a further 2 years extensions at the end of the original term.

**Variation Date:**  
01/10/2018

**Value/Cost of Variation:**  
£83,427

**Cumulative Value (Tendered Contract value plus all Variation Values to date):**  
Total value of contract is £858,774.95

This comprises the value of the main contract for the initial period of 3 year which is £535,169, plus, the contract had an extension provision for 2 years of which, 18 months...
extension has been utilised at an additional cost of £240,178.95. The variation of the contract to include website work added £83,427.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Impact of Variation:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The main contract had option to extend for a further two years, which extend the contract until 31st March 2020. This variation is for a period of 18 months, ending at same time with the main contract i.e. 31st March 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments: | N/A |
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| **Contract Name/Description:** HASV2  
Accommodation-based care and support for people with learning difficulties |
|---|

| **Contract Value (Tendered):**  
£23,350,454.10 |
|---|

| **Name of Contractor:**  
MCCH |
|---|

| **Contract Period (Please state start/finish dates):**  
01/07/2011 – 30/06/2016 |
|---|

| **Variation Description:**  
The Contract with MCCH was initially for three years with an option to extend for up to two years, which was done. It was initially negotiated by Greenwich Primary Care Trust (PCT) and the responsibility for the contract was transferred to Royal Greenwich by way of novation at the time the contract was signed. This was due to a statutory transfer of resources from PCTs to local authorities in 2011. The PCT (now Greenwich Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG)) retained an interest in the contract, contributing approximately £900,000. However, GCCG withdrew from the contract with immediate effect from 1 July 2016. Four of the properties (The Gables, Samuel Close, Erindale Terrace and Arnold House) are owned by the NHS. At the start of the contract there was an agreement in place where Greenwich PCT paid MCCH £350,000 per annum to cover the rent for these properties; MCCH would then pay the rent over to NHS in a cyclical arrangement. However, in July 2016 GCCG withdrew from this arrangement, |
|---|

Given that the Council has Service Users in the properties, many of whom have been resident in the accommodation for several years, a six months variation of the length of the contract was sought to ensure continuity of service. The extension by 6 months will allow Senior Management within Royal Greenwich and GCCG to agree a way forward regarding the rent deficit, as well as giving the Strategic Commissioning team the requisite time to make our intentions known to the market. |

| **Variation Date:**  
01/10/2018 |
|---|

| **Value/Cost of Variation:**  
£2,043,016.62 |
|---|

| **Cumulative Value (Tendered Contract value plus all Variation Values to date):**  
£31,634,411.31  
This cumulative value comprise:  
Tendered contract value plus, the cumulative impact of inflationary uplift over the years |
|---|
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(£1,592,531.49), plus the value of the extension covering July 2017 to October 2017 of £1,549,469.70, plus the value of the extension covering November 2017 to June 2018 of £3,098,939.40 and plus the cost of the variation cited in this report.

In summary, the cumulative value of the contract is as follows:

Original tender price = £23,350,454.10
+ £1,592,531.49
+ £1,549,469.70
+ £3,098,939.40
+ £2,043,016.62

**Cumulative value = £31,634,411.31**

**Time Impact of Variation:**
This variation started from 1st July 2018 until 31st December 2018.

**Comments:** N/A
**Contract Name/Description:** HASV3  
Independent Mental Capacity Advocate (IMCA) service

**Contract Value (Tendered):**  
£79,000

**Name of Contractor:**  
Advocacy for All

**Contract Period (Please state start/finish dates):**  
1 year (01/04/2018 – 31/03/2019)

**Variation Description:**  
The current contract which is for a period of 1 year expires on 31st March 2019. This variation aims to extend the continuation of service delivery to cover the period from 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2020 i.e. 12 months extension. The extension is requested to allow sufficient time for the Strategic Commissioning team to undertake a procurement exercise for a service or services to deliver all statutory advocacy provision, which can be taken to market in late 2019 in order for the successful provider(s) to deliver services from 1st April 2020.

The service will be delivered on a spot purchase basis, with the hourly rate charged by Advocacy for All as follows:
- Up to 700 hours in the year £30.93
- 701 – 900 hours in the year £27.10
- 901 hours or more in the year £26.15

The spend on IMCA for 2019-20 is anticipated to be around £65,000, based on previous years’ expenditure.

**Variation Date:**  
20/11/2018

**Value/Cost of Variation:**  
Approximately £65,000

**Cumulative Value (Tendered Contract value plus all Variation Values to date):**  
£144,000

**Time Impact of Variation:**  
Original contract period expires on 31st March 2019, this variation extends the contract for a further 12 months, ending 31st March 2020

**Comments:**  
N/A
**Contract Name/Description:** HASV4

Independent Mental Health Advocacy (IMHA) service

**Contract Value (Tendered):**

£96,000

**Name of Contractor:**

Greenwich Advocacy Partnership

**Contract Period (Please state start/finish dates):**

23 months (10/04/2017 – 09/04/2019)

**Variation Description:**

RBG commissioned a service to deliver Independent Mental Health Advocacy (IMHA) from Greenwich Advocacy Partnership (a consortium of local providers comprising Metro (Greenwich), Greenwich MIND, Advocacy in Greenwich and Advocacy for Older People) for a period of 23 months, commencing 10th April 2017. The current contract expires on 9th March 2019. A variation to the length of the contract is requested to allow sufficient time for the Strategic Commissioning team to undertake a procurement exercise for a service or services to deliver all statutory advocacy provision, which can be taken to market in late 2019 in order for the successful provider(s) to deliver the services from 1st April 2020.

**Variation Date:**

24/10/2018

**Value/Cost of Variation:**

Approximately £53,013.70

**Cumulative Value (Tendered Contract value plus all Variation Values to date):**

£149,013.70

**Time Impact of Variation:**

Whereas, the current contract expires on 9th March 2019, the variation to the length of the contract means that the Council, through the provider, can continue to deliver the service up to 31st March 2020, when a new provider would have been sourced to start providing the service from 1st April 2020.

**Comments:**

N/A
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contract Name/Description:</strong> HASV5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent advocacy service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contract Value (Tendered):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Contractor:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for Older People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contract Period (Please state start/finish dates):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 years (01/04/2015 – 31/03/2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Variation Description:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The contract was awarded via the 2014 Voluntary and Community Sector grant funding process. As independent advocacy is a statutory requirement it has been decided that this provision should not be met by grant funding in future, but should be met by the Health and Adult Services care packages budgets. Although the primary function of the service is to support the provision of independent advocacy for Royal Greenwich residents over the age of 55, Advocacy for Older People have been able to support adults outside of this cohort in previous years. The current contract, which was awarded for a period of 4 years, expires on 31st March 2019. A variation is sought to extend the length of the Contract to allow sufficient time for the Strategic Commissioning team to undertake a procurement exercise for a service or services to deliver all statutory advocacy provision, which can be taken to market in late 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Variation Date:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/11/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Value/Cost of Variation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cumulative Value (Tendered Contract value plus all Variation Values to date):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Time Impact of Variation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A new procurement exercise is expected to commence in late 2019, with the aim of appointing the successful provider(s) to deliver services from 1st April 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comments:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contract Name/Description:</strong> HASV6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent advocacy service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contract Value (Tendered):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Contractor:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich Advocacy Partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contract Period (Please state start/finish dates):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 years (01/04/2015 – 31/03/2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Variation Description:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBG commissioned a service from Greenwich Advocacy Partnership (a consortium of local providers comprising Metro (Greenwich), Greenwich MIND, Advocacy in Greenwich and Advocacy for Older People) to deliver independent advocacy as required by The Care Act 2014. The original contract, which was awarded for 4-years, expires on 31st March 2019. While the current provision is funded by the third sector grant, as independent advocacy is a statutory requirement it has been decided that this provision should not be met by grant funding in future, but should be met by the Health and Adult Services care packages budgets. Therefore, a variation to the length of the contract is requested to allow sufficient time for the Strategic Commissioning team to undertake a procurement exercise for a service or services to deliver all statutory advocacy provision, which can be taken to market in late 2019 in order for the successful provider(s) to deliver services from 1st April 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Variation Date:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20/11/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Value/Cost of Variation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cumulative Value (Tendered Contract value plus all Variation Values to date):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£375,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Time Impact of Variation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The variation of the contract length requested is to cover the period from 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2020. There are plans to take this requirement to the market in late 2019, for the successful provider(s) to deliver services from 1st April 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comments:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Directorate of Housing & Safer Communities

| **Contract Name/Description:** | H&SCV1  
Barnfield Estate Environmental & Landscape Design Management Fees |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Value (Tendered):</strong></td>
<td>£116,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of Contractor:</strong></td>
<td>Farrer Huxley Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Period (Please state start/finish dates):</strong></td>
<td>31st October 2018 to 30th April 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Variation Description:** | (THE LEVEL OF DETAIL HERE MUST BE AT LEAST THE SAME AS THE DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT)  
A competitive tender was undertaken in April 2016 to appoint a consultant to carry out multi-disciplinary consultancy services for the consultation, design, procurement and supervision of environmental and landscape works. Subsequent increases in the scope of works, design changes and additional resident consultation/open days (various stakeholders’ consultations) resulted in additional landscape consultant fees for Farrer Huxley Associates to cover the changes. |
| **Variation Date:** | 12/10/2018 |
| **Value/Cost of Variation:** | £261,975 |
| **Cumulative Value (Tendered Contract value plus all Variation Values to date):** | £378,175.00 |
| **Time Impact of Variation:** | The preparatory works have ceased since the exhaustion of the original tendered sum in July 2018, which has resulted in a delay in the contract being tendered and its subsequent progression to the construction phase. |
| **Comments:** | None. |
Directorate of Regeneration, Enterprise & Skills (DRES)

**Contract Name/Description: CON 1079**

A variation to increase the contract value of Iceni Projects Ltd to provide consultancy services for design development and determination of planning approval for the demolition and part retention of the listed huts at Gordon primary school.

**Contract Value (Tendered):**

£20,872

**Name of Contractor:**

Iceni Projects Ltd

**Contract Period (Please state start/finish dates):**

June 2017 to April 2019

**Variation Description:**

The original commissioning was for an options appraisal and heritage statement at Gordon Primary School, which was awarded to Iceni Projects Ltd at £20,872. The options appraisal pulled together previous feasibilities and current condition to consider what are the best reuse and redevelopment of the huts, whilst trying to retain their heritage significance.

This variation is to cover the fees for the design input required and submission of a planning application, at a cost of £29,697

**Variation Date:**

2/10/2018

**Value/Cost of Variation:**

£29,697

**Cumulative Value (Tendered Contract value plus all Variation Values to date):**

£50,569

**Time Impact of Variation:**

The process is broken down in five stages with costs and the proposed programme of when
the application is likely to be determined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Design Briefing, Client Liaison &amp; Concept Design Development</td>
<td>£ 8,607</td>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design Development Detail</td>
<td>£ 4,474</td>
<td>Nov 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Preparation of Application Design Pack including Surveys and Drawings</td>
<td>£ 8,271</td>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Design, Access &amp; Heritage Statements</td>
<td>£ 4,951</td>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Submission &amp; Determination Management</td>
<td>£ 3,394</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Determination Date</th>
<th>Apr 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee Quotation</td>
<td>£ 29,697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
N/A
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**Contract Name/Description: CON1095**  
Plumcroft Primary School (Vincent Road SE18) – Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Value (Tendered):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£7,463,851.01 – Glenman Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£154,840.00 – Currie &amp; Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£127,910.50 – Perfect Circle JV Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Contractor:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenman Construction – Main contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie &amp; Brown - Professional Services (Employers Agent, QS &amp; Principal Designer CDM).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Circle JV Ltd. – Professional Services (Project Management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contract Period (Please state start/finish dates): | 2/2/17 – 19/10/18 |

## Variation Description:

A demolition and enabling works contract was awarded to and undertaken by 777 Demolitions and Haulage Co Ltd, report CON717. This was to demolish existing residential properties and provide a site at Vincent Road SE18 suitable to construct a new school. It was undertaken in advance of the main school construction works.

As part of this enabling work 777 Demolitions and Haulage Co Ltd undertook work to the Thames Water owned sewers on the site. These works were to be installed in accordance with issued layouts and in accordance to specifications. All works on the sewers were required to be to a standard which Thames Water would accept for adoption.

Glenman Construction was subsequently appointed to build the new Plumcroft School campus, report CON780, on the site at Vincent Road. During the construction period issues began to present in the newly laid sewers across the site. Glenman undertook urgent repairs to a section of the sewer.

The issues arising with the sewers required investigation. Trial hole excavations, CCTV of the sewers runs and visual inspection on manholes were undertaken. The outcome of which was a view, provided by external technical consultants that remedial works were required to provide a sewerage system which was constructed to specification.

A Thames Water engineer visited site, inspected the sewer works completed during the enabling contract and confirmed that additional work was required to achieve a standard suitable for their adoption.
On 17\textsuperscript{th} January 2018 a letter was sent from RBG Legal Services, notifying 777 Demolitions and Haulage Co Ltd of a Defect to Sewage Diversion. This letter provided early warning that remedial work to the sewers was required and would likely extend beyond contract programme. It provided an overview of the likely defects known at the time of dispatch and informed that defective work must be remedied in the first instance in order for the main works to continue unabated.

The letter offered opportunity to 777 Demolitions and Haulage Co Ltd to undertake the remedial works, failing this a third party would be instructed to perform the remedial works and all costs incurred, as a consequence shall be to their account. 777 Demolitions and Haulage Co Ltd responded by letter dated 22\textsuperscript{nd} January 2018, stating that they did not accept any liability for the defective works.

777 Demolitions and Haulage Co Ltd were notified of the intention to instruct Glenman Construction to undertake the remedial works known at the time. This instruction resulted in an Extension of Time to the contract. Failure to instruct Glenman promptly would have resulted in additional delay and cost to the project.

The rectification works were undertaken by Glenman and the scheme is now complete. Review and assessment is currently underway to determine the full impact of the sewer remediation and subsequent impact on the overall project cost and the Council will seek to recover these costs from 777 Demolitions and Haulage Co Ltd.

Following a final site inspection by Thames Water on 18th October 2018, and confirmation following this visit, the sewerage system as diverted throughout the new school site is regarded as acceptable for adoption by Thames Water. This has now been formalised within the Thames Water Sewer Diversion agreement.

The variation to Curry & Brown’s contract and Perfect Circle contract is in relation to additional fees caused by the sewer remediation works and fees to analyse and calculate the exact costs and liabilities associated with the sewer remediation works. Legal proceedings have been initiated against 777 Demolitions and Haulage Co Ltd to recover these costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation Date:</th>
<th>30/11/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value/Cost of Variation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- £1,745,268 – Glenman Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- £116,256 – Currie &amp; Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- £50,288 – Perfect Circle JV Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the construction period issues arose requiring additional sewer remediation work. This increased the main works cost, the level of professional services fees and prolonged the delivery programme. As a result there was a requirement to vary the contracts currently in place on the project.
The total value of the variations is £1,911,812, however due to available funding and contingency this represents an increase against the current budget of £1,166,227 (see the table below).

### Cumulative Value (Tendered Contract value plus all Variation Values to date):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Current Contract Value</th>
<th>Final Anticipated Value</th>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Additional budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction works – Glenman Construction</td>
<td>£7,463,851</td>
<td>£9,209,119</td>
<td>£1,745,268</td>
<td>£8,035,000</td>
<td>£1,174,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees – Currie &amp; Brown</td>
<td>£154,840</td>
<td>£271,096</td>
<td>£116,256</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£221,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees – Perfect Circle JV Ltd</td>
<td>£127,910</td>
<td>£178,198</td>
<td>£50,288</td>
<td>£639,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional fees</td>
<td>£411,339</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>-£300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition/Enabling &amp; other project costs</td>
<td>£1,646,474</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,575,999</td>
<td>£70,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£7,746,602</td>
<td>£11,716,227</td>
<td>£1,911,812</td>
<td>£10,550,000</td>
<td>£1,166,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimated total project cost is currently £11,716,227, a sum of £1,166,227 above the existing approved budget. Representing an increase in overall project cost of 11.05%.

### Time Impact of Variation:

The Practical Completion date was extended from 27/4/18 to 19/10/18

### Comments:

The costs can be accommodated within the existing Schools Capital Programme budgets and contingency therefore there is no additional budget pressure as a result of the variations. The majority of the additional costs should be recovered, subject to the success of the legal process.
1. **Decision required**

Cabinet is requested to:

1.1 Agree to the Connaught Phases 2 and 3 Viability Test by way of a Deed of Variation (Appendix 1), which delays the Council’s receipt of Phases 2 and 3 project and vacant possession costs (6.4), and to authorise the Head of Legal Services to execute (sign and/or seal) the necessary legal documents. The Deed of Variation will be entered in to once the proposed appropriation for planning purposes has occurred.

1.2 Agree to grant a 300 year lease of the land at the former Connaught Estate, SE18, hatched red on the plan and attached as Appendix 2 (the “Phases 2 & 3 Land”) from the Housing Revenue Account to Lovell Partnerships Ltd.

1.3 Agree to appropriate the Phases 2 & 3 Land at the former Connaught Estate, after the 300 year lease at 1.2 has been granted, from its present housing purpose to planning purposes pursuant to Section 122 Local Government Act 1972 and subject to the powers provided by Section 203 Housing & Planning Act 2016 for the reasons set out in Section 8 of this report.

ITEM NO: 8
1.4 Agree to the freehold transfer of the same land pursuant to the Development Agreement (DA) between the Council and Lovell Partnerships Ltd was signed in July 2013 subject to the powers provided by Section 233 Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

1.5 The Deed of Variation of the 8th September 2016 entered into by the Council, Lovell and Morgan Sindal contains an indemnity in the Council’s favour for any claims or demands, including for compensation, as a result of rights being infringed where appropriation for planning purposes has taken place.

1.6 Agree to treat the information in Appendix 1, 3, 4 and 5 as exempt under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A, point 3, “information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)”.

1.7 Agree that the exempt information, presented in this report is not subsequently released to the press or public.

1.8 Note that the decisions being sought in this report will allow the Council to fulfil its obligations under the Development Agreement, for Connaught Phases 2 & 3.

1.9 To note under the current scheme of delegation the Leader approves appropriations, in this case, the Leader has agreed to a variation to the scheme of delegation to enable Cabinet to make the appropriation decision.

2. **Links to the Royal Greenwich Strategy**

2.1 This report reflects and directly contributes to the Council objectives as outlined within the Greenwich Corporate Plan 2018 - 2022:

- Housing
- Ensure a healthy and safe living environment
- Support and protect children and families in need
- Social care and health
- Promote economic prosperity

2.2 Specifically, the subject matter to which this report relates will increase Royal Greenwich’s supply of affordable housing, thereby supporting the alleviation
of housing need and improving economic and health and well-being outcomes for residents.

2.3 Relating to Housing, the appropriation is a pre-requisite to the transfer of land from the Council to Lovell in recognition that the land previously formed part of the former Connaught Estate. The transfer will allow Lovell to construct up to 352 new homes, as part of the wider Woolwich Estates development and is an obligation set out in the Development Agreement between the Council & Lovell Partnerships.

3. **Purpose of Report and Executive Summary**

3.1 The DA provides for the phased transfer of land forming the Woolwich Estates Regeneration Scheme and sets out criteria that need to be met ahead of any transfer of land from the Council to the Developer. One such criterion is agreement to each phase Viability Test.

3.2 The Phase 2 and 3 Viability Test has been agreed through detailed discussions between Lovell Partnerships and Royal Borough of Greenwich (RBG) officers and its commercial advisors, PWC and cost consultants, Currie Brown. Appendix 3 sets out a report from PWC detailing the key terms of the Viability Test and the process entered into to enable it to be agreed.

3.3 The comprehensive DA between the Council and Lovell Partnerships in relation to the Woolwich Estates development requires the Council to appropriate land within the development site for planning purposes when requested to do so by the Developer.

3.4 The DA between Lovell and the Council also requires the Council to transfer land to the Developer on a phased basis, subject to agreed construction targets being met.

4. **Introduction and Background**

4.1 **Cabinet Decision**

4.1.1 This report is intended to bring Cabinet up to date on all aspects of the scheme. It is prudent therefore that Cabinet consider and endorse the key decisions outlined in section 1 to enable the project to progress to the next stage working jointly with our Development Partner, Lovell. Updates will be brought to future Cabinet meetings as necessary.
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4.2 Viability Background

4.2.1 On 20th June 2012, Cabinet agreed to enter into a DA with Lovell Partnerships Ltd, Morgan Sindall Group PLC and Asra Housing Association (now called PA Housing) to enable the phased redevelopment of Connaught, Maryon Road and Grove and Morris Walk housing estates (hereafter known as the Woolwich Estates Regeneration Scheme).

4.2.2 The DA sets out the conditions precedent to be fulfilled prior to each phase of the scheme going live. This includes a condition precedent that the Phase Viability Condition is satisfied for each relevant phase.

4.2.3 The Deed of Variation (DOV) sets out that post Viability, conditions required to be satisfied are to appropriate and to transfer the land.

4.3 Appropriation Background

4.3.1 The DA between the Council and Lovell Partnerships in regard to the Woolwich Estates development requires the Council to appropriate land within the development site for planning purposes when requested to do so by the Developer.

5. The Phase Viability Condition

5.1 The Phase Viability Condition is met if at the time the Viability Test Model is produced for a phase / subsequent phases, it delivers a positive residual land value and demonstrates a Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) to Lovell as stated in Appendix 4. The ROCE is a measure of the profitability of the Viability Test Model taking into account the amount of capital (equity and debt) invested by Lovells. Note that the Phase Viability Condition is satisfied so long as there is a positive residual land value: there is no minimum amount.

6. Connaught Phases 2 and 3 Viability Test Outputs

6.1 The DA establishes that in order for the phase viability condition to be met, the financial model must demonstrate a ROCE to Lovell as stated in Appendix 4. The ROCE for phases 2+3 falls below the test level. Lovell has however confirmed that they will accept this ROCE in the spirit of partnership working to enable progression of these phases of the scheme.

6.2 The primary reasons for the lower than required ROCE relate to changes to the phasing of construction and sales. The build programme was
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unfortunately not representative in terms of work in progress; the sales profile was unrealistic due to the overlap of Phases 2 and 3.

6.3 The Deed of Variation will have no impact on the land values and payments will be due as contractually stated in the Development Agreement.

6.4 The Phase 2 and 3 ROCE Appendix 4 is based on RBG agreeing to delay its project costs and vacant possession costs for phases 2 and 3 (outline of changes below). In not delaying the project and vacant possession costs, the ROCE would fall to a level that would mean the scheme was not viable for Lovell to continue with the programme.

**Connaught Phase 2:**

- Vacant possession costs of £2m delayed from November 2019 to January 2021
- Project Costs of £285,000 delayed from between September 2019 and September 2020 to all being paid in January 2021

**Connaught Phase 3:**

- Vacant possession costs of £2.3m delayed from December 2020 to November 2022
- Project Costs of £900,000 delayed from between August 2018 and June 2020 to all being paid in November 2022

6.5 As indicated in the report, the consortium has developed a financial model for the project, which may be considered as broadly viable and as a basis for taking the project forward at this stage. This is a dynamic model, whereby agreed factors will vary as the Development proceeds, which will be subject to future viability tests to determine the timing of and extent to which the Royal Borough will receive any reimbursement of re-housing and buy back costs and any future overage payments.

6.6 The definition of Phase Viability Condition is any Phase for which the Viability Test Model applies (except in circumstances where this Agreement was terminated), delivering a positive residual land value (even if that is different from that delivered when the Project Viability Condition was passed in respect of the Project Conditions) and that the ROCE at the time the Viability Test Model is produced calculated across all Phases (other than any in respect of which this Agreement has terminated) is not less than that stated in Appendix 4.
7. **The Financial Model**

7.1 The details of how the model works are contained within Schedule 8 of the DA. Appendix 5 (Connaught Phases 2 and 3 Viability – Financial Model Report) sets out the process which has been followed to establish the Viability Test for Phases 2 and 3 of Connaught.

8 **Appropriation**

8.1 The Development Agreement between Lovell Partnerships and the Council requires the Council to appropriate land for planning purposes when requested by the Developer. Section 122 Local Government Act (1972) gives Local Authority’s the powers to appropriate land for any purpose once the original use of the land has ended. In this instance it is proposed to appropriate land for planning purposes to enable the continued redevelopment of the former Connaught Estate in line with existing planning permission.

8.2 Carrying out works on land which has been acquired or appropriated by a local authority for planning purposes is authorised if it is done in accordance with planning permission, even though it involves interference with a third party interest, or the breach of a restriction as to the use of land arising by virtue of a contract. The interests and rights to which this applies are any easement, liberty, privilege, right or advantage annexed to land and adversely affecting other land, including any natural right to support. In this instance, Phases 2 & 3 of the redevelopment of the former Connaught Estate scheme received approval from Planning Board on 11th September 2017.

8.3 An individual who believes that a development will cause interference to their rights is entitled to object to the appropriation. However, in the event of a successful claim the claimant will not be able to delay or disrupt the construction process. Instead, compensation is payable where loss has been suffered as a result of the interference with any such third party interests or restrictions, assessed on the basis of the loss in value of the claimant's land as a consequence of the interference or breach.

8.4 Assessments of the impact of the Connaught Phases 2 & 3 development on sunlight and daylight formed part of the planning application. The impact of the development on the surrounding properties was considered using BRE guidelines and based on the findings in the assessment it was considered that the proposed development would have a negligible impact in regards to the levels of daylight & sunlight that would be seen at neighbouring properties.
8.5 Cabinet originally agreed to the appropriation of land for planning purposes across the Woolwich Estates Programme Area in June 2012 with the appropriation taking place once the land in question is no longer required for its original purpose. The legal basis for this decision at the time was Section 237 Town & Country Planning Act 1990. However, this legislation has subsequently been repealed and the power to override easements and other rights is contained within Section 203 Housing & Planning Act 2016. As a result, it is considered that the original Cabinet approval is no longer valid and the latest Cabinet is now being requested to take this decision.

8.6 Section 203 Housing & Planning Act 2016 gives the Council powers to appropriate land thereby overriding easements and other rights. Section 233 Town & Country Planning Act allows for a future disposal of land where the land has been appropriated for planning purposes. In this instance the Development Agreement between the Council and Lovell Partnerships requires the Council to transfer the land that is to benefit from the proposed appropriation to Lovell to enable the construction of up to 352 new homes that form Phases 2 & 3 of the Connaught redevelopment.

9. **Options**

9.1 There are two available options:

a) To take no further action; or

b) To agree to sign off the viability test, delaying Vacant Possession and Project Cost payments as detailed above by way of DOV and agree to grant a 300 year lease, appropriation and freehold transfer.

**Option A – Take No Further Action**

This is not recommended as it will result in the regeneration of the Woolwich Estates not progressing through the existing partnership arrangements as set out within the DA. It would also delay or prevent the Council from responding to the chronic housing demand and thereby delivery of the much needed new affordable housing that would benefit the borough.

The requirement to appropriate and subsequently transfer the land in question is set out in the Legal Agreements between Lovell Partnerships and the Council. Any option that did not result in the appropriation and transfer taking place would see the Council in breach of its Legal undertakings to the
Developer and at risk of a claim for any losses arising from the Council’s failure to fulfil its obligations.

**Option B – Proceed with the agreement of the Connaught Phases 2 and 3 Viability Test**

It is recommended that the Viability Test is agreed and the regeneration programme for Connaught Phases 2 and 3 progresses.

10. **Preferred Option and Reasons for Recommendations**

10.1 Option B would be the preferred option, to ensure that the scheme can progress.

10.2 Appropriation of the land in question for planning purposes will remove the potential for an individual to delay construction of Phase 2 by claiming the development will result in a loss of previously enjoyed interests or rights. Instead of delaying the construction process an individual can claim compensation for the loss of such interests and rights. Failure to undertake this procedure would leave the Council open to a claim for any losses suffered by the Developer that arose from the Council’s breach of the Development Agreement.

10.3 A failure to transfer the land in question once appropriation is in place would also see the Council in breach of its obligations as set out in the Development Agreement. Under this scenario Lovell would not be able to construct the 166 new homes that currently have planning approval and the Council would be susceptible to a claim for damages relating to any losses incurred by the Developer.

10.4 Failure to undertake either the appropriation or subsequent transfer would leave the Council in breach of its obligations in the Development Agreement, and at risk of facing legal action to recover losses caused to the Developer.

11. **Consultation Results**

11.1 Consultation took place with Members about the principles of the overall programme and delayed payment.

11.2 The intention to appropriate and transfer the land has been advertised in two consecutive editions of Greenwich Weekender, in line with statutory
requirements for the disposal of land containing an element of open space. No responses have been received following the placing of the Notices.

12. **Next Steps: Communication and Implementation of the Decision**

12.1 Once Viability is signed it will trigger the Land Transfer and Appropriation.

12.2 If agreed, the decisions sought by this report will be made public via the Council’s website and will be communicated to Lovell and their legal representatives in order that the proposed transfer of land can be enacted.

13. **Cross-Cutting Issues and Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Sign-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Legal including Human Rights Act | The Council has instructed Trowers & Hamlin LLP, external legal advisers, on this matter who have provided the following legal comments. The Council is entitled to rely upon the advice from Trowers & Hamlin.  

In June 2012 Cabinet agreed to enter into the development agreement with Lovell Partnerships Ltd and others for the regeneration of the Woolwich estates.

A provision of that DA set a viability threshold of Appendix 4 Return on Capital Employed as a return/profit for the Developer. The financial report notes that this precondition has not been satisfied under the viability test. The Developer is therefore entitled, under the DA, to delay phases 2 and 3.

The proposal is a waiver of certain provisions in the DA which means the Developer will implement phases 2 and 3 (for potentially a lower percentage return/profit than the DA entitles them to) on condition that the Council defers | John Scarborough, Head of Legal Services, 12 March 2019 |
the date it receives certain payments. The proposal does not reduce or lower the sums the Council would be entitled to receive.

The legal basis and consequences of the Council appropriating the land is set out in section 8 (above).

| Finance and other resources including procurement implications | Cabinet is requested to agree the Connaught Phases 2 and 3 Viability Test and associated Deed of Variation (DOV), which will delay the Council’s receipt of Phases 2 and 3 project and vacant possession costs in the amounts and dates at paragraph 6.4. The anticipated dates the Council will receive land payments will not be impacted by the DOV.

The Woolwich Estates Development Agreement provides a phase viability condition that the financial model must demonstrate a minimum Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) to Lovell to satisfy the phase conditions. The ROCE for Connaught Estate Phases 2 and 3, with the proposed DOV included, fall below the phase viability condition.

Lovell has agreed to waive this phase condition, on the agreement that the Council defer VP and project costs. If agreement to defer is not obtained, the ROCE would fall substantially lower than the phase condition and would potentially make phases 2 and 3 unviable.

The viability test for phase 2 and 3 can be considered a fair view of the current conditions of the development and may be considered as broadly viable and as a |

| Jason Coniam, Principal Accountant 19/02/2019 |
basis for taking the project forward at this stage.

In agreeing the Viability Test and DOV, this will trigger land and appropriation transfers aligning with the requirements of the Development Agreement (DA).

The granting of a 300 year lease is required to enable the Council to appropriate for planning purposes, while minimising the financial implications arising from the value of land transferred out of the Housing Revenue Account.

The appropriation is requested to ensure that the development is not open to the threat of injunctive relief arising from private rights; the Council has full indemnity for any claims or demands which minimises potential financial risk.

The Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme forward funds costs under this development, and therefore, has already incurred the costs being deferred. Prudent assumptions on the timing of reimbursements have been made within the HRA, which means the deferral proposed can be managed within current HRA cash flow projections.

**Equalities**

Decision-makers are reminded of the requirement under the Public Sector Equality Duty (s149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to

(i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act,

(ii) advance equality of opportunity between people from different

| Deborah Dack, Development Officer | 11-03-19 |
groups, and foster good relations between people from different groups. The decisions recommended through this paper could directly impact on end users.

14. **Report Appendices**

14.1 The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:

- Appendix 1: Deed of Variation (DOV)
- Appendix 2: Red Line Map
- Appendix 3: Exempt PWC Report
- Appendix 4: Exempt ROCE
- Appendix 5: Exempt Schedule 8 of the DA

**Background Papers**

20th June 2012
Decision by Cabinet

Report Author: Deborah Dack, Development Officer
Tel No. 020 8921 6139
Email. Deborah.Dack@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Jeremy Smalley, Assistant Director of Regeneration
Tel No. 020 8921 2244
Email. Jeremy.Smalley@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Pippa Hack, Director (Regeneration, Enterprise & Skills)
Tel No. 020 8921 5519
Email. Pippa.Hack@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted
By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted
By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.
By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted
1. **Decision required**

Cabinet is asked to:

1.1 Note the Appendices to this report which provide an overview of the Council’s performance across its high-level objectives;

1.2 Request any additional information to be included in the next quarterly report; and

1.3 Request any specific performance information to be circulated to Cabinet, following a consideration of the performance information attached.

2. **Links to the Royal Greenwich Strategy**

2.1 Following Cabinet’s decision to receive quarterly performance reports with regard to the Council’s high-level objectives, this report provides performance information across each of those high-level objectives.

3. **Purpose of Report and Executive Summary**

3.1 In March 2017, Cabinet agreed that it should receive performance reports reflecting the high-level objectives of the Council. The purpose of these reports is to bring together a mixture of performance information and wider social, economic and demographic data to inform Cabinet in its decision-making and policy setting role.
4. **Introduction and Background**

4.1 These quarterly reports have been updated to reflect the new high-level objectives of the Council which are set out in the Corporate Plan 2018-2022.

4.2 The report is structured around 8 appendices, each of which links to the priorities contained within one of the 8 chapters of the Corporate Plan 2018-2022.

4.3 The title of each appendix and the chapter of the Corporate Plan 2018-2022 to which it relates is shown on the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix Title</th>
<th>Corporate Plan 2018-2022 Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Healthier Greenwich</td>
<td>A Healthier Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Safer Greenwich</td>
<td>A Safer Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Great Place to Grow Up</td>
<td>A Great Place to Grow Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering New and Good Quality Homes</td>
<td>Delivering Homes through Economic Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Cleaner Greener Greenwich</td>
<td>A Cleaner Greener Greenwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Prosperity for All</td>
<td>Economic Prosperity for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Great Place to Be</td>
<td>A Great Place to Be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Oversight</td>
<td>A Strong Vibrant and Well Run Borough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 The appendices contain a short narrative covering the following subheadings:

- **Key Messages** – Salient points on overall performance in the quarter, in relation to the appendix.

- **External Updates** – Significant points to note about externalities that could or do affect performance (new/changes in legislation, changes in central government funding, etc.)

- **Services Updates** – Significant points to note about the performance and delivery of specific services. I.e. new service delivery models, improved or updated services.

- **Analysis** – An opportunity to provide more in depth information into a particular topic.

4.5 The appendices are designed to be flexible and can build in information at the request of Cabinet or to highlight a certain topic of interest. Therefore, Cabinet is asked to identify any future topics it would like to see contained within future Cabinet reports.
4.6 The information contained within these appendices has been derived from all Directorates and also includes information from external sources.

5. **Available Options**

5.1 To note the appendices in this report and request any specific performance information to be included within the next Cabinet Performance Report or to be circulated to Cabinet following consideration of this report.

5.2 To not note the appendices in this report and not to request any specific performance information to be included within the next Cabinet Performance Report or to be circulated to Cabinet following consideration of this report.

6. **Preferred Option**

6.1 To note the appendices in this report and request any specific performance information to be included within the next Cabinet Performance Report or to be circulated to Cabinet following consideration of this report.

7. **Reasons for Recommendations**

7.1 To enable Cabinet to be informed on the performance of the Council.

8. **Consultation Results**

8.1 No public consultation was undertaken.

9. **Next Steps: Communication and Implementation of the Decision**

9.1 The next Cabinet performance report is due in March 2019.
## Cross-Cutting Issues and Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Sign-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong> including Human Rights Act</td>
<td>There is no statutory duty to report regularly to Cabinet on the Council’s performance. However, under Section 3 of the Local Government Act 1999, the Council (as a best value authority) has a statutory duty to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Regular reports on the Council’s performance assist in demonstrating best value and compliance with the statutory duty.</td>
<td>John Scarborough, Head of Legal Services, 4 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td>This report details a number of performance indicators and as such raises no new financial implications</td>
<td>Damon Cook, Asst Director Finance &amp; Deputy s151 Officer 01/03/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equalities</strong></td>
<td>There are no equality implications arising from this report</td>
<td>Jackie Jago, Head of Corporate Services 25/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing establishment</strong></td>
<td>There are no staffing implications arising from this report</td>
<td>Jackie Jago, Head of Corporate Services 25/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk management</strong></td>
<td>There are no implications for the risk register.</td>
<td>Jackie Jago, Head of Corporate Services 25/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td>There are no implications for the Environment – the report does contain</td>
<td>Jackie Jago, Head of Corporate Services 25/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and sustainability</td>
<td>performance data relating to the environment</td>
<td>Head of Corporate Services 25/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community safety</td>
<td>There are no implications for Community Safety</td>
<td>Jackie Jago Head of Corporate Services 25/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>There are no implications arising from this report</td>
<td>Jackie Jago Head of Corporate Services 25/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellbeing</td>
<td>There are no implications arising from this report</td>
<td>Jackie Jago Head of Corporate Services 25/02/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11. Report Appendices

11.1 The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:

- Appendix A: A Healthier Greenwich
- Appendix B: A Safer Greenwich
- Appendix C: A Great Place to Grow Up
- Appendix D: Delivering New and Good Quality Homes
- Appendix E: A Cleaner Greener Greenwich
- Appendix F: Economic Prosperity for All
- Appendix G: A Great Place to Be
- Appendix H: Governance and Oversight
12. **Background Papers**


Report Author: Thomas Crook – Corporate Development Officer
Tel No. 020 8921 5401
Email. Thomas.Crook@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Daniel Tahsin – Corporate Strategy Manager
Tel No. 020 8921 6158
Email. Daniel.Tahsin@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Reporting to: Jackie Jago – Head of Corporate Services
Tel No. 020 8921 5044
Email. Jackie.jago@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Katrina Delaney – Director of Central Services
Tel No. 020 8921 6101
Email. Katrina.delaney@royalgreenwich.gov.uk
Key Messages

Delayed Transfer of Care (DTOC) bed delays

- Lewisham and Greenwich Trust hold a weekly DTOC meeting in order to further facilitate DTOC monitoring & issue resolution/escalation for Greenwich clients who are DTOC or Ready for Discharge (RFD).

- Delayed transfers of care (DTOCs) remains below trajectory - 577 bed days for Q3 18/19 is lower than the nationally set target trajectory for the quarter (1140). Further work is underway to reduce this further however it is clear that the introduction of 20 discharge to assess beds at Duncan House have had a big impact on this important agenda.

Transfer of Care Collaborative

- In addition, the Transfer of Care Collaborative (ToCC), a multi-disciplinary and organisation team comprising professionals from health and social care, continues to work to reduce DTOC.

- ToCC was developed to foster an integrated approach to discharge planning, with a focus on developing a better understanding between professionals of the different, complementary roles they play in this process. The ToCC team works to streamline discharge pathways and processes, with a view to reducing lengths of stay and avoidable readmissions, and improving the system of support available to people in the community.

- As part of the ToCC programme, four workstreams are currently underway to identify high impact short and long-term system improvements that can be made in the hospital and community settings across the Bexley and Greenwich health and social care system.

A&E Time to treatment

- In 17/18, pressure on the Accident and Emergency (A&E) department at Queen Elizabeth Hospital (QEH) meant that more people waited longer than they should for treatment or admission to a hospital bed.

- Compared to Q2, there is no significant change compared to Q3 with 87% of patients being seen or treated within the four hour emergency standard. Ahead of winter, the trust (with support from the CCG and RBG) put in place a programme of work to reduce overcrowding and delays in A&E to ensure that more patients are seen and treated within the four hour emergency standard. This programme was detailed in this year’s Q1 performance report.

- Patient numbers to the Urgent Care Centre across November 2018 were 8,696, a decrease on the previous month (8,762), and an increase on the same time the previous year (8,592).

- Streaming performance has deteriorated on the previous month for paediatrics, 89.5% of paediatric patients being streamed within 15 minutes (compared to 90% previous month). There has been improvement for adults with 92.1% of adult patients being streamed within 20 minutes (compared 91.2% previous month).

- The overall breach performance has again decreased at 97.8% for the month of December. This dip in performance is against a background of high activity in the UCC immediately following the Christmas
period which did not follow expected levels based on previous years. The UCC team have responded by increasing rotas whilst new doctors are being trained, they have also been working closely with ED to review patient flows as part of the wider improvement plan in order to achieve the streaming targets:
  - A second UCC streaming process is being introduced
  - The referral pathway to CDU has been implemented to avoid the need for referral back to ED which is expected to improve quality through reduction in patient waiting times
  - A weekend dressings clinic was introduced via the GP Hub in mid-December

**Access Hubs**

- The NHS England mandate sets out a requirement to ensure that everyone has easier and more convenient access to GP services, including appointments at evening and weekends.

- All London CCGs have successfully established extended access services which allow for 8am till 8pm, 7 days a week, GP services for their local populations. London has achieved this ahead of the rest of the country and is in a good position to move forward in the continued delivery of a joined up service which provides choice, additional capacity to the system, supports improved access and outcomes for its population.

- Activity data for the Access hubs continues to show good usage for the weekday and most Saturday sessions. Appointment uptake on Sundays remains poor, despite an intensive advertising campaign directed at patients and practices. All 35 practices are now actively using the hubs.

- There has a significant improvement for hub utilisation with 80.5% of hub utilisation in Q3 compared to 55% from the previous quarter. With further improvement required the Federation is considering implementing SMS text messaging as a way to remind patients of appointments and to allow cancellation. Slots are now ring fenced for the 111 service to enable them to directly book appointments for patients they have assessed on the telephone.

**National Diabetes Participation Programme**

- Responsibility for NDPP now sits with Greenwich CCG, supported by RB Greenwich Public Health.

- Referrals to NDPP from NHS Health Checks and Primary Care in Greenwich continue to be well below target, with only 45 new referrals in Q3. Greenwich CCG, in partnership with RB Greenwich Public Health and Greenwich Health (the GP Federation) have been implementing a recovery plan to increase referrals.

- Practices are being financially supported through additional funding secured for NDPP implementation to write to eligible patients encouraging them to contact Live Well Greenwich to find out about NDPP and other diabetes prevention support. However, piloting this approach in Primary Care took longer to implement than anticipated due to capacity issues in the pilot GP practice.

- A Protected Learning Time (PLT) on Diabetes Prevention and Treatment is planned for February 2019, which will promote NDPP and encourage practices to undertake the searches, highlighting the financial support that is available to them to contact eligible patients. This PLT will also highlight GP responsibility to opportunistically check “at risk” patients for pre-diabetes and refer to NDPP if eligible.
Further communications to practices promoting NDPP are planned for early 2019 with the intention of increasing referrals.

If referrals in Q4 remain low, the CCG may require practices to directly contact eligible patients to request consent to make a NDPP referral as the current process of searches and invitations relies on patients taking action.

Integration

The aim of integration is to improve services for citizens; making the experience more seamless and joined up. There is also the aspiration that integration produces efficiencies across the whole Health and care system. There has been a strong emphasis on Social care supporting the acute NHS system and driving down bed blocking or Delayed Transfer of Care (DToC’s). Some of the resources that have come to Council’s have been directly linked to reducing DToC’s

The NHS Long Term Plan (LTP) continues this trend and proposes more integration between Council’s and the NHS. The current push is toward the development of Integrated Care systems.

This is NHS England’s description of integrated Care Systems:

- “NHS organisations and local councils in England are joining forces to coordinate services around the whole needs of each person. Their aim is that people can live healthier lives and get the care and treatment they need, in the right place, at the right time.”

Integrated care systems - Discharge to access (Duncan house)

Greenwich’s Discharge to Assess unit, jointly commissioned by Greenwich CCG and Royal Borough of Greenwich (RBG,) was opened in Duncan House, in January 2018. The aims of this unit are:

- Support Lewisham and Greenwich NHS Trust (L&GT) to reduce DToCs and excess bed days.
- To facilitate an environment where more accurate assessments of long term care needs can be made.
- To reduce projected dependence, and subsequently expenditure, on higher-level care services (e.g. care home placements and large packages of care at home) through earlier intervention, and allowing sufficient time for recuperation and convalescence following prolonged hospital admissions.

It has very high satisfaction ratings, with 93% of residents saying that they would recommend it.

It has improved the performance of Greenwich CCG and RBG, by helping to reduce DToCs significantly, and saving 5230 bed days so far.

22 people (25%) were discharged with a lower level of care than was anticipated on admission, and 55 (63%) achieved their discharge anticipated goals. Just 10 patients (11%) left Duncan house needing more care than was originally anticipated.

The reduction in care needs has resulted in savings for the system, which have been estimated at £462k per year. If these savings are netted against the cost of running Duncan House it would give a net cost of £730 per bed per week, which is comparable to placing people in a nursing home without the likelihood of the individual improvements or the ability to live independently.

Budgets and costs.

Adult Social care budgets are a matter of national as well as local interest. The extra funding for the NHS that is linked to the NHS LTP has not yet been matched by a long term settlement for Adult
Social Care. The Local Government Association estimates that the Social care funding gap will be £3.5 Billion by 2025. Currently around £21 Billion is spent on Adult Social Care in England.

- Extra resources have been made available to ASC since 2014 through the Social care precepts and the various iterations of the Better Care Fund, The Council’s ASC spend is under significant pressure
- The financial position of Adult Social care is reported as part of the Council’s revenue budget monitor. The most recent report went to the Council’s Cabinet on 20th Feb 2019

Non-elective Admissions (NEA)
- Providing care and support in the community and reducing the burden on hospital services remain system priorities in Greenwich.
- With oversight from the A&E delivery board, partners across health and social care continue to deliver a programme of work to reduce the number of people requiring hospital admission.
- There was a reduction in admissions in quarter one 18/19 when compared to the same period in 17/18, suggesting that this work is having an impact in Greenwich. Quarter 3 data is not yet available. Key schemes to support a reduction in non-elective admissions were reported in the quarter 1 performance report.

Reablement – No change – Annual figure
- The proportion of older people (aged 65 and over) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement / rehabilitation services (ASCOF 2Bi & 2Bii). This measures the benefit to individuals from reablement, intermediate care and rehabilitation following a hospital episode, by determining whether an individual remains living at home 91 days following discharge.

There has been an increase in the number of clients who are at home on the 91 day point. In 2016/17 we ranked 13th out of 16 in our comparator group. 82.3% (2017/18) compared to 81.5% (2016/17) clients of all hospital discharges into reablement were still at home.

Key Service Updates

Safeguarding
- November 2018 marked the Royal Borough’s Inaugural Adult Safeguarding Month and featured a programme of events designed to improve practice amongst professionals working with adults at risk of abuse or neglect and to increase general awareness. Subjects included fire safety, rogue traders, introductions to adult safeguarding and deprivation of Liberty Safeguards
- Events were run for both professionals and members of the public, including service users. Safeguarding Month culminated with the Greenwich Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Conference on 28th November at Charlton Athletic, where this year’s theme was Domestic Violence.

Greenwich comes top in London for good food
- The Royal Borough of Greenwich has topped the Good Food for London league table for the second consecutive year, highlighting its commitment to helping residents eat healthily and combat poor nutrition.
- Good Food for London charts the progress made by London’s 33 boroughs in making London’s food system healthier and more sustainable.
• Royal Greenwich is one of only half of councils to be an accredited Living Wage employer and to have Fairtrade status.
• Many local organisations and businesses in the borough are part of initiatives such as the Good Food in Greenwich network, the Greenwich Sugar Smart pledge scheme, the Healthier Catering Commitment and Breastfeeding Welcome.

Alcohol Advice Roadshow
• Public Health Greenwich launched an alcohol awareness roadshow.
• The roadshow aims is to help people understand the impact of alcohol and what this means to help stay in control of their drinking and stay healthier longer. People have the opportunity to work out what type of drinker they are, how many units they consume and how that might impact upon their health.
• The roadshows are run at locations across the borough including: Thamesmead (Morrisons), Chartlon (ASDA), Eltham (Passey Place), Woolwich Market, and General Gordon Square.

Transformation
• The Adults Transformation Board was set up in May 2016 to support the Transformation of Adult Social Care in Greenwich. It is a multi-agency partnership which provides leadership to the Adult Transformation Programme. The Director, chairs the Board, other DMT members attend and key partners involved include Oxleas, CCG, Finance, HR, Healthwatch and GAVS. The Board has oversight of the development of the Adults Transformation Programme and will respond to emerging priorities and escalations.
• Transformation has been designed to deliver; greater user voice, increased focus on prevention, working closer with partners, improving customer experience, financial efficiencies and more sustainable models.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Previous Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heath &amp; Wellbeing</td>
<td>Non-Elective Admissions - Reduction in non-elective admissions</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>7400 (Q1 18/19)</td>
<td>7751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delayed Transfer of Care (bed days) per 100 001</td>
<td>577 (Q3)</td>
<td>891 (Q2)</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live Well Greenwich Line total contacts</td>
<td>6796 (Q3)</td>
<td>5949 (Q2)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>A new target is under development, in response to developments in the Live Well Greenwich Line contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Diabetes Participation Programme</td>
<td>(Q3 Cumulative)</td>
<td>(Q2 Cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of children born at a low birth weight</td>
<td>7.5% (2016)</td>
<td>8.1% (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of overweight or obese children at reception</td>
<td>25.7% (17/18)</td>
<td>24.1% (16/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of overweight or obese children at year 7</td>
<td>40.4% (17/18)</td>
<td>42.7% (16/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of adults (aged 18+) classified as overweight or obese, 2015-18</td>
<td>58.9% (16/17)</td>
<td>63.0% (2015-16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&amp;E Time to treatment (% admitted, transferred or discharged within four hours)</td>
<td>87% (Q3)</td>
<td>89% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>95% (National standard) 87.8% (Locally agreed target)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left department before being seen for treatment rate</td>
<td>2.8% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>2.2% (Q1 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Hub Utilisation</td>
<td>80.5% (Q3)</td>
<td>55.1% (Q2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding</td>
<td>Number of safeguarding concerns recorded in Qtr</td>
<td>227 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>227 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of safeguarding enquiries completed in Qtr</td>
<td>45 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>67 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Concerns from BME/White ethnicity in Qtr</td>
<td>18% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>13% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admissions to 24h care</td>
<td>155 (Q3 Cumulative)</td>
<td>103 (Q2 Cumulative)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>London Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reablement (older people still at home 91 days after discharge)</td>
<td>82.3 (17/18)</td>
<td>81.5 (16/17)</td>
<td>83.10%</td>
<td>London Average 85.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of community contacts leading to full assessment</td>
<td>21% (Q3 Cumulative)</td>
<td>21% (Q2 Cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of comprehensive assessments with an outcome of services</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% leading to community based services</td>
<td>88% (Q3 Cumulative)</td>
<td>88% (Q2 Cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% leading to res/nursing placement</td>
<td>7% (Q3 Cumulative)</td>
<td>6% (Q2 Cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people provided with OT equipment with no other long term care packages.</td>
<td>69% (Q3 Cumulative)</td>
<td>69.4% (Q2 Cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

Project Updates

Adult Customer Journey (AJC)

• The main purpose of the Adult Customer journey is to improve the customer journey, service efficiency and reduce duplication of process through the reorganisation of adult social care in the Royal Borough of Greenwich.

Background:

• The ACJ Project began in July 2016. A series of events over 18 months has been held to share the “as-is” and receive feedback from service users, staff and stakeholders. Following consultation, a series of change management processes are being implemented, in liaison with the Union, staff, HR, Finance, facilities management, Oxleas, CCG, LGT and other stakeholders.

• The consultation led to a consensus view on key areas that required focussed attention and improvement:

  1. Systems and processes: Current systems were deemed cumbersome, complicated and repetitive assessment forms and administration processes involved too many handovers of service users.

  2. Learning from experience: Staff wanted to be empowered to make decisions and enhance practitioner knowledge and incorporate lessons learned from previous organisational changes/approaches.

  3. Communications: Ensuring better communications is needed both internally and externally and clearer communication is needed with users and carers regarding pathways.

  4. Adult Customer Journey launched in January. Key deliverables included:

     - Three service areas and eight teams with health and Social Care teams being co-located.

     - Staffing restructure complete – 90% of people were given their first choice of role (the remainder got their second)

     - IT and change infrastructure being implemented

     - Workforce development plan includes generic and team specific training.

     - New performance measures developed with service user input.

     - Ongoing review of new pathways and processes to ensure smooth transition with a formal review at 6 months

LD Integrated Customer Journey

• The LD Integrated Customer Journey aims to ensure that people with Learning Disabilities who need social services support have a good experience when they are in contact with the CLDT Team, in developing a seamless journey.

• It is also aimed at ensuring that people experience health and social care outcomes in line with the wider general population. Both RBG and Oxleas recognise that a more co-ordinated approach in delivering their services to people with learning disabilities is best served by developing a fully integrated model of care for people with learning disabilities.
• The Customer Journey has been designed to: re-organise the Community Learning Disability Team (CLDT) to meet the identified needs while promoting independence and choice for those needing support. A clear care co-ordination framework is integral to making this work and expected to deliver:
  
  - Cost effective services for people with a learning disability and their carers to promote good health, independence, choice, control and wellbeing in their lives.
  
  - One integrated assessment process, one principal identified worker, one care plan and one review process including joint documentation, commonly agreed aligned eligibility criteria and an integrated IT solution to enable access to seamless information.
  
  - CLDT are replacing the current arrangements of Fast and Long-term teams with a Single Point of Access (SPA) and two fully inter-disciplinary Functional teams that include specialist health and social care professionals who have developed expertise in Mental Health and Challenging Behaviour and Complex Physical Health. The Single Point of Access (SPA) Team will coordinate access to these services.
  
  - A functional Team developed for young people, Preparing for Adulthood, previously known as Transition Services has its own panel which means there will be no need to go through the SPA as the panel will determine, with the appropriate functional team manager, where the young person should be referred.

LD Housing Strategy

• The LD Housing Strategy addresses two key challenges facing RBG in the provision of accommodation-based services for people with a learning disability. Much of the existing housing in which RBG accommodates people is not considered fit for purpose. There is a lack of capacity to accommodate people in the borough. Golden Lane has been appointed to support RBG on the delivery of the new offer.

• Currently, the combined, average unit cost of Greenwich Living Options and the Learning Disability Accommodation block contract is £81,000, a total spend of approximately £10million a year to accommodate 125 people.

• The council has chosen a partner to deliver specific objectives; this partnership arrangement is in three distinct phases.
  
  - Phase 1 - The selection of our preferred partner (completed).
  - Phase 2 – Collaboration with our partner to identify our priorities, consult with service users and families, develop our delivery plans and publish our formal strategy (completed).
  - Phase 3 - The delivery of housing solutions. The final phase will be broken up into separate projects, each of which will require appropriate procurement processes to select developers etc. Our preferred partner may have a role in the actual delivery of people’s housing solutions but their primary role will be in project managing the delivery of our strategy.

LD Day Opportunities

• LD Day Opportunities seeks to address the issues around service users with learning disabilities making use of the Day Opportunities services available within the borough; and to ensure the service supports the current need for outcomes focused, person centred services. Reasons for transformation include: not accessing enough community options, traditional elements still being in place, ineffective joined up working and traditional transport being costly.
The outline for the project
- October 2016 - Communication and Engagement Strategy
- Dec 2016 - April 2017 - Engagement process
- May 2017 - DMT Options Paper
- June- September – Engagement continues
- November 2017 - DMT Pilot proposal paper
- January - October 2018 - Pilot completed
- November 2018 - DMT Pilot update and Phase 2 paper
- January 2019 – Phase 2 Commences
A Safer Greenwich

Key Messages

Crime Statistics

- For the rolling 12 months from January 2018 to December 2018, Greenwich showed an increase in total crime of 0.7% when compared to the previous 12 months. This compared to the Metropolitan Police Service which showed a 2.0% increase. The increase in Greenwich was mainly driven by increases in Domestic Abuse Offences, Burglary and Theft from a Motor Vehicle.

Knife Crime

- There were 11 young victims of knife crime (up to age 24, excluding domestic abuse) in quarter 3, which was the same as quarter 2.
- Total Knife Crime with Injury (all ages of victims) increased slightly (41 offences, up from 38 in quarter 2).
- Violence with Injury (not knife-specific) reduced in quarter 3 (464 offences, down from 487 in quarter 2).
- Weapon-Enabled offences increased slightly in quarter 3 (126 offences, up from 123) – these include offences of threatening with or without intimidation.

Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO’s)

- Up to the end of the quarter, a total of 557 HMOs had been licensed and compliance visits to these HMOs commenced. Enforcement against landlords who fail to licence their property resulted in two Civil Penalties being issued (possible penalties up to £30,000) in the quarter with another 88 in progress.

External Updates

Hackitt Report and Fire Safety

- Fire doors: We will commence a tender for fire doors in February 2019, with a view to commencing a 15 month programme from April 2019. We have worked closely with the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government and London Councils, and our tender specification takes account of the changes in regulation and testing requirements.
- Hackitt report & fire safety: We are developing an Action Plan to take account of the recommendations and enable us to ensure we are meeting the expectation around current best practice.
- Window panels and ‘spandrels’: We have undertaken an initial review to identify sites where we have window panels and spandrels. The next stage in the process is to undertake physical inspections, which may then require some testing to be carried out. The inspections will be undertaken and completed by the end of April 2019.
Basic Command Unit (BCU)

- On 28th November 2018, the previous borough based policing arrangements were formally replaced by the new Basic Command Unit that will cover Greenwich, Lewisham and Bexley. This will be a considerable change for Greenwich as we move towards sharing police resources across three boroughs, working with a new command structure configuration and an overall reduction in police numbers. The police will keep the new arrangements under review for the first three months and expect to be reporting on performance in late March/early April 2019.

Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)

- Mandatory HMO licensing was extended to a wider range of properties on 1st October 2018. Approximately 60% of existing licensed HMOs will be passported into the new licensing scheme.

Key Service Updates

Knife Crime and Serious Youth Violence Task Group

- In response to a rise in knife crime and serious youth violence, the Knife Crime and Serious Youth Violence Task Group was established to agree and implement a range of measures designed to reduce knife crime and serious youth violence in Royal Greenwich.

- The work of the Task Group falls into four categories:
  - Understanding the landscape within which violence occurs, including why young people become involved and the different ways in which they are involved in this type of crime: Work is currently underway with Newton Europe to explore and review the serious incidents that have occurred in Royal Greenwich in order to enhance our understanding of earlier points of intervention and the most prevalent characteristics of those involved in order to inform service and practice development across the partnership;
  
- Early identification of young people and families at risk and providing early help to prevent involvement in knife crime and serious youth violence. A bid has been submitted to the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government to support the implementation of a systemic change in the way that children who may be at risk are identified in primary schools in the borough. We are awaiting the outcome of this bid;
  
- Conducting Community Conversations with key stakeholders: A series of events has started with stakeholders including young people, parents, the faith groups and the wider community in order to enable them to share their experiences and help partners to address the issues that are prevalent in their communities; A faith leaders’ conference in December started a series of ongoing events with the faith community and an anti-knife crime summit was held for young people from educational establishments across the borough on 14th February. This event was delivered in conjunction with Greenwich Young People Council and Charlton Athletic Community Trust. Involving communities in the response to knife crime is a key element of the work of the Task Group;
  
- Interventions: The Task Group seeks to improve how we intervene with those who are at risk and those who pose the greatest risk in our communities. In recognition of the complexity of the lives of those young people who become involved in serious youth violence and the number of overlapping
risk factors, including the prevalence of criminal exploitation that often drives violence amongst and against young people, an Exploitation and Serious Youth Violence Reduction Unit is being created.

- The unit will be integrated both in terms of playing a central role within the wider partnership by gathering and sharing intelligence and also (due to the model of delivery) by consisting of a range of workers from across agencies that play key roles in working with children and young people who are at risk and/or involved in serious youth violence, including a Community Safety Officer leading on gangs, Youth Violence & Vulnerability Officer, Youth Offending Service Officers and St Giles mentors, Police and Probation staff.

- In addition, a number of roles will be created to support the work delivered by the unit, including a specialist girls’ worker, analysts, business support and management and leadership roles. Members of the unit will be co-located to maximise effectiveness of communication, daily tasking and responsive working. Alongside intervening, disruption and enforcement measures will be used by the unit.

- Cases will be identified and filtered through the Greenwich Risk Adolescent Safeguarding Prevention meeting (GRASP) by use of a Matrix that assigns the level of risk and need based on the information and intelligence held.

- All of the above activities are now progressing well and, as a consequence, the Knife Crime and Serious Youth Violence Task Group will conclude at the end of March 2019. A concluding report that takes an overview of the work of the group and charts the way forward will be produced.

Problem Solving Activity

- Quarter 3 saw a concerted effort to tackle anti-social behaviour on bikes caused by youths in the Greenwich Maritime & Old Royal Naval campus. This multi-agency problem solving activity resulted in 11 youths identified and intervened with. 8 of the 11 signed up to Acceptable Behaviour Agreements with the police and council and the other three given strong words of advice to cease all bike related ASB forthwith pending further more serious consequences for non-compliance. This saw an immediate reduction in reported instances of anti-social behaviour in Greenwich Maritime & Old Royal Naval College and the surrounding environs to both police and council.

- The Street Pop intervention and outreach pilot project has seen engagement and profiling of Woolwich’s rough sleepers, prolific street drinkers and exploitative beggars. This has enabled the problem solving team to ensure that the right level of intervention is offered to each individual based on individual needs assessments conducted on the street and then linking them in to services to treat their issues in a holistic way before resorting to enforcement. So far, 16 entrenched rough sleepers have benefited from intensive 1:1 engagement and 8 of these people are now in temporary accommodation or receiving treatment for drug/alcohol addiction. The problem solving team hopes to build on this success in the upcoming months by the continuation of the project, subject to a successful bid for funding.

Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs).

- The HMO service is in the process of dealing with 11 illegal eviction cases and one of these is being prosecuted in court.
Following the appointment of a Tenancy Relations Officer, the HMO Team has assisted 13 people to seek a Rent Repayment Order and the Council is applying for one itself to seek the return of housing benefit from a landlord.

Woolwich Estates

- Additional policing patrols on the new Trinity Walk estate, as well as at Morris Walk and Maryon Grove, paid for from the Woolwich Estates programme, continue. Monitoring of the outcomes of this additional work is underway. The Met Police have yet to set out the Section 92 Agreement Terms for 2019/2020. Current arrangements are in place until end of March 2019.
- The Registered Provider partner for the Woolwich Estates development, Paragon Asra, has employed staff to be based in Woolwich with new offices on the Arsenal Site. They are currently carrying out additional recruitment for tenancy management. This team liaises and works with their tenants and have been promoting training for tenants to improve their employability.

Transport

- The Council's School Travel Planning work with three schools won awards at London-wide awards in December 2018. The winners were: Charlton Manor Primary School, for Excellence in Partnership; Halley Academy, for Excellence in Road Safety; and St Mary Magdalene (All through), for School of the Region (South).
- Additional staff have been recruited to support the Council's parking enforcement service. This will enable a more robust enforcement of parking controls borough-wide. The impact of the additional resources is being monitored for its effectiveness and has resulted in a more visible service.
- A key element of the Parking Strategy Action Plan is to press forward with the preparation of an application to London Councils to adopt the powers from the police for enforcing moving traffic contraventions (MTCs) by CCTV. Work is progressing well and it is anticipated that MTC enforcement will commence towards the end of this year.
- A revised Parking Action Plan has been prepared setting out key objectives and milestones for the coming year which will be monitored regularly.
- The ongoing review of the borough’s existing Controlled parking Zones (CPZs), along with other areas experiencing parking pressures, continues. The works programme is being reviewed and updated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Previous Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safer Borough</td>
<td>Total number of Notifiable Offences</td>
<td>6,734 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>6,564 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Burglary Offences</td>
<td>606 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>427 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Robbery Offences</td>
<td>167 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>153 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of repeat victims of Domestic Abuse (MARAC)</td>
<td>19.8% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>15.9% (Q1 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Domestic Abuse Violence With Injury Offences</td>
<td>464 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>487 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weapon Enabled Offences</td>
<td>126 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>123 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife Crime with injury offences</td>
<td>41 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>38 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife Crime With Injury Offences that are non-domestic and where the Victim is aged 1-25</td>
<td>11 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>11 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Hate Crime offences</td>
<td>452 (Q3 ytd 18/19)</td>
<td>302 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Repeat Victims of Hate Crime (received at hate crime case panel)</td>
<td>5.3% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>6.7% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Prevent referrals</td>
<td>17 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>15 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPNs &amp; Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>No. of Fixed Penalty Notices issues</td>
<td>236 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>309 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of ASB incidents reported to the police</td>
<td>1,549 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>1,807 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of new ASB cases opened by the ASB Team</td>
<td>89 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>95 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Safety</td>
<td>No. of road accidents leading to death or serious injury - Children</td>
<td>4 (0 fatal) (2017/18)</td>
<td>1 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of road accidents leading to death or serious injury - All</td>
<td>97 (3 fatal) (2017/18)</td>
<td>76 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of residential streets that are 20mph zone controlled</td>
<td>85% (2018)</td>
<td>80% (2017)</td>
<td>100% (2023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Light Faults - % of total assets</td>
<td>1.7% (Dec 2018)</td>
<td>1.4% (Sep 2018)</td>
<td>&lt;2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street light repairs (days) – average time taken to repair faulty street lights</td>
<td>3 days (Dec 2018)</td>
<td>2.5 days (Sep 2018)</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of highway safety defects repaired in time</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96% (2017/18 year end)</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Homes</td>
<td>No. of completion certs issued by local authority</td>
<td>213 (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>174 (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of illegal building work discovery cases in the borough</td>
<td>1 (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>6 (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of enforcement notices served across all private rented sector Environmental Health teams</td>
<td>131 (Q3 year to date 2018/19)</td>
<td>120 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of licensed HMOs</td>
<td>557 (Q3 year to date 2018/19)</td>
<td>469 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

Burglary

- Following recent increases in burglary in the Royal Borough, a partnership burglary task group was set up in October 2018 between the police and Council. The group has produced a Burglary Action Plan that sets out a plan intended to reduce this crime in the borough.

- Engagement: Over 500 residents attended three Burglary/Crime Prevention Roadshows in quarter 3. These events focused on raising awareness and educating the public on target hardening to make their property less vulnerable to this type of crime. These road shows were run jointly by officers in the police and the council in the lead up to the Christmas period and will continue into quarter 4 to reinforce the message.

- Trading Standards officers offered crime prevention advice in relation to artifice burglary and doorstep crime and community safety officers provided advice on preventing theft from the person and offering property marking (mobile phone/bike registering) as well as taking reports/casework. Further Woolwich/Eltham/Greenwich locations and dates have been confirmed and dates confirmed for Feb 2019.

Cocooning

- Cocooning is a reactive tactic intended to protect against the reoccurrence of residential burglary in hot spot areas when carried out in conjunction with other police efforts. It is based on the knowledge that it is not uncommon for burglars to target a number of houses in the same street or streets and that they often operate in a small area. It involves the victim of the burglary being seen in person and offered crime prevention advice and reassurance. The neighbours will also be visited (preferably in person) and will be informed of the recent burglary (including method and property taken). They will also be offered crime prevention advice. Cocooning must take place within 48 hours as that is the most likely timeframe for a burglar to return.

- During quarter three, the Woolwich Riverside Ward SNT carried out regular cocooning exercises focused on distraction burglaries. This type of crime is carried out by burglars (often referred to as bogus callers) who try to mislead or distract the attention of often vulnerable members of the public to get into their home to steal money or valuables. The exercises were carried out in conjunction with the Council’s community safety and trading standard officers whose main role was supporting and sharing intelligence of affected addresses affected that are not reported directly to police.

Communications

- Council officers have produced a leaflet concerning burglary/crime prevention information for distribution by SNT during cocooning visits to ensure awareness raised of artifice burglary/doorstep crime. It will also be used at future burglary/community crime prevention events to be held in the Town Centres.

- Burglary messaging has been relayed to residents via social/print media and other channels, particularly focussing on the run up to Christmas and areas identified as most vulnerable. Further messaging will be delivered during the coming year to groups/areas identified as particularly vulnerable to burglary.
Links are also being made with Housing providers, Neighbourhood Watch, and other partners to coordinate dissemination of information.
A Great Place to Grow Up

Key Messages

Note – due to the nature of some measures there are no updates available at this reporting point. Some measures have been updated from the provisional figures provided at the Q2 reporting stage.

- Overall, performance remains strong with key highlights including:
  - The number of children subject to a child protection plan remains low compared to previous years;
  - First time entrants and re-offending have reduced this reporting year to date (see analysis section for more detail);
  - Early Help continues to have a positive impact on reducing the need for families to step back up to statutory services;
  - 57 Children’s Services apprenticeship PLUS enrolments in place.

External Updates


- In a no deal scenario, the current system of reciprocal recognition of professional qualifications between the EU, EEA EFTA and Switzerland and the UK will not apply after 29 March 2019. This does not affect those who have already had their qualifications recognised. UK Government will introduce new system for recognising qualifications.

- Any child living in the UK can apply for and access a school place in England irrespective of migration status. This will continue after our exit from the EU.

Key Service Updates

Young People’s Knife Crime Summit #chooselife

- 100 pupils from secondary schools and alternative education provision across the borough attended this one day event organised by Greenwich Young People’s Council and Charlton Athletic Community Trust. Students took part in workshops on the law, first aid and creating change and their ideas will be used to further develop the Tackling Knife Crime action plan.

Academies / free schools

- The increase in the secondary academy number for this reporting period (10 schools; 63% of all secondary schools) reflects the opening in September 2018 of Leigh Academy Blackheath.

- The conversions of The John Roan Secondary School and Wingfield Primary School are scheduled to complete during the 2019 calendar year.

- We await the outcome of a bid to the Department for Education to fund a new special school (under the special schools free school application process) to support the increasing pressure for specialist
provision for children with autistic spectrum disorder in Greenwich. The outcome of the bidding process is expected in March 2019.

Safe Drive Stay Alive

• The Royal Borough’s annual Safe Drive Stay Alive programme saw over 1,100 sixth form students attend an incredible performance at Greenwich Theatre. Real emergency services personnel, family members of casualties and casualties themselves step onto stage and share their experiences. The hard hitting show encourages them to make good choices as drivers and passengers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Previous Value</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attainment</strong></td>
<td>% of pupils achieving a good level of development in their Early Years Foundation Stage Profile</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>78% (Summer 2018)</td>
<td>England 72%; London 74% (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% pupils that achieve the expected standard in Reading, Writing and Maths (RWM) at KS2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>70% (Summer 2018)</td>
<td>England 64%; London 70% (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% children achieving a standard pass (4 or higher) in both English and Maths at KS4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>58.5% (Summer 2018)</td>
<td>England 59.4%; London 67.9% (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of RBG resident pupils who are offered their first preference (primary)</td>
<td>n/a until Q4</td>
<td>86.5% (3089/3571) (2018)</td>
<td>Pan London - 86.5% (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of RBG resident pupils who are offered their first preference (secondary)</td>
<td>n/a until Q4</td>
<td>62% (2025/3280) (2018)</td>
<td>Pan London - 66% (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of RBG places offered to RBG residents (secondary)</td>
<td>n/a until Q4</td>
<td>82% (2250 / 2760) (2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of schools in borough that are rated Good or Outstanding (primary)</td>
<td>98% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>98% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>London - 92% (Dec 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of schools in Borough that are rated Good or Outstanding (secondary)</td>
<td>79% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>79% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>London - 86% (Dec 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Special/PRU schools in borough that are rated Good or Outstanding</td>
<td>80% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>80% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>London - 93% (Dec 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of school that are academies in borough (primary)</td>
<td>24% (15/63) (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>24% (15/63) (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of schools that are academies in borough (secondary)</td>
<td>63% (10/16) (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>60% (9/15) (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of schools that are academies in borough (special)</td>
<td>50% (2/4) (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>50% (2/4) (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of secondary school pupils eligible for free school meals</td>
<td>n/a until Q4</td>
<td>16% (May 18)</td>
<td>London - 16% (Jan 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of primary school pupils eligible for free school meals</td>
<td>n/a until Q4</td>
<td>16% (May 18)</td>
<td>London - 15% (Jan 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td>Number of RBG Children’s Services Apprenticeships Plus enrolments</td>
<td>57 as at end of Q3 18/19</td>
<td>54 as at end of Q2 18/19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of pupils that are deemed persistent absentees (i.e. missing 10% or more sessions) (secondary)</td>
<td>Annual measure so no update until Q2 19/20</td>
<td>13.9% (Autumn &amp; Spring 17/18)</td>
<td>London - 11.8% (Autumn &amp; Spring 17/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First time entrants to Youth Justice System (per 100,000 aged 10-17)</td>
<td>371 (Jul 17-Jun 18)</td>
<td>419 (Apr 17 - Mar 18)</td>
<td>326 (Jul 17 - Jun 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of young offenders re-offending (3 month tracked cohort)</td>
<td>48.1% (Oct 16 - Dec 16)</td>
<td>54.3% (Jul 16 - Sep 16)</td>
<td>44.4% (Oct 16 - Dec 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM NO: 9 (Appendix C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of children stepped down to early help who remain below the threshold for social care and/or YOS (cumulative)</strong></td>
<td>92% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>100% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
<td>Number of children accessing 30 hours free childcare through RBG settings</td>
<td>n/a until Q4</td>
<td>1,529 (as of Summer 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keeping Children Safe</strong></td>
<td>Rate of section 47 enquiries per 10,000 of the under 18 CYP population (cumulative i.e. rate will grow per quarter)</td>
<td>97.0 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>63.6 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children who are the subject of a Child Protection Plan</td>
<td>202 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>219 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of children becoming the subject of a child protection plan for a second or subsequent time within two years of the previous plan ending (cumulative)</td>
<td>6.1% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>5.6% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Looked After Children</strong></td>
<td>% of cases where the length of placement has lasted more than 2 years (where the child has been Looked After for more than 2 years)</td>
<td>71.1% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>77.2% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of looked after children who have achieved permanence (cumulative)</td>
<td>27 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>18 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average time between a child entering care and moving in with its adoptive family, for children who have been adopted (days)</td>
<td>387 (Q3, 2016-19)</td>
<td>393 (Q2 2016-2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% looked after children achieving expected standard or above in reading, writing and maths (key stage 2)</td>
<td>46.4% (Summer 18)</td>
<td>45% (Summer 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% looked after children achieving a standard pass (4 or higher) in both English and Maths at Key stage 4</td>
<td>32.4% (Summer 18)</td>
<td>21% (Summer 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of care leavers (including those not in touch with LA) who are EET at ages 17 to 21</td>
<td>59.2% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>61.7% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of looked after children missing from care for more than 24h (cumulative)</td>
<td>60 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>49 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>No. of schools that have benefitted from cycle training</td>
<td>18 (2018/19 Q3)</td>
<td>12 (2018/19 Q2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children receiving level 1 bikeability.</td>
<td>645 (2018/19 Q3)</td>
<td>437 (2018/19 Q2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children receiving level 2/3 bikeability.</td>
<td>480 (2018/19 Q3)</td>
<td>367 (2018/19 Q2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of schools that have a walk to school initiative</td>
<td>65% (2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment &amp; Skills</strong></td>
<td>16 – 64 Years with NVQ 4+</td>
<td>53.5% (2017)</td>
<td>45.9% (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Borough residents aged 16 – 64 with no qualifications</td>
<td>7.1% (2017)</td>
<td>7.1% (2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of work experience placements</td>
<td>1,400 (2017/18)</td>
<td>1,787 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

First time Entrants to the youth justice system

- The Early Help model of whole family work and engagement appears to be having an impact on our first time entrants. The official Youth Justice Board measure for first time entrants is the number as a rate per 100,000 young people aged 10 to 17. As the left hand chart below shows, the rate for Greenwich has been steadily decreasing since the latter part of 2016 and we are closing the gap on the London average.

- This official measure is subject to a six month time lag but our local tracking figures show that this decrease is continuing; in the first three quarters of the 2018/19 reporting year there have been 56 first time entrants compared to 90 over the same period last year.
  - Of the 56 first time entrants year to date, 47 (84%) are male; this is consistent with previous years;
  - Of the 56 first time entrants, nine had a knife offence as part of their first conviction.

- The representation of Early Help and partners at the GRASP panel (Greenwich Risk Adolescent, Safeguarding, Prevention), which promotes early identification of concern, enables children and their families to be offered interventions and support early to prevent escalation into the criminal justice system.

![Chart showing rate of first time entrants to the youth justice system (per 100,000)](chart1)

![Chart showing number of first time entrants per quarter](chart2)
Key Messages

Mutual Exchange Event
• We are holding a further event to raise awareness of mutual exchanges as a way to help meet the needs of under-occupiers and tenants who are severely overcrowded. This will be particularly for those who have been affected by the welfare reform changes. This will take place on Thursday 21 March 2019.

• This event will be of interest to tenants looking for smaller and more affordable homes and overcrowded social tenants will be able to search for a property to better meet their needs.

• An exchange can provide the fastest means of moving to a more suitable home. To date this financial year, 88 households have successfully moved through mutual exchange.

External Updates

Bids for Government funding
• We have been successful with bids for funding from the MHCLG in two distinct areas:
  1. Firstly, the Council will receive £50,000 to tackle rogue landlords in the private sector. The purpose of the funding is to support action against criminal landlords, for example, to build relationships with external organisations such as the emergency services, legal services and local housing advocates. The Borough will use its funding to support a multi-borough intelligence gathering project, training and concept work on new software package.

  2. Separately, the Council will receive £200,000 for services to prevent and support rough sleepers, under the Government’s Rapid Rehousing Pathway project; aimed at directing rough sleepers into settled accommodation. The funding will resource three staff under the ‘Navigators’ part of project. The work will include an assessment of need and eligibility and rehousing into an appropriate settled home and, where needed, referral to support services. These services will be provided by one of the Borough’s existing specialist providers working with rough sleepers, Thames Reach.

• We are also awaiting the decision on two other bids made to the MHCLG, to fund other initiatives to eradicate rough sleeping.

Key Service Updates

The Repairs Stores Pilot
• The repairs stores pilot has commenced and will help inform our approach to rolling out an imprest stock model for our key trades, and improve productivity.

• The 2018/19 Housing Capital Programme is being delivered, with some larger schemes needing to run into 2019/20. We are currently developing the programme for 2019/20 to mobilise it for Summer.

Local Implementation Plan for Transport
• The Council has completed a consultation on the draft new third Local Implementation Plan for transport (LIP3). It is an innovative and ambitious plan that sets out how we will work in partnership
with Transport for London (TfL) and others to help deliver the vision set out in the Mayor’s Transport Strategy. Officers are amending the Plan based on consultation responses, ready for submission to TfL and adoption by the Council.

Work with Registered Providers (RP)
- A series of one to one meetings has been arranged to work with RPs on their development programmes in the borough to assist with understanding and resolving any blockages and issues they might have to increase supply and speed up delivery.

Right To Buy (RTB) investment
- The use of RTB investment to fund property purchases for use as temporary accommodation remains ongoing with over 180 properties bought to date. Discussions with RPs on RTB investment agreement continue.

Meridian
- New homes are currently under construction at two of the six sites agreed for Meridian - Rochester Way and Sandpit Place. Homes at Rochester Way are due for handover in late 2019.

LA New Build
- Cabinet agreed the financial envelope for the delivery of c.750 new Council homes together with the initial five sites identified for delivery.
- The updated Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted on 11 December 2018. This included a new section on Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), following on from the confirmation of the Article 4 Direction that removed the permitted development rights for conversion of dwelling houses to small HMOs coming into force on 27 September 2018. The revised SPD ensure a strategic, co-ordinated borough wide approach to quality standards in new HMOs.
- A total of 1,900 new homes were completed in 2017/18, including 229 social/affordable rented homes and 294 intermediate homes (a total of 28% of new homes were affordable). Although overall completions are down from the previous year, the proportion of total homes that are affordable has increased from the previous year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Previous Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Homes</td>
<td>Number of council owned homes – Local Authority new build</td>
<td>140 (2011 - date)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of residential permissions given (net) (3 year rolling)</td>
<td>19,859 (2015/16 - 2017/18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number affordable residential permissions (net) (3 year rolling)</td>
<td>3,667 (2015/16 - 2017/18)</td>
<td>35% on sites of 10 units or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of new homes built (net) (3 year rolling)</td>
<td>6,085 (2015/16 - 2017/18)</td>
<td>8,055 (2,685 per annum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number affordable homes built (net) (3 year rolling)</td>
<td>1,745 (2015/16 - 2017/18)</td>
<td>35% on sites of 10 units or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% major planning applications determined in time</td>
<td>100% (2018/19 Q3)</td>
<td>100% (2018/19 Q2)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% non-major planning applications determined in time</td>
<td>93.2% (2018/19 Q3)</td>
<td>92.8% (2018/19 Q2)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy Management</td>
<td>Borough rental collection rate</td>
<td>98.45% (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>98.29% (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of fraudulent applications and properties revoked though Unauthorised Occupation team case work</td>
<td>28 (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>19 (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing stock lost through right to buy</td>
<td>275 (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>140 (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Number of cases where homelessness has been prevented through advice and case work</td>
<td>800 (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>478 (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of households in temporary accommodation</td>
<td>864 (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>909 (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of households accepted as homeless</td>
<td>361 (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>287 (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of homeless households rehoused</td>
<td>34.44% (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>38.27% (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Homes</td>
<td>Percentage of Council properties classed as non-decent</td>
<td>Annual Collection 3.9% (17/18 Year End)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of voids (snap shot at reporting period)</td>
<td>257 (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>227 (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voids Turnaround time - Key to Key - in Days</td>
<td>74 (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>72 (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Void loss against rent role</td>
<td>1.29% (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>1.15% (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of resident satisfaction with completed repairs</td>
<td>94.98% (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>96.59% (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of urgent repairs completed within time</td>
<td>93.62% (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>94.16% (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Fire Risk Assessment completed in last 12 months - High Rise Council Block</td>
<td>100% (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>100% (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of properties with gas serviced within the last 12 months (snap shot)</td>
<td>99.98% (Q3 2018/19)</td>
<td>99.88% (Q2 2018/19)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

Housing Repairs Service – Review Update

Targeted reviews are taking place to deliver key improvements in the following areas:

Customer Care & Communications
- Complaints Team Improvement Plan – how complaints are managed and responded to, and how learning is captured.
- Resident Satisfaction Surveys – looking at how surveys can be extended to capture greater feedback to help inform service improvement

Costs & Efficiency
- Tackling immediate issues around operative mobile working – ensuring all staff have functional equipment for mobile working
- Changing how staff access and use the Council stores – developing a pilot to move away from multiple weekly visits to the Stores, and free up more operative time to be spent on site doing jobs.

Learning and Development
- Initial scoping to develop an approach to multi-skill training and delivery for staff, to enable simple jobs requiring a variety of skills to be undertaken first time.

Performance update as at Quarter 3 of 2018/19:
Below is an update of the progress being made in all the areas:

Customer Care & Communications
- **Complaints Team Improvement Plan:** The Complaints Team has reviewed it’s processes for managing all correspondence and analysing the data received from complaints.
- Following on from the review, there has been a notable improvement in performance, with performance against the KPIs for Stage 1 complaints and Councillor Enquiries improving month on month.
- **Resident Satisfaction Surveys:** An external organisation has been engaged to deliver a timed pilot, providing customer satisfaction surveys across a number of channels including telephone interviews and SMS messages. This is due to be sent out in early March.

Costs & Efficiency
- **Resource Handheld Tablets:** The shortage of handheld tablets has now been addressed. We have worked with ICT to help them source suitable replacement devices and a supplier that we intend to use going forward.
- Staff now have handheld devices and super user training has been delivered to staff within R&I to help support handheld functionality, and resolve any minor technical issues locally.
- Changing how staff use and access the Council stores: In January 2019, we commenced a van stock pilot project with four of our core trades; gas, carpentry, electrical and plumbing. This involves vans being stocked with a determined amount of supplies relevant to their trades.
• Van stock items and quantities have been developed in conjunction with Wolesley who supply our Stores through a Council wide corporate contract. The project will be monitored, and changes / refinements made during the course of the pilot as needed.

• In addition, as part of the project, RBG staff have designed, manufactured and fitted bespoke racking for the vans specific to each trade.

• It is anticipated the pilot will result in greater productivity of staff and reduced downtime, as they will be able to complete more jobs without coming back to the depot to collect supplies.

• We will review the success of this pilot in April 2019 to inform further roll out.

**Learning & Development**

• **Explore Multi-Skill training** and delivery for staff: A tender has been issued to source an appropriate provider to carry out a desk-based skills assessment for all staff. It is anticipated the assessments will commence in March 2019 and completed in April 2019.

• The assessments will provide a base-line to help inform and develop a multi-skills repairs delivery model and to shape the long-term learning and development strategy for the service including the use of apprenticeships.

**Local Development Scheme**

• Greenwich has the third highest housing target in London (both in the current London Plan and the draft new London Plan). The updated Local Development Scheme (LDS) published in April 2018 sets out the 3-year project plan for the preparation and review of the Local Plan and other planning documents to ensure that there is a robust, up-to-date and proactive planning framework in place to respond to this challenging target.

• The preparation of the Site Allocations Local Plan is underway, with the next stage of formal consultation in early 2019. It includes a range of sites to meet the identified development needs set out in the Core Strategy, with a focus on ensuring housing-led allocations deliver high quality and sustainable places to live over the long term. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being updated alongside the site allocations, to ensure that the appropriate physical and social infrastructure is delivered alongside new development.

• Supplementary guidance is also being developed for areas with particularly high growth potential/development interest.

• Work on reviewing the Woolwich SPD is well underway – this will provide a development framework to ensure a coordinated, consistent and high quality approach to managing development in the town centre, specifically considering how key development sites fit together and the importance of introducing new residential development to the town centre to support its vitality.

• The Thamesmead and Abbey Wood Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF), being developed in partnership with the GLA, TfL and LB Bexley, will establish the parameters for appropriate development and transformation of the area over the next 20 years, with a focus on securing the necessary investment to bring the DLR across the river to Thamesmead.

• A borough-wide Urban Design Guide SPD will also be prepared in 2019, to set out clear expectations for the quality of new development at all scales. This will be particularly important in meeting the draft
new London Plan’s presumption in favour of development of small housing sites of 25 units and under, without compromising on the quality of new homes delivered.
A Cleaner Greener Greenwich

Key Messages

- A limited quantity of the Authority’s waste may be affected by a ‘no deal’ Brexit. Contingency plans are in place with the Contractor.

- The service is continuing with the planned replacement of older more polluting vehicles for newer vehicles and the Council fleet is on target to meet the ULEZ standards ahead of the deadlines in 2020 & 2021.

- The Royal Borough adopted a Parks and Open Spaces Strategy and Action Plan in 2017 and the relevant actions for 2019 are currently being delivered.

External Updates

- The Mayor of London’s Environmental Strategy, published in May 2018, requires all London Boroughs to produce a Recycling and Reduction Plan (RRP) to demonstrate how they are acting in general conformity with the Mayor’s Strategy. Greenwich’s RRP is in its final stages of drafting.

- Following the publication of Defra’s Waste and Resource Strategy in December 2018, the Council will be responding to several consultations including:
  1. Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR – is a mechanism to add all of the environmental costs associated with a product throughout the product life cycle to the producer that product).
  2. Deposit Return Schemes (DRS – where the consumer pays an up-front deposit for the bottle, which is repaid to them on return of their empty drinks container).

Parks & Open Spaces

- Parks Estates and Open Spaces (PEOS) submitted an Expression of Interest (EOI) to the Future Parks Accelerator scheme for £679,267 for refurbishment and conversion for commercial/social use of 4 redundant, semi-derelict former park public toilets, at Bostall Gardens, Maryon Wilson Park, Queenscroft Park and St. Alfege Park. Unfortunately, we have been notified that the scheme was oversubscribed and we have not been selected to be awarded funding. This scheme is funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund and the National Trust.

Key Service Updates

Road Cleanliness

- Number and tonnage of fly tips have reduced. Influencing factors could be effective communications, enforcement activities and the deployment of Taskforce Teams having a positive impact.

- An efficient leaf clearance programme resulted in roads being cleansed over and above the scheduled the once per fortnight schedule during this period.

- Environmental Management System implemented in waste collection and street cleansing operations. Commercial system still in development.
Fleet
- The environmental profile of the fleet is being improved via replacement of older vehicles with Euro 6/Vi vehicles. The fleet is also operating 6 electric vehicles.

Waste
- Uncollected bins increased in Q3 as a result of operational issues, greater volumes of waste in the run up and during the holiday period, and the roll-out of the new Environmental Management System. Measures have been put into place to systematically reduce these going forward.
- Measures to reduce the amount of out of borough residents and trade waste from disposing of waste from at the Reuse & Recycling Centre have proved to be successful with a reduction in projected waste of over 1600t in Q3, with a projected £160k disposal saving. Residents are asked to bring Driving Licence or a Council Tax bill to the site to prove that they live in the Borough.

Parks & Open Spaces
- PEOS supported the Friends of Queenscroft Park and Avery Hill Park with bids to the Mayor of London’s Greener City Fund for trees. These bids were successful and a community orchard has been planted at Queenscroft Park with the assistance of the Friends Group and Haimo Primary School and Eltham Hill Secondary School Pupils. The Friends of Avery Hill Park have planted trees in the Avery Hill Park. 4 other Park Friend Groups secured 50 trees each from the Mayor of London’s Greener City Fund and PEOS have agreed planting locations in these sites. It is planned to plant 895 trees during 2018/19 across parks, highways and housing land and this makes a significant contribution towards the Corporate Plan Target to plant 2022 trees by the year 2022.
- PEOS have been allocated £177,000 Section 106 funding to develop a master plan and delivery of priority improvements at St. Alfege Park in Greenwich. PEOS have tendered for landscape architect services to support development of the master plan during 2019.
- 8 Park Friends Groups Greenwich Neighbourhood Growth Fund applications progressed to the public vote stage of the scheme. The applications ranged from improvements to play areas to installation of a new drinking water fountain.
- PEOS are preparing 13 Green Flag Park Award applications for 2019/20. These would have been submitted by the 31st January. These include Eltham Crematorium as an additional application on previous years. Application sites will be externally assessed between March and June, with successful sites receiving awards in July 2019.
- PEOS are progressing with the development of an Allotment Action Plan. A further consultation meeting with Allotment Site Representatives is scheduled for 6th February to review a new draft allotment tenancy agreement. The Allotment Action Plan is scheduled to be completed by 31st March 2019.
- PEOS are progressing with the development of a Bereavement Services Action Plan. This Action Plan will cover both Crematorium and Cemetery Services. Current work on the Action Plan includes benchmarking with Regional and UK Burial and Crematorium Authorities and analysis of future potential supply and demand. The Bereavement Services Action Plan is scheduled to be completed by 31st March 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Previous Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Number of trees planted (needs to include Parks and Housing)</td>
<td>403 (17/18)</td>
<td>470 (16/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Net number of street trees in the Borough (individually recorded assets, excludes plantations and groups of trees)</td>
<td>12,660 (17/18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Number of fly-tips reported (by the public) removed</td>
<td>464 (Q3 18-19)</td>
<td>733 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Total number of fly-tips removed</td>
<td>3611 (Q3 18-19)</td>
<td>4177 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Total tonnage of fly-tips removed</td>
<td>297 (Q3 18-19)</td>
<td>373 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Allotments % vacant</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>95% occupancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Allotments number vacant</td>
<td>18/808</td>
<td>16/810 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>95% occupancy</td>
<td>Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE) has a target of 66.67% at A or B standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Parks cleanliness score (APSE land audit measurement)</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>85% at A and B standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Number of Green Flag awards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>a) 12 for 18/19, b) 13 for 19/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm</td>
<td>Percentage of residential road cleansing schedules completed</td>
<td>130% (Q3 18-19)</td>
<td>97% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>99% (higher is better)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Percentage household recycling rate (Rolling year)</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.3256</td>
<td>35% (higher is better)</td>
<td>33% - (London recycling rate 16-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Contamination of recycling</td>
<td>11.12% (Q3 18-19)</td>
<td>12.86% (Q2 18-19)</td>
<td>10% (lower is better)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Fleet % ULEZ Compliant</td>
<td>25.73% (Q3 18-19)</td>
<td>18.4% (Q2 18-19)</td>
<td>36% (higher is better)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Proportion of sites where air pollution levels remained within the</td>
<td>72.73% (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>81.82% (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Government’s Air Quality Strategy Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Messages

- Small, Medium and Micro Enterprise Businesses (SMMEs) are the lifeblood of the local economy: 90% of the Borough’s 11,265 businesses are micro, employing fewer than 10 people, but collectively create the majority of jobs. The Council’s work in this area aims to ensure businesses have access to the services they need to start up and grow whilst ensuring that it retains and attracts as many businesses to the borough as is possible. There has been a lot of success in this area with the recent relocation of Drury Tea and Coffee and Henson’s food demonstrating that Greenwich is an attractive place for inward investment; local businesses winning £3.67 million in contract awards through the Building Legacies Programme; and the recent highly successful Business Award.

Key Service Updates

- The Council continues to strengthen its work to improve schools engagement with business. The Council Work Experience service arranges c 1,800 pre and post-16 work experience placements for schools in the borough each year - working with over 1,000 employers.

- The Council has recently launched its campaign to increase the number of accredited Living Wage Businesses in the borough by extending its Business Rates Relief Scheme. This will cover the cost of subscriptions to the Living Wage Foundation for five years. This is the second time the Council has made this offer, which is available to a further 100 employers to achieve accreditation in the next 12 months.

- Micro and Small Business are the lifeblood of the local economy and collectively create the majority of the jobs locally. The Council encouraged residents and visitors to shop locally through the promotion of Small Business Saturday on the 1st December 2018. Small Business Saturday is a national social media based campaign which aims to encourage people to shop in small independent businesses on the first Saturday of December. The Council showed its support through the promotion of Greenwich One Card offers, free parking in all the Council owned car parks on Saturday 1st and Sunday 2nd of December 2018.

- The Council is also funding the Phase 2 of the E-business Programme delivered with South East Enterprise. This includes specialist advice around Cyber Security, GDPR and e-commerce and runs to December 2020.

- The Council, in partnership with East London Business Place, delivers the Building Legacies Programme, which is funded by European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). This ensures local businesses are capacity built and fit to respond to contract opportunities.

- Following the inaugural Best of Royal Greenwich Business Awards in 2018, the Council held a second highly successful second award ceremony. Categories included awards for Greener Greenwich, High Street Retailer, Social Enterprise, Apprenticeship Employer, Micro and Small Business and Young entrepreneur.

- The Royal Borough has a long history of supporting apprenticeships and has expanded into a whole range of roles within the organisation from business administration, environmental services, social care
and the trades to horticulture, town planning, building surveying, media and civil engineering. The Council is using the Apprenticeship Levy to support workforce development and succession planning, and to create opportunities through a Greenwich Direct Apprenticeships programme to bring new employees into the organisation. This means that instead of using an Apprenticeship Training Agency (ATA) as previously, the Council now employs apprentices directly and is committed to paying the London Living Wage.

- Work experience and work related learning continue to connect young people with business and provide an introduction to work. The service secured £20,000 from City Airport to deliver the Runway to Success work related learning programme, which includes a range of employability and ‘world of work’ learning modules.

- The Council continues to make significant progress in its work on city innovation, delivering on the Greenwich Smart City Strategy published in 2015. Digital Greenwich (DGC) had been successful in eleven consortium bids with a total value in excess of £50m with the benefit to the Borough an estimated £18.7m.

- Key achievements include securing a National Centre of Excellence and test bed for connected and autonomous vehicles, with £19M secured from Government and Industry. This will be used to gain new insights in how transport is changing and can deliver benefits for the Borough, and to attract businesses and further investment.

- The Council is bringing forward a new Economic Development Strategy (EDS) for the Borough. When adopted, this will set out the Council’s long-term vision for the local economy to 2030. It will detail the Council’s approach to growing key employment sectors, safeguarding existing employment and attracting new businesses to the Borough. This important strategy will shape the Council and its partners’ response to future skills needs, and deliver inclusive sustainable growth that tackles poverty and supports social mobility.

- Greenwich Liveable Neighbourhood: initial engagement on how to transform Greenwich town centre into a healthier place for people, using an innovative online tool, is almost complete. So far we have received over 1,500 brilliant comments.

Priority Investment Programme

- The Council has invested significant capital funds in what is known as the Priority Investment Programme, which includes a range of projects:


  - **Charlton Riverside** – adoption of a Supplementary Planning Guidance Document (SPD) to control the delivery of up to 7,500 new homes & 4,400 new jobs. The objective is to deliver new jobs, homes alongside infrastructure such as a new East-West primary road, improvements to rail & bus infrastructure, new primary and secondary schools and healthcare facilities. The Council is continuing to work with other landowners, statutory bodies and community groups to deliver the aspirations set out in the SPD.

  - **Plumstead library** project will deliver a new combined library, leisure and cultural facility with the construction now underway.
• **Woolwich Creative District** – acquisition of key buildings on the Royal Arsenal is complete in order to develop a creative district for London. Planning consent is already in place for the scheme. The contractor has been appointed and refurbishment work on the buildings will commence shortly. A report on proposed letting to Punchdrunk, an immersive theatre company, has been approved with anticipated occupation in late 2019.

• **Woolwich Leisure Centre** – The Council is developing a new leisure centre at Viscount House to replace the current Waterfront Leisure Centre. Cabinet agreed a two phased delivery route in January 2019, with the leisure centre being developed first and the residential scheme delivered at a later date. Community Consultation commenced in Feb 2019, to understand the facilities which borough residents would like to be included in the new Leisure Centre. Results of the community consultation and a schedule of works to the Waterfront Leisure Centre will be considered by Cabinet in Spring 2019.

• **Plumstead Good Growth funding** – work has commenced to implement the programme. This includes soft market testing of the White Hart Road depot to workspace providers. The tender process for the architect-led design team, for urban improvement and shopfronts scheme for Plumstead High Street and White Hart Road is underway.

• **Spray Street** – Business support to existing businesses regarding potential relocation opportunities is underway. The developer SSQ LLP is currently assessing the impact of the Covered Market listing to the development.

• **Property Asset Strategy** – Cabinet agreed the new Capital Strategy which includes the Property Asset Strategy. The strategy will support operational service delivery alongside opportunities to generate income and / or support growth and regeneration. The strategy also has renewed governance arrangements in place.

• **Nathan Way Industrial Units** – the construction of 22 new commercial / industrial units at Nathan Way is underway, providing employment space which can support relocation from other parts of the borough as well as new businesses relocating into the borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Previous Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>Percentage overall employment rate (working age)</td>
<td>70.8% (2018/19 Q2)</td>
<td>72.4% (2018/19 Q1)</td>
<td>London average</td>
<td>London: 74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of Job Seeker’s Allowance claimant count</td>
<td>1.5% (2018/19 Q2)</td>
<td>1.7% (2018/19 Q1)</td>
<td>London average</td>
<td>London: 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of ESA claimants</td>
<td>10,290 (May 2018)</td>
<td>10,200 (Feb 2018)</td>
<td>London borough average</td>
<td>London: 8,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people placed by GLLAB</td>
<td>399 (Oct 2018 - Jan 2019)</td>
<td>323 (Apr - Sep 2018)</td>
<td>740 (yearly target)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Centre Plus – no. of vacancies</td>
<td>382 2018/19 Q2</td>
<td>353 (2018/19 Q1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No and Percentage of GLLAB jobs paying LLW</td>
<td>119 (54%) (2018/19 Q2)</td>
<td>120 (54%) (2018/19 Q1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td>Business breakdown by size (employment) in Greenwich (0-9 employees)</td>
<td>9,995 (2017/18)</td>
<td>10,190 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business breakdown by size (employment) in Greenwich (10-49 employees)</td>
<td>1,015 (2017/18)</td>
<td>1,000 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business breakdown by size (employment) in Greenwich (50-249 employees)</td>
<td>225 (2017/18)</td>
<td>220 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business breakdown by size (employment) in Greenwich (250+ employees)</td>
<td>30 (2017/18)</td>
<td>30 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of new businesses in Greenwich (rolling year)</td>
<td>-170 (2017/18)</td>
<td>910 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of business properties paying NDR</td>
<td>5,217 (2017/18)</td>
<td>5,140 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total NDR income</td>
<td>£71,297,000 (2017/18)</td>
<td>£68,893,000 (2016/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Greenwich businesses that pay at least the LLW</td>
<td>77 (2017/18)</td>
<td>104 (2016/17)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Centres</strong></td>
<td>Town Centre vacancy rates (%) - Eltham</td>
<td>5% (Oct 2018)</td>
<td>6.5% (Jul 2018)</td>
<td>UK average</td>
<td>UK: 9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Centre vacancy rates (%) - Greenwich</td>
<td>3.5% (Oct 2018)</td>
<td>3.5% (Jul 2018)</td>
<td>UK average</td>
<td>UK: 9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Centre vacancy rates (%) - Woolwich</td>
<td>7.9% (Oct 2018)</td>
<td>7.9% (Jul 2018)</td>
<td>UK average</td>
<td>UK: 9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footfall numbers (year on year % change) - Eltham</td>
<td>-4.7% (July 2018)</td>
<td>-4.7% (July 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footfall numbers (year on year % change) - Greenwich</td>
<td>9.3% (July 2018)</td>
<td>9.3% (July 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footfall numbers (year on year % change) - Woolwich</td>
<td>-3.6% (July 2018)</td>
<td>-3.6% (July 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>% of journeys undertaken by public transport</td>
<td>29% (2017)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

Employment

- JSA Claimant Count Unemployment is at a historic low at 1.1%, against a London average of 0.7%.
- In 2015, the proportion of the working age population with no qualifications stood at 10.7%; this has now significantly reduced to 7.1% or 13,400 people, but remains slightly above the London Average of 6.8%.
- Adult & Community Learning: Over the 2017/18 academic year over 4,850 learners undertook training delivered through an RBG funded ACL course delivered by one of 10 sub-contracted providers, an increase of 23% on the previous year. Subjects on offer included basic skills, ESOL (English as a second or other language), employability and preparation for work. A new Greenwich Learns web site and brochure was launched for the 2018/19 academic year to promote ACL provision.
- 129 apprentices are currently enrolled in the Council’s Apprenticeship programme and 41 have completed it so far.
- Nearly 1,800 pre and post 16 work experience placements through 600 employers were delivered in 2016/17.
- GLLaB continues to deliver an employment and job brokerage service to help local residents secure jobs from regeneration activities in the Borough, and beyond. This is funded through a mix of external funding and Section 106 monies. The funding covers customised training for local people, employment support to prepare people for work, and business engagement.
- The service focuses on two key areas – an increasing focus on those who are furthest from the labour market with more complex support needs which requires intensive and specialised support as well as delivering in work support for those who wish to progress in the labour market (eg. where low pay is an issue).
  - Overall, since April 2018:
    - 2,160 new service users have registered with GLLaB,
    - 495 have completed training,
    - 697 have been supported into work.
    - Around 21,000 residents have been supported into work since GLLaB was first established.
    - 10 IKEA Recruitment Roadshows across the borough were attended by over 1,400 residents.
    - 250 long term unemployed people undertook pre-employment training for IKEA vacancies.
    - To date this has led to over 70 job offers, all paid at a minimum of London Living Wage.
- The local economy has 95,000 jobs and 11,265 businesses. Over the past years The Royal Borough of Greenwich has experienced strong employment and business growth, with 19,000 new jobs added to the economy over the ten years from 2007-17. Although higher value employment in the borough has increased significantly over the past years, RBG still has a high share of low wage sectors such as retail, health and social care, albeit these sectors are still important.
• The E-Business Programme has so far supported 195 businesses (exceeding target by +62 businesses already) and 395 1-to-1 support (exceeding target by +155 days).

• Since May 2018, The Building Legacy’s Programme has supported 85 businesses and 64 jobs have been created. Businesses in Greenwich have secured £3.67 million in contract awards, bringing the total for the entire programme thus far to £8.2 million.
Key Messages

- Libraries and Leisure: In comparison to Q3 2017, the Leisure service has experienced an 8.5% (38,420) drop in visits from 450,106 to 411,686 during Q3 2018 over all of the leisure facilities. This is largely attributed to the Waterfront Leisure Centre, Greenwich Centre and the closure of the pool at Thamesmead for a month.

- Arts and Culture: Royal Greenwich Festival programme for 2019 is out for tender; Woolwich Creative District secures first tenant – Punchdrunk subject to final legal approvals; Chair and Trustees appointed (including three Councillors) and new Chief Executive, James Heaton, to start in April 2019;

- Visit Greenwich: Visit Greenwich Destination Management Plan (DMP) – draft version for 2019 to 2023 has been circulated with the final draft to be signed off at the VG Board meeting 12th March. A new Business Plan is being drafted in line with the new DMP. 2018 attractions footfall slightly down but hotel occupancy up 6.4% on 2017.

External Updates

Arts and Culture:

- Mayor of London launched the new Cultural Strategy ‘Culture for All Londoners’ (Dec18)

- Following on from the Mayor’s ‘London at Night Report (Nov18)’, the Mayor’s office has released a report about London’s Night Time Economy: ‘Think Night: London’s Neighbourhoods From 6pm To 6am’ (Feb19).

- Arts Council England published an ‘EU Exit Guide’ on 11 February 2019 to share relevant government information to help arts and cultural organisations prepare in the event that the UK exits from the European Union without a withdrawal agreement.


- Arts Council England are currently developing its new strategy for 2020-2030. This will shape its development, advocacy and investment approach over the next ten years. It is due to share its findings from the consultation, the delivery plan and next steps in Spring 2019.

VisitGreenwich

- Visitor numbers to London – decline in domestic visits: The London tourism industry has voiced strong concern regarding the decline in domestic visits, which has led to the GLA / London & Partners forming a London Domestic Consortium to plan for a new domestic marketing approach. Visit Greenwich and partners regard it as high priority to support this work and have come together as a Strategic Level partner so as to have a strong presence and influence on the campaign planning and delivery.

- Brexit – uncertainty has pros and cons for the UK tourism industry. On the positive side, a low exchange rate is good for inbound tourism particularly from USA and long haul, as well as domestic ‘staycations’. Negative effects are that London doesn’t always do well out of staycations; possible
airline disruption; visitor perception that the UK is too difficult to travel to and stay away; disruption in supply of goods; decline in European visitors particularly Youth Travel (European Youth Identity Card);

**Key Service Updates**

**Leisure service highlights:**
- In comparison to Q3 2017, the Leisure service has experienced an 8.5% (38,420) drop in visits from 450,106 to 411,686 during Q3 2018 over all of the leisure facilities
- This is largely attributed to the Waterfront Leisure Centre, Greenwich Centre and the closure of the pool at Thamesmead for a month.
- Sutcliffe park Sport Centre continues to thrive with month on month increases Q3 14,325 visits to clip and climb (no comparative data due to only opening in January 2018)

**Leisure detail:**
- The biggest contributing factors to the drop in membership at the Waterfront included the lack of a dedicated car park and the increasing competition in the area.
- The drop off in visits at the Greenwich Centre were attributed to further increases in local competition with a new yoga studio opening up opposite the centre. The reduction in free 2hr parking continues to challenge the centre in terms of retaining members when some competitors can offer on-site parking for their users.
- There was also a drop in visits at the Eltham Centre which was largely due to a two-week closure of the studio for essential maintenance

**Leisure Events / Developments:**

**Sutcliffe Park Sports Centre:**
- Sport to shine: Greenwich Sport Development team held a Sport 2 Shine disability camp at Sutcliffe Park Sports Centre during the October half term. 10 young people attended each day where they had the opportunity to take part in Climbing, BMX and Multi-sport activities.
- Sportathon Speed Climbing: With 14 schools attending Sportathon over Q3, saw over 230 local Royal Greenwich Borough pupils use the climbing walls free of charge winning them points for the annual summer event, traditionally held in June.
- Cambridge Harriers Open indoor 60m sprints: Approximately 60 athletes both, men and women, took part in the Open Indoor 60m sprint. The quickest male had a time of 6.93 second and the quickest female recorded a result of 7.8 second.

**Eltham Centre:**
- Eltham lights up: Carnival through the high street, GLL staff were based outside the library giving out freebies to locals, activities were also put on inside the centre.
- Local clubs, including scouts and schools, all held their end of year galas at the centre at a reduced rate.
- There has also been a gym refresh with new equipment and cycle studio refresh.
Recent works to the roof were completed in studio one, this should help keep further maintenance and potential closures to a minimum.

Library service highlights:
- Withdrawals during Q3 are up 3%, continuing the steady growth of recent years.
- Reservations are up by 1% in comparison to Q3 2017, and online reservations are 10% higher compared to the same period last year.
- Visits during Q3 small decrease of 2%, from the peak levels achieved last year.

Library service detail:
- E-books are doing especially well since we expanded the range available to borrowers from approximately 6,000 titles to 20,000. This growth has seen E-book rise by 168% in Q3 2018 compared to Q3 in 2017.
- Children’s library issues continue to grow, helped by the Story Garden at Eltham.
- Abbey Wood had approximately 6,000 more visits during Q3 in 2018 in comparison to the previous year, this is largely due to good partnerships that have strengthened with local schools.
- Charlton Library experienced just over 4,000 additional visits compared to Q3 in 2017, this has been attributed to more joint working with the Royal Greenwich Heritage Trust.

Library events/activities:
- Blackheath Library held a very successful Fun Palace event on Saturday 6th October with free all age drawing workshops. This year we had more adults participating in the activities.
- Eltham Library has been expanding its partnership work with diverse local organisations, recently the cast of Aladdin from the Bob Hope Theatre came in and met local children.
- December saw the opening of the Enchanted Garden installation, this has helped boost children visits and withdrawals.

VisitGreenwich activities:
- The new DMP will be launched to stakeholders and partners on 25th April at Dreadnought Building at the University of Greenwich. Key note speaker will be Sally Balcombe, CEO of VisitBritain/VisitEngland.
- Evaluation work on the Woolwich Cultural Destinations project has begun for Year 2, report due end March. A final report will be produced for end of March 2020.
- Greenwich Tourist Information desk has a new location within the Visitor Centre at the Old Royal Naval College. It is now a dedicated space for visitors to find out information and book tickets. This forms part of the Old Royal Naval College’s Painted Hall project. (Painted Hall is due to re-open 23rd March.)
- Cruise ships – 17 ships are scheduled to berth at Greenwich in 2019.
- Visit Greenwich now has 135 partner businesses (target for end March is 130).
- Visit Greenwich is working with RBG and Digital Greenwich on a new Interreg-funded project called EYES. The project is aimed at reaching excluded NEETS across the Borough to engage with them.
using a new digital platform to help stimulate increased levels of activity socially, culturally and economically.

Arts, Culture and Heritage

- Woolwich Creative District Trust now has a board and a Chief Executive – James Heaton – who brings significant experience of managing venues such as the Roundhouse and the Nimax group of theatres. Good progress is being made on finalising the stage 4 designs for the buildings and work is underway to develop a narrative and signage for the buildings.

- The tender process for the Royal Greenwich Festivals 2019 round has commenced.

- The Royal Greenwich Heritage Trust has submitted a funding application to the National Heritage Lottery Fund to make their museum and archive collection more accessible by touring the borough. Outcome expected in Spring 2019. Work on the new museum and archive storage facility is well underway.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Previous Value</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centres</td>
<td>Total visits to RBG leisure centres</td>
<td>411,686 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>450,106 (Q3 17/18)</td>
<td>-38,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total visits to RBG leisure centres – Adults / Children</td>
<td>393,151 / 18,535 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>421,940 / 28,166 (Q3 17/18)</td>
<td>-28,789 / -9,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>No of individuals who have visited a Council library in a reporting period</td>
<td>620,450 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>631,406 (Q3 17/18)</td>
<td>-10,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of individuals who made a withdrawal from a council library</td>
<td>16,089 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>18,355 (Q3 17/18)</td>
<td>-2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of withdrawal from a council library</td>
<td>229,932 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>236,537 (Q3 17/18)</td>
<td>-6,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Saver</td>
<td>No of residents with a Greenwich Higher Savers Card</td>
<td>9,961 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>13,007 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>-3046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total visits by Greenwich Higher Saver Card holders</td>
<td>318,667 (Q3 18/19)</td>
<td>315,441 (Q2 18/19)</td>
<td>3,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Visitors to attractions in the borough (calendar year to date)</td>
<td>13.5 m (Jan to Dec 2018)</td>
<td>9.7 m (Jan to Sept)</td>
<td>9.8 m (Sept 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic impact of visitors to Greenwich (£m)</td>
<td>£1.386 bn (2017)</td>
<td>up 5.6% on previous year</td>
<td>£1.312 bn (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of jobs in the Borough supported by tourism</td>
<td>16088 (2017)</td>
<td>up 1.6% on previous year</td>
<td>15,836 (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of visitors</td>
<td>19.37 m (2017)</td>
<td>up 1.2% on previous year</td>
<td>19.14 m (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average length of stay in the Borough</td>
<td>1.08 days (2017)</td>
<td>up 0.6% on previous year</td>
<td>1.07 (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average spend of stay in the Borough</td>
<td>£244 (2017)</td>
<td>up 1.7% on previous year</td>
<td>£240 (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

Tourism
VisitGreenwich - draft destination performance data for 2018 (top level figures):

- Attractions footfall: 13.5 million visits (up 0.65% on 2017). Full 2018 data for London is yet to be published, but Jan to September data is showing that numbers were slightly down on same period 2017 (- 0.6%). December is reporting to be a good month, however.

- Hotel occupancy: 79.3% (up 6.4% on 2017). Hotel average spend per room (RevPar): £75.66 (up 4.9% on 2017)

- For comparison, London hotel occupancy is up 2% to an average of 83.3%

- The full STEAM report for 2018, which monitors the value and volume of tourism in the destination is due early April this will offer further detail on the changes experienced in 2018.
Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Previous Value</th>
<th>Target (18/19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax collection rate</td>
<td>76.25%</td>
<td>94.65% as at 31.3.18</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Period 9 collection rate as 31.12.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates collection rate</td>
<td>81.23%</td>
<td>98.36% as at 31.3.18</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Period 9 collection rate as 31.12.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Human Resources

- As mentioned in the previous Cabinet Performance reports, as a result of RBG transitioning to a new apprenticeship delivery model in 2018 (from an Apprenticeship Training Agency to a direct employment model) RBG is currently under target for the number of new apprentices starting. However, the first pilot recruitment cohort took place in July 2018, with 7 new apprentices successfully appointed and starting their employment in RBG in Q3 2018/19.

- A second recruitment event took place in November 2018, with 8 new apprentices who began in Jan 2019 (Q4 2018/19). A third recruitment event is also scheduled for Monday 18 March 2019.
Freedom of Information Performance

FOI & EIR Performance (Q3, 2018/19)

- Percentage Overall: 89%, 93%, 91%
- Statutory Required Performance: 180, 169, 104
- Number Received: 0, 0, 20

Customer services

Contact Made for Individual Cases via Customer Services Public Facing Channels (Q3, 2018/19)

- Corporate Contact Centre (Day): 42%
- Eltham Centre: 4%
- Corporate Contact Centre (Out of Hours): 7%
- Woolwich Centre: 10%
- Registrars: 2%
- Customer Service Switchboard (External Contacts): 34%
Ward Budgets

- The Ward Budget scheme was agreed by Cabinet on 24th July 2018, and will run to the end of the current Administration in 2022.
- Each of the 17 wards has an allocation of £30,000 to support initiatives across their local communities.
- To date, 13 ward budget applications have been approved, 3 of which were a cross-boundary initiatives.
- £75,086 (15%) has been committed to date with £434,914 (85%) still remaining in the budget.
- The table below shows the project activity agreed to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Ward Budget Proposals Approved or in Process Including Cross Ward Boundary Proposals</th>
<th>Total Approved Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coldharbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Eltham</td>
<td>• New Eltham Christmas lights</td>
<td>£780.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham North</td>
<td>• Drinking Fountain in Eltham Park South</td>
<td>£9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Radio Scheme for Eltham High Street</td>
<td>£1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham South</td>
<td>• New Eltham Christmas lights</td>
<td>£780.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Radio Scheme for Eltham High Street</td>
<td>£1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyndon</td>
<td>• Beach Project</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Winns Common Playground</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidbrooke and Hornfair</td>
<td>• Kidbrooke Park School / Greenwich Theatre Drama Programme</td>
<td>£4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Charlton and Kidbrooke Environmental Champions</td>
<td>£2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Youth Zone at Samuel Montagu Centre</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kidbrooke Fitness and Befriending Club</td>
<td>£5,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>• PiP East Greenwich Pleasaunce Wassail and Wildflowers</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumstead</td>
<td>• Winns Common Playground</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shootershill</td>
<td>• Winns Common Playground</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>• Support for Riverside Neighbourhood Watch</td>
<td>£395.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greenwich Night Shelter – Dishwasher</td>
<td>£1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Picnic in the Park 2019 – 2022</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complaints

Statutory Complaints

- Statutory complaints refer to those received by the Council that fall into either of the following categories.
  1. Formal complaints concerning children’s social care
     - Children’s Services administer these complaints under a five-stage process
  2. Formal complaints concerning adult’s social care
     - Health & Adults administer these complaints under a four-stage process.

- The tables below highlight the performance of the Council in terms of response punctuality and the rates at which the Council either found fully or partially in favour of the complainant (upheld/partially upheld) or against the complainant (not upheld) at the respective stages of the complaint process.

Statutory Complaints Concerning Children’s Social Care (Q3 2018/19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILDREN’S SERVICES STATUTORY Stage One – Local Resolution</th>
<th>CHILDREN’S SERVICES STATUTORY Stage Two – Independent Investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. complaints received</td>
<td>Handled within timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CHILDE...
Statutory Complaints Concerning Adult Social Care (Q3 2018/19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTH &amp; ADULTS STATUTORY</th>
<th>HEALTH &amp; ADULTS STATUTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage One – Independent Investigation</td>
<td>Stage Two – Complaint Reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. complaints received</td>
<td>No. complaints received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handled within timescale</td>
<td>Handled within timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upheld</td>
<td>Upheld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Upheld</td>
<td>Partially Upheld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Upheld</td>
<td>Not Upheld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEALTH &amp; ADULTS STATUTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage Three – Ombudsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. complaints received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Statutory Complaints

- Non-statutory complaints refer to all other complaints received by the Council outside those categorised as statutory, however also exclude complaints that relate to schools, councillors and appeals against FOI responses, parking fines, planning applications and benefit claims which are all administered under separate processes.

- Under the Council’s complaints policy, non-statutory complaints are administered under a three stage process
  - Stage One – Initial complaint received. The Council undertakes an initial investigation and responds within 15 working days.
  - Stage Two – Complaint Reviewed. This is where the complainant has appealed against the Council’s response to their Stage 1 response. The Council must respond within 20 working days.
  - Stage Three – The complainant escalates the matter to either the Local Government Ombudsman or the Housing Ombudsman

- The tables below highlight the performance of the Council in terms of response punctuality and the rates at which the Council either found fully or partially in favour of the complainant (upheld/partially upheld) or against the complainant (not upheld) at the respective stages of the complaints process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children's Services Non-Statutory</th>
<th>No. complaints received</th>
<th>Handled within timescale</th>
<th>Upheld</th>
<th>Partially Upheld</th>
<th>Not Upheld</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>No. complaints received</th>
<th>Handled within timescale</th>
<th>Upheld</th>
<th>Partially Upheld</th>
<th>Not Upheld</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities &amp; Environment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRES</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance (Benefits)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance (Customer Services)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance (Human Resources)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance (Revenues)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Adults Non-Statutory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Safer Communities</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>465</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Decision required**

   This report makes the following recommendations to the decision-maker:

   1.1 To agree the Social Mobility Delivery Plan and its recommendations as listed at 4.5.

   1.2 To agree to the creation of the Social Mobility Board and its terms of reference as referred to in 4.10 and set out in Appendix C.

   1.3 To note that out of 26 recommendations, only 5 have a direct cost associated with them and that funding has been secured for the first year.

   1.4 To agree that officers will investigate the potential funding routes for the 2 options which have unfunded cost implications for future years (Recommendations 10 and 18), as set out in Section 4.8.

2. **Links to the Royal Greenwich high level objectives**

2.1 Social Mobility covers all aspects of an individual’s life including the housing they live in, the job they work in, their education and their local environment. Therefore this report relates to the Council’s agreed high level objectives as follows:

   - A Healthier Greenwich
   - A Safer Greenwich
   - A Great Place to Grow Up
   - Delivering Homes Through Economic Growth
   - A Cleaner, Greener Greenwich
   - Economic Prosperity for All

ITEM NO: 10
3. **Purpose of Report and Executive Summary**

3.1 On the 21st of March 2018, Cabinet agreed the vision and broad objectives of a Social Mobility Strategy.

3.2 In addition, Cabinet agreed that a further report and detailed delivery plan, including financial considerations, would be brought to a future meeting for consideration. This is that report and the detailed Delivery Plan is set out at Appendix A.

4. **Introduction and Background**

4.1 This Delivery Plan follows on from the Social Mobility Strategy which set out the very broad vision for the Royal Borough’s approach in regard to social mobility and builds on the work undertaken by the Royal Greenwich Fairness Commission of 2017. The Delivery Plan is broken down into 8 chapters, reflecting each of the key themes:

1. Improve the Financial Resilience of Families and Individuals
2. Support for the Unemployed and Underemployed
3. Improving Opportunities and Skills for Children and Young People
4. Support for Small and Medium sized Enterprises
5. Digital Inclusion
6. Help at Home
7. Building more Social and Affordable Homes and Improve the Quality of Homes
8. Improving Health and Wellbeing and Build Community Networks

4.2 Each theme has its own specific evidence base which has been used to determine the areas for action. This is supported by national research and, where available, local and service-specific evidence. The starting point was to make sure that the evidence base was as complete as possible, in order to ensure that the Delivery Plan is well-informed, relevant and ambitious. This evidence base is referenced within the body of the Delivery Plan.

4.3 The Delivery Plan has been developed in a collaborative and corporate way with over 50 Council Officers, drawn from across the Council, inputting into the development of the recommendations. This means it has been developed to complement existing, and developing Council Strategies, including the forthcoming Housing and Economic Development Strategy. This ensures that
work has remained focused on where gaps exist as opposed to duplicating work which is already ongoing.

4.4 The recommendations seek to alleviate and remove the barriers that people experience, helping to improve access to opportunities across the multifaceted nature of people’s lives. This has involved understanding how protected characteristics interact with barriers in health, education, employment and at home. Our research found that gaps exist between groups, and, unfortunately, many of our residents do not have the same opportunities open to them as others.

4.5 A total of 26 recommendations (one primary recommendation and 25 recommendations) are made, the majority focus on working in different ways to alleviate some of the barriers that hold individuals back from reaching their full potential. These are listed below:

**Primary Recommendation**
Creation of the Social Mobility Board

**Improve the Financial Resilience of Families and Individuals**
1. To change the functions of the ‘Universal Support Team’ to proactively deliver a 1-1 Advice and Support Service to RBGs most vulnerable residents.
2. Proactive identification and support for vulnerable residents in arrears to the Council.
3. Provide financial education to school aged children.

**Support for the Underemployed and Unemployed**
4. To set up an annual programme of ‘Yes I Can’ job fairs. These are focused at bringing individuals who are unemployed and have long-term health conditions or are disabled together with local employers to improve employment opportunities for this group by sharing opportunities and advice, both for the individual and the employer.
5. The Royal Borough of Greenwich should adopt and champion the Mayor’s Good Work Standard and look to sign up as many businesses as possible to this standard.
6. To carry out targeted advertising of the Council’s Childcare Loan Deposit Scheme to those who are going on maternity/paternity leave, and look to increase the number of employers in the Borough who offer a Childcare Loan Deposit Scheme.
7. To conduct an annual survey of staff to understand rates of underemployment and overemployment in the Council, and use the
feedback from this survey to develop models that can support these individuals.
8. To develop a model where short-term projects can be advertised to existing staff.

**Improve Opportunities and Skills for Children and Young People**
9. Create more work experience placements across Greenwich, advertise placement opportunities online and provide specific support to in-need groups, such as Care Leavers, around securing work experience and future employment opportunities.
10. Establish a Sports Coaching trainee programme for 16-25 year olds who are NEET, at risk of being NEET, from low-income households, care leavers and looked after children.

**Support for Small and Medium Sized Enterprises**
11. To offer an LLW paid internship to local planning students to conduct an annual survey of Borough-wide starts and completions of commercial space in new developments. To use this survey data to proactively link upcoming and vacant business space to SMEs looking for space.
12. The Council should look to take the head lease of large vacant units on our high streets and break up these units into smaller sizes to enable local SMEs to locate to our town centres.

**Digital Inclusion**
13. To implement and refine a Digital Inclusion model and to put into place a dedicated ‘Digital Inclusion Officer’ to oversee the implementation of this model.
14. Identify and trial new forms of assistive digital technology that can improve the lives of residents with specific needs.

**Help at Home**
15. Take a proactive approach to reducing energy bills for residents. This includes proactively engaging energy providers to install smart meters when a Council property becomes void and explore the use of funds available to the Council to improve the energy efficiency of housing.
16. Establish a model for food pantries in the Borough, specifically assessing the potential of a co-operative model.
17. Carry out an annual mail out to families who are eligible for, and not claiming Healthy Start Vouchers and Free School Meals to increase their uptake
18. Establish a 3 year holiday meals programme.
19. Investigate the potential for creating a co-operative model that will enable residents to buy discounted essential appliances and basic technology.
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Building more Social and Affordable Homes and Improve the Quality of Housing

20. Support on-going building of affordable homes and continue to increase the number of Council owned houses built.
21. Explore the use of Additional and Selective licensing in the Borough to improve standards for residents in the private rented sector.

Improve Health and Wellbeing and Build Community Networks

22. Increase the number of Play Streets in the borough and develop a ‘Play Estate’ scheme in areas with high deprivation and low physical activity.
24. Expand the scope of the Residents’ Survey or use another suitable route to improve data collection on levels of physical activity in the Borough, to understand the effectiveness of current services and new schemes.
25. Establish a set of intergenerational activities, beginning with linking nursery classes and residential care home residents.

4.6 21 of the 26 recommendations do not have an identifiable cost associated with them, but are achievable through existing resource use. There are, however 5 recommendations which have cost implications.

4.7 The annual level of resources required to deliver the proposed recommendations have been calculated on the basis of a programme running over a 3 year period. It is acknowledged that the commitment to improving residents’ lives is an on-going and core aspiration for the Council. Setting out an initial 3 year timeframe is realistic, both in terms of enabling implementation of recommendations and delivering real benefits and also to provide for a review of this commitment during that 3 year period.

4.8 A summary of the 5 recommendations with costs associated with them is set out below. Funding has been secured for the first year and officers will investigate the potential routes through which these recommendations could be funded in subsequent years, such as sponsorship or social value offers generated through the Council’s procurement activities.

Recommendation 10

Year 1 to be funded by s106 (employment) contributions

Subsequently, to explore options to identify a budget of £22,500 per annum which will be used to train 20 vulnerable young people each year in formal sports coaching qualifications. This budget will be used for:

- Course fees
- Uniforms and clothing
- Facility hire
- Travel costs
- Mentoring support

Where possible contractors and partners in the borough will be approached to make a social value offer by sponsoring elements of this project (e.g. uniforms).

**Recommendation 11**
To offer two London Living Wage internships to local planning students to conduct a survey of business space in the Borough, at a cost of £8,000 per annum. For each of the 3 years, to be funded from the Council’s strong financial standing and repaid from future increases in business rates occupation.

**Recommendation 13**
To provide a Digital Inclusion Officer to oversee the implementation of a Digital Inclusion Model, at a cost of £50,000 funded from the authority’s IT Development Fund.

**Recommendation 17**
Funded by ongoing efficiencies derived from bringing urgent mailouts in-house, £3,500 per annum which will be used to support a targeted communication campaign to households that are eligible from Free School Meals and Healthy Start Vouchers but not claiming them. This will include using both social media and direct mail channels.

This recommendation has the potential to increase funding for schools in the Borough via the amount of Pupil Premium they receive. This is directly linked to the number of children that are eligible for, and claiming, free school meals at their school. This equates to £1,320 per child for primary schools and £935 per child for secondary schools.

**Recommendation 18**
Year 1 to be funded from remaining resources in the Child Poverty Reserve

Subsequently, to explore options to identify resources of £33k per annum, which will be used to deliver a Holiday Meals programme over the period. This will also fund targeted communications for the programme to increase uptake. The programme will deliver over where over 8,000 meals across 13 locations for the 12 weeks of school holidays each year.
The Council previously funded a Holiday Meals programme during 2018/19.

4.9 The recommendations vary in timescale, with some recommending changes to current working practices and others recommending investigations into the viability of new approaches that could be implemented in the future.

4.10 To support the implementation of these recommendations, and the future development of the social mobility agenda, the primary recommendation of the Delivery Plan is to form a new Social Mobility Board. This Board will oversee the implementation of the agreed recommendations and will review current practices to drive forward the Social Mobility agenda. Terms of reference for this Board are listed as Appendix C.

5. **Available Options**

5.1 To agree the Social Mobility Delivery Plan and its recommendations.

5.2 To not the Social Mobility Delivery Plan and its recommendations.

5.3 To agree to the creation of the Social Mobility Board and its terms of reference.

5.4 To not agree to the creation of the Social Mobility Board and its terms of reference.

5.5 To agree that officers will investigate the potential funding routes for recommendations with cost implications in future years.

5.6 To not agree that officers will investigate the potential funding routes for recommendations with cost implications in future years.

6. **Preferred Option**

6.1 To agree the Social Mobility Delivery Plan and its recommendations.

6.2 To agree to the creation of the Social Mobility Board and its terms of reference.

6.3 To agree that officers will investigate the potential funding routes for recommendations with cost implications in future years.
7. **Reasons for Recommendations**

7.1 All of the recommendations have been derived from an extensive needs analysis and are designed to support residents in realising their full potential.

7.2 Without the agreement to create the Social Mobility Board there will not be a high level group with responsibility overseeing the implementation of the recommendations and driving the agenda forward in the future.

8. **Consultation Results**

8.1 Both the Social Mobility Strategy and Fairness Commission had significant levels of public consultation and both documents have formed the basis for this Delivery Plan.

8.2 It is expected that some of the recommendations, if agreed, will require further consultation with the public around the specific actions being suggested.

9. **Next Steps: Communication and Implementation of the Decision**

9.1 Upon agreement, the Social Mobility Board will begin to meet and the recommendations will be implemented.

10. **Cross-Cutting Issues and Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Sign-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong> including Human Rights Act</td>
<td>The recommendations of cover a range of Council functions as set out in the report. The recommendations are consistent with the Council’s statutory powers and duties, including the general power of competence under section 1 of the Localism Act 2011. Should any of the agreed recommendations require any significant changes to the way in which the Council delivers its services, those changes will be the subject of a specific decision report under the Council’s Constitution which will include detailed advice on any legal</td>
<td>John Scarborough, Head of Legal Services, 15/02/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Finance and other resources including procurement implications** | The report proposes a number of recommendations for implementation, five of which have a tangible cost. The costs and funding source for each of those five recommendations is set out within the report. Two recommendations (R10 and R18) do not, currently, have secured funding for future years beyond 2019/20. The Social Mobility Board will need to ensure that:  
- any contracts entered into (employment or service related) are commensurate with the agreed funding period for each of the five recommendations  
- work is undertaken to secure funding for subsequent years, as described in section 4.8 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damon Cook, Assistant Director of Finance &amp; Deputy s151 Officer, 15/02/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Equalities** | The Strategy recognises the importance of the Equality Act 2010, and pays due regard to:  
(i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;  
(ii) advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups, and;  
(iii) foster good relations between people from different groups. The Social Mobility Strategy will not be removing any existing services but is seeking to improve access to services and opportunities for marginalised and |
| Daniel Tahsin Corporate Strategy Manager 07/02/2019 |  
| **ITEM NO: 10** |  

---
vulnerable groups. An equalities framework has been central in the process of developing recommendations and where available anonymised service user data on protected characteristics has been used to help understand specific needs of groups and to develop solutions to best support them.

The impact has been analysed and does not vary between groups of people. An Equality Impact Assessment can be found in Appendix B.

**Health and wellbeing**

A number of the recommendations in the delivery plan are specifically focussed on improving:
- Rates of physical activity
- Levels of healthy eating
- Social and Community networks
- Work conditions and opportunities for employees

Daniel Tahsin
Corporate Strategy Manager
07/02/2019

11. **Report Appendices**

11.1 The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:
- Appendix A: Social Mobility Delivery Plan
- Appendix B: Equality Impact Assessment of Social Mobility Delivery Plan
- Appendix C: Social Mobility Board – Terms of Reference

12. **Background Papers**


Greenwich: Our future together, Greenwich Fairness Commission, April 2017, available at:
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Introduction

“Social Mobility is about ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to build a good life for themselves regardless of their family background. In a socially mobile society, every individual has a fair chance of reaching their potential” – Social Mobility Commission

Following the 2008 financial crisis, the country has seen significant reductions in public spending, stagnation of wages, increased cost of living and the most significant change to welfare since its inception. In Greenwich, the ratio of housing affordability to earnings has nearly doubled, leading to increased rates of homelessness and greater pressure on our social housing stock which has reduced in size due to the government’s right to buy policies.

It is within this climate of increasing inequality that this Delivery Plan is presented. Its aim is to deliver a set of recommendations that go beyond ‘business as usual’ and present sustainable solutions not only for the short term but also for the long term. The Royal Borough of Greenwich has a core commitment to improving the Social Mobility of its residents, be that through delivering high quality schooling, ensuring we provide homes of good quality or supporting the development and growth of small businesses in the Borough. Therefore, these recommendations should not be seen as everything the Council does to improve social mobility in the borough, but rather as a demonstration of its intention to continue to go above and beyond to give every resident a fair chance at realising their potential.

This Plan follows on from the Social Mobility Strategy which set out the very broad vision for the Royal Borough’s approach in regard to social mobility and builds on the work put forward by the Royal Greenwich Fairness Commission of 2017. The Plan is broken down into 8 chapters, reflecting the themes of the Social Mobility approach:

1. Improve the Financial Resilience of Families and Individuals
2. Support for Unemployed and Underemployed
3. Improving Opportunities and Skills for Children and Young People
4. Support for Small and Medium Sized Enterprises
5. Digital Inclusion
6. Help at Home
7. Building more Social and Affordable Homes and Improve the Quality of Homes
8. Improving Health and Wellbeing and Build Community Networks

Each theme has its own specific evidence base, which has been used to draw attention to areas for action. This is supported by national research, and where available, local and service-specific evidence. The starting point was to ensure that our evidence base was as complete as possible, in order to ensure that the Delivery Plan is well informed, relevant and ambitious. This evidence base is referenced throughout the document and collated in a bibliography.

---

1 Social Mobility Commission, State of the Nation 2017 (2017)
The Delivery Plan has been developed in a collaborative and corporate way, with over 50 Council Officers representing every Council Directorate inputting into the development of the recommendations. This means it has been developed to complement existing and developing Council Strategies, including the forthcoming Housing and Economic Development Strategy. This ensures that work has remained focussed on where gaps exist rather than duplicating work which is already ongoing.

The recommendations seek to alleviate and remove the barriers that people experience, helping to improve access to opportunities across the multifaceted nature of people’s lives. This has involved understanding how protected characteristics including income, age, gender and disability correlate with barriers in health, education, employment and at home. Our research found that gaps exist between groups, and unfortunately, many of our residents do not have access to the opportunities that are available.
Creation of the Social Mobility Board

Social Mobility is a topic that cuts across nearly all Council Services, all Directorates and all Cabinet Member Portfolios and, therefore, corporate in nature, not service driven. This delivery plan has been developed with significant cross departmental working to derive the recommendations contained in this document. Social Mobility is an on-going aspiration and agenda for the Council. It necessitates cross-departmental and inter-service working to develop and implement initiatives. To deliver the recommendations set out in this Plan and to drive forward the Social Mobility agenda, the formation of a new “Social Mobility Board” is proposed.

**Primary Recommendation**

**Creation of the Social Mobility Board**

This Board would be chaired by the Leader of the Council and membership would contain the lead Cabinet Member, Lead Director. In addition the Board would invite relevant Cabinet Members to attend based on the content of the meeting.

The creation of the Board demonstrates the Royal Borough’s long-term commitment to improving the social mobility of all of our residents. The Board will work to support continued cross-directorate and cross-portfolio working to deliver solutions that deal with the need of residents which can often be complex and multi-faceted and which change over time.

The Board will be responsible for overseeing the delivery of the recommendations and the development of further initiatives.
List of Recommendations by Theme

**Primary Recommendation**
 Creation of the Social Mobility Board

**Improve the Financial Resilience of Families and Individuals**
1. To change the functions of the ‘Universal Support Team’ to proactively deliver a 1-1 Advice and Support Service to RBGs most vulnerable residents
2. Proactive identification and support for vulnerable residents in arrears to the Council
3. Provide financial education to school aged children

**Support for the Underemployed and Unemployed**
4. To set up an annual programme of ‘Yes I Can’ job fairs. These are focused at bringing individuals who are unemployed and have long-term health conditions or are disabled together with local employers to improve employment opportunities for this group by sharing opportunities and advice, both for the individual and the employer
5. The Royal Borough of Greenwich should adopt and champion the Mayor’s Good Work Standard and look to sign up as many businesses as possible to this standard
6. To carry out targeted advertising of the Council’s Childcare Loan Deposit Scheme to those who are going on maternity/paternity leave, and look to increase the number of employers in the Borough who offer a Childcare Loan Deposit Scheme
7. To conduct an annual survey of staff to understand rates of underemployment and overemployment in the Council, and use the feedback from this survey to develop models that can support these individuals
8. To develop a model where short-term projects can be advertised to existing staff

**Improve Opportunities and Skills for Children and Young People**
9. Create more work experience placements across Greenwich, advertise placement opportunities online and provide specific support to in-need groups, such as Care Leavers, around securing work experience and future employment opportunities
10. Establish a Sports Coaching trainee programme for 16-25 year olds who are NEET, at risk of being NEET, from low-income households, care leavers and looked after children

**Support for Small and Medium Sized Enterprises**
11. To offer an LLW paid internship to local planning students to conduct an annual survey of Borough-wide starts and completions of commercial space in new developments. To use this survey data to proactively link upcoming and vacant business space to SMEs looking for space
12. The Council should look to take the head lease of large vacant units on our high streets and break up these units into smaller sizes to enable local SMEs to locate to our town centres
Digital Inclusion

13. To implement and refine a Digital Inclusion model and to put into place a dedicated ‘Digital Inclusion Officer’ to oversee the implementation of this model

14. Identify and trial new forms of assistive digital technology that can improve the lives of residents with specific needs

Help at Home

15. Take a proactive approach to reducing energy bills for residents. This includes proactively engaging energy providers to install smart meters when a Council property becomes void and explore the use of funds available to the Council to improve the energy efficiency of housing

16. Establish a model for food pantries in the Borough, specifically assessing the potential of a co-operative model

17. Carry out an annual mail out to families who are eligible for, and not claiming Healthy Start Vouchers and Free School Meals to increase their uptake

18. Establish a 3 year holiday meals programme

19. Investigate the potential for creating a co-operative model that will enable residents to buy discounted essential appliances and basic technology

Building more Social and Affordable Homes and Improve the Quality of Housing

20. Support on-going building of affordable homes and continue to increase the number of Council owned houses built

21. Explore the use of Additional and Selective licensing in the Borough to improve standards for residents in the private rented sector

Improve Health and Wellbeing and Build Community Networks

22. Increase the number of Play Streets in the borough and develop a ‘Play Estate’ scheme in areas with deprivation and low physical activity

23. Develop a Borough-wide Play Strategy

24. Expand the scope of the Residents’ Survey or use another suitable route to improve data collection on levels of physical activity in the Borough, to understand the effectiveness of current services and new schemes

25. Establish a set of intergenerational activities, beginning with linking nursery classes and residential care home residents
A household’s financial resilience is crucial to their security, wellbeing, access to opportunities and therefore their social mobility. Income is fundamental to financial resilience and is inextricably linked to the security and nature of employment, maximisation of welfare entitlement, the ability to navigate financial institutions and plan finances. A stable income goes further than covering the costs of living (including rent, bills, food, heating and other unplanned expenses), it also provides a disposable income to enable a person to live their life as they wish and supports a household to build up savings and plan for the future.

However, an increasing number of people are struggling to make ends meet and are experiencing financial difficulty. While the number of people in employment is the highest it has ever been, this employment has not been of a sufficient standard to achieve an improvement in the living conditions for many. In fact, the number of workers in poverty has continued to rise over the last 5 years\(^2\). This is the result of stagnating wages, rising living costs, insecure working and welfare reforms which have pushed many households, especially those on low-incomes, into vulnerable positions.

As of 2018, there were approximately 48,000 households in Greenwich with an income of less than £25k\(^3\), which is around 60% of the median income in the Borough (c£35,000\(^3\)) (An approximate measure of relative poverty). The graph below shows the approximate number of households within each ward with an income of less than £25k.

\[\text{Figure 1: Approximate number of low-income households in Greenwich by ward.}\]

Universal Credit replaces and combines six benefits into one payment, available for people who are working and on low-incomes or who are out of work. One of the key changes for

\(^3\) Acorn CACI, Paycheck Dataset (2018)
claimants is the move to monthly payments. Currently, most people who claim benefits and working tax credits budget on a weekly or fortnightly basis. As Universal Credit is paid monthly, it therefore requires individuals and families to budget on a monthly basis. In addition, the housing element of Universal Credit, which was previously paid to the housing supplier, is now paid directly to the individual. This means that individuals must arrange their own rent payments.

These changes are significant and potentially put already vulnerable households at further risk. Low-income households often choose to budget weekly as it enables them to have greater control over their spending. Therefore, monthly budgeting may make it harder for them to plan financially and manage their spending. The added responsibility of arranging rent payments puts further pressure on monthly budgets. When households are not used to budgeting monthly, there is a higher risk of defaulting on payments, such as rent or utilities, and turning to pay-day loans.

The Money Advice Service estimates that over 3 million individuals will struggle with their finances as a result of monthly payments under Universal Credit, with two-thirds of people claiming benefits and tax credits saying they regularly run out of money before the end of the month. Therefore, greater levels of support will be needed for individuals to improve their budgeting and financial management skills.

The Council had in place measures to provide budgeting support and assisted digital skills support as statutory services to support Universal Credit claimants after full role out began in the Borough in July 2018. However, recent changes in central government policy moved the responsibility for this to the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). The support provided by the CAB is to assist residents during the transition period to UC. Support will be provided for anyone, for up to 5 weeks, until the date of the first payment. There are concerns that this support will be too generic and not available for a long enough period to help the Borough’s most vulnerable residents who often have multiple and complex needs.
Recommendation 1

To change the functions of the ‘Universal Support Team’ to proactively deliver a 1-1 Advice and Support Service to RBGs most vulnerable residents

Many of the Borough’s most vulnerable and least financially resilient (In crisis) residents (Table 1), have many and complex needs. Including:

- Very low/no income
- Barriers to work
- Disability
- Physical and mental health issues
- English as a second language
- Multiple debts

These residents may or may not interact actively with the Council, though evidence suggests they will likely have debts with the council. It is these residents who would benefit most from an advice service that had oversight of as many of their issues as possible and could respond appropriately, without onward referrals or signposting.

Through a pro-active, evidence based, approach, the team will focus on delivering one-one advice and support to the ‘In crisis’ residents in the Borough. The team has specialist advice, benefits and income maximisation knowledge. They also have access to the Low Income Family Tracker (LIFT) Dashboard. The LIFT dashboard provides a financial overview and demographic information about RBG residents that are in receipt of either Housing Benefit or Council Tax Support. The tool gives the team the ability to drill down into the financial situation (Table 1) of specific cohorts or individuals in a number of different ways (age group, household type, children, employment, disability, type of benefit, location) which enables targeted interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy in Practice - Household Finances</th>
<th>Number of RBG Households (Nov 18)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households coping financially</td>
<td>22,711</td>
<td>Coping - households take-home income is greater than expected costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households struggling financially</td>
<td>2525</td>
<td>Struggling - households take-home income is greater than expected costs by between £0-£100 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households at risk financially</td>
<td>2799</td>
<td>At risk – household costs exceed take-home income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in crisis financially</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>In crisis – household take-home income doesn’t cover housing costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Low Income Family Tracker (LIFT) dashboard financial classifications.

As of November 2018, 194 households in the Borough were defined on the dashboard as being ‘In crisis’ meaning that the households’ income doesn’t cover their housing cost. These
individuals are at high risk of becoming homeless and the nature of their situation will mean that there is no silver bullet to resolve their issues.

The Universal Support Team has the flexibility to interact on a one to one basis with these residents and has oversight of their situation and of the services available to them, including:

- Budgeting support
- Advice services
- Benefit take up (Income maximisation)
- Council debts
- Housing support
- Healthcare and wellbeing support
- Employment (Gllab, Gllp)
- Increased focus on assistance for those at risk of homelessness

It is anticipated that the team will be able to proactively engage with an ‘In crisis’ individual without unnecessary onward referrals, will be a source of continuous advice and support until such time as their situation has been improved and they are no longer in crisis.

The financial situation of the individuals that come into contact with the team can be tracked over time and it is anticipated that the numbers of ‘In crisis’ residents in the Borough will be reduced. At this point it is anticipated that the capacity of the team can be re-assigned to providing a similar level of support to the ‘At risk’ cohort.

Low-income households tend to have more difficulty budgeting month by month and find it harder to build up savings, as often their wages are unstable and not always sufficient to cover monthly outgoings. As a result, spending that is not as urgent as rent or food for example, will often be left until last, or in many cases foregone. This includes monthly bills such as Council Tax. However, neglecting these payments can often incur fines and often push residents further into debt, where they in turn, become more likely to turn to high-interest ‘pay-day loans’ to cover the shortfall, exacerbating their problems further.

Low-income households are also more likely to stay in debt for longer, with 44% of those in the lowest income group still servicing payment obligations two years later. Debt collection practices can perpetuate the problem for vulnerable residents, creating more stress and financial insecurity.

---


5 Institute for Fiscal Studies, Problem debt and low-income households (2018)
Recommendation 2
Proactive identification and support for vulnerable residents in arrears to the Council

Through the use of the LIFT dashboard the Council can proactively identify residents in receipt of housing benefit or council tax support who are in Council Tax arrears. Every individual on the dashboard is identifiable by their housing benefit reference number. Through linking this information to the data held on those in council tax arrears, it will be possible to proactively identify those who ‘can’t pay.’ In response, the Council would have evidence to proactively offer a compassionate repayment programme for vulnerable ‘in crisis’ or ‘in difficulty’ individuals rather than continuing with enforcement action which would simply add to the debt the individual cannot afford to pay. There are compassionate repayment options already in place by the Council, however, there is difficulty in identifying those vulnerable residents who would benefit, as in many cases they choose not to engage with the Council.

Offers made could include:
- Waiving of court fees
- Payment plan
- Mandatory debt and budgeting course
- Universal Support Team Referral
  - Budgeting support
  - Advice services
  - Income maximisation
  - Council debts
  - Housing support
  - Healthcare and wellbeing support
  - Employment
- Increased focus on assistance for those at risk of homelessness
- Gllab/Gllp referral

Children and Young People

National research has increasingly drawn attention to a lack of financial awareness and resilience amongst young people. The Citizens Advice Bureau reported a 34% rise in the number of under 25s seeking advice and help with high cost credit in the past two years. Similarly, debt management charity Step Change found that nearly two-thirds of all its customers seeking advice in the first six months of 2017 were under 40. This indicates that

---

7 Step Change Trust, Rising debt levels and the struggle to cover household bills (2017)
more young people are struggling with financial management skills, such as choosing the best payment options, managing debts and payments and saving money.

The current financial landscape is very different to what young people faced twenty years ago. Due to technological change, the current financial climate and more aggressive advertising, children and young people are faced with a much wider range of financial decisions in their day-to-day lives compared to the previous generation. This could include choosing a mobile plan, monthly entertainment subscriptions, budgeting for driving lessons, saving up for a car or deciding whether or not to go to university and how to manage loans.

In addition, the advent of smart phones has introduced a new era of gambling. Online gambling and games have much more aggressive advertising, and having this at your fingertips is an added pressure. Understanding how to manage money is a key skill that is essential for all aspects of adult life, and the earlier young people are able to gain these skills the better.

Young Money is a charity focused on improving the financial knowledge, skills and confidence of children and young people, championing the inclusion of financial education in school curriculum. Recent research found that despite financial education being on the secondary school national curriculum, it is only taken up by around 40% of secondary schools. Interviews with teachers revealed there to be “significant concern about young people’s lack of awareness and financial understanding”.

Furthermore, the All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on Financial Education for Young People found that only 17% of secondary school teachers have personally received or are aware that a colleague has received training or advice on teaching financial education. While 58% of teachers would like to receive more training on how to deliver financial education.

There is currently no formal method of assessing financial education at school, leading to differing approaches and lack of consistency in how financial education is taught and what resources are used. The APPG and Young Money research found that teachers have limited confidence and resources to tackle the problem. Initial enquiries to schools locally has also indicated that there are mixed approaches in the Royal Borough of Greenwich.

### Recommendation 3

**Provide financial education to school aged children**

Anecdotally, initial feedback from schools in the borough has confirmed that financial education is not fully integrated into the curriculum. It is often taught as a stand-alone topic for a morning or day and is at risk of being treated as a ‘tick-box’ exercise. As is the case nationally, schools are under significant pressure to deliver exam results and are operating with stretched resources.

---
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resources. Consequently, additional subjects or skills that are not formally part of the curriculum may be neglected.

Young Money has released a resources text book for teachers called ‘Your Money Matters’. It provides lesson plans, activities and case studies on different aspects of financial education, including: saving, making the most of your money, borrowing, moving on from school, the world of work, risk and reward and security and fraud. The topics and exercises are integrated into school subjects, such as maths. This helps to make financial education seamlessly part of the day-to-day learning, and also provides some real-life examples to ground school subjects.

The Schools forum provides an opportunity to benchmark what schools are currently doing in relation to financial education and how it is integrated into the curriculum, and identify what support schools would like in this area. It also is a chance for us to share existing resources, and trial new approaches in this area.
Support for the Underemployed and Unemployed

Employment in the UK is at a record high, with over 75.8% of the working age population in employment\textsuperscript{10}. The percentage of those in work in Greenwich also remains high, albeit slightly lower than the UK at approximately 70.8%\textsuperscript{11}.

However, some groups experience additional barriers in accessing these employment opportunities. In particular, people with disabilities and long-term health conditions face difficulty in getting into employment. As the charity Scope found, people with a disability are twice as likely to be unemployed compared to those without a disability\textsuperscript{12}. Further to this, those with learning disabilities tend to have an even lower rate of employment\textsuperscript{13}.

Greenwich Local Labour and Business (GLLaB) has been working with the Camden Society to set up Work Train Greenwich. Work Train is a service that provides skills and opportunities for those with learning disabilities so they can get into the workforce. The Royal Borough of Greenwich currently provides apprenticeships to those referred to them by Work Train but other organisations provide more permanent jobs for those referred.

In January 2019, the first “Yes I Can” job fair took place in Woolwich Town Hall. The fair, run in conjunction with the Woolwich Job Centre Plus and GLLaB, was aimed at jobseekers with long-term health conditions or disabilities. The fair was different in structure from most job fairs. Instead of jobseekers visiting the employers’ booths, the employers would come to the jobseekers. The employer would speak to a group of job seekers for 10-15 minutes to discuss their business and explain any opportunities available. The jobseekers had the opportunity to ask questions of the employer and gain advice as to how to increase their chances of finding employment. The fair attracted over 60 jobseekers and 17 employers. The feedback from the fair was very positive both with jobseekers and employers, and, as a result of the event, five of the employers signed up to the Governments ‘Disability Confident Scheme’ which supports employers in making the most of the talents of disabled people.

\textsuperscript{10} Office for National Statistics (ONS), UK labour market: January 2019 (2019)
\textsuperscript{11} ONS, Official labour market statistics, economically active, Greenwich NOMIS (2018)
\textsuperscript{12} Scope, Disability Facts and Figures (2017)
\textsuperscript{13} TUC referencing Labour Force Survey, Disability employment and pay gaps 2018 (2018)
Recommendation 4

To set up an annual programme of ‘Yes I Can’ job fairs. These are focused at bringing individuals who are unemployed and have long-term health conditions or are disabled together with local employers to improve employment opportunities for this group by sharing opportunities and advice, both for the individual and the employer.

This should consist of three events hosted at the Greenwich, Eltham and Woolwich Centres to ensure good geographical spread across the Borough. The Council should also take an active role at this event, as a significant local employer, advertising posts that may be available and bringing employers to the event, potentially via the Championing of the Good Work Programme.

Additionally, Council Services and the proposed Universal Support Team should actively encourage and advertise the event to those residents they are working with who are looking for work and suffer from long-term health conditions or are disabled.

Quality of employment

High levels of employment and a population with higher qualifications have not led to reduced rates of poverty. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation reports that, since 2004/05, ‘the number of workers in poverty has increased at a faster rate than the total number of people in employment’\(^\text{14}\).

This can be partly attributed to the quality of work available. In recent years, there has been a rise in insecure work, such as zero-hour contracts and casual employment (the so called ‘gig economy’).

Data from the ONS indicates that from 2008 to 2018, gross median earnings in Greenwich increased by 13.8% from £575 per week to £655. However, if the same earning had increased in line with the consumer price index (CPI)\(^\text{15}\) there would have been an increase of 26.5% over the same period of time. This indicates that, in real terms, Greenwich residents are approximately £73 per week (c£3,800 a year) worse off than they were a decade ago. Pressures on the cost of living are illustrated in figure 2.

\(^\text{15}\) CPI indicates the change in prices of goods and is used as a proxy for the cost of living
The Council continues to champion measures to improve wages and working conditions for those that work in the Borough. There is continued commitment to the promotion of the London Living Wage (LLW) scheme and the Council’s procurement policies are under review, with a greater emphasis on delivering social value and increased competitiveness for LLW employers. However, it should be noted that, in certain industries, wages are a significant proportion of the cost of operating and marginal increases can make a business unviable financially. There is very little the Council can do to change this. Therefore, a focus on improving working conditions can help to ensure that other important elements that add to the overall quality of a job should be promoted.

Anecdotally, factors that make a ‘good employer’ may be the availability of initiatives such as flexible working, guaranteed hours, training and career progression or assistance with childcare. Until recently, there has been no set definition or framework for comparison. However, in April 2019, the Mayor of London will launch the new ‘Good Work Standard.’

The ‘Good Work Standard’ brings together best employment practice and links to resources and support from across London to help employers improve their organisations. The initiative has been developed in collaboration with London’s employers, professional bodies and experts. It aims to set a benchmark which every London employer can work towards and achieve. There are a number of ‘Must Dos, Could Dos and Should Dos’ for legal compliance and accreditation to the standard that build a hierarchy of best practice under the broad categories of:

- Fair pay and Contracts

---
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Recommendation 5

The Royal Borough of Greenwich should adopt and champion the Mayor’s Good Work Standard and look to sign up as many businesses as possible to this standard.

The adoption and championing of the Mayor’s Good Work Standard represents a route through which the Council can help to improve the working environment for Greenwich residents and those who work in the Borough. As a large local employer the Council, itself, has the ability to improve the working conditions of a significant number of Greenwich residents. By achieving and championing this accreditation the Council will demonstrate its good practice but also ensure it continues to keep its policies and practices in line with best practice.

Childcare as a Barrier to Employment

A significant pressure for parents, both those in work and those seeking work, is the rising cost of childcare. In 2018, the Trade Union Congress (TUC) reported working parents with children under five have seen nursery fees rise three times faster than their wages over the past decade. Costs for families with a full-time and a part-time working parent have increased by 52% per week since 2008. The situation is even worse for lone parents, childcare costs for a single mother or father, working full time, have risen seven times faster than earnings\(^\text{17}\). In addition to the increased costs many childcare providers require upfront deposits of up to £1,500\(^\text{18}\).

This rapid rise in the cost of childcare has led to some parents unable to work, or working fewer hours than they would like to, simply because they cannot afford childcare. The Council has already recognised this as an issue and has introduced the Childcare Loan Deposit Scheme. This scheme provides an interest free loan to full and part time permanent members of staff who have a child under the age of 3, to cover the significant upfront costs of childcare.

However, to date, the scheme has seen poor uptake, and therefore a targeted approach to advertising the scheme is recommended. Once this has been taken up by Council staff more widely, the Council would be in a better position to recommend this approach to other employers in the Borough and provide advice/best practice guidance in the running of the scheme. This would then provide the benefits more widely to the Borough’s residents.

\(^{17}\) TUC, Childcare fees have risen three times faster than wages since (2018)  
\(^{18}\) Gingerbread Charity, Upfront: A childcare cost guarantee (2016)
**Recommendation 6**

To carry out targeted advertising of the Council’s Childcare Loan Deposit Scheme to those who are going on maternity/paternity leave, and look to increase the number of employers in the Borough who offer a Childcare Loan Deposit Scheme.

**Underemployment and Overemployment**

Employment rates in the Borough are at a historic high. Added to this, the proportion of residents with degree level qualifications or higher has increased to 53.5% (a rise of 22% since 2007) and the number of workless households has decreased to 13.4% of all households (a drop of 7.6% since 2007)\(^9\). To put it simply, in the past decade, Greenwich residents have become more educated and are more likely to be in work. However, as touched upon earlier, these positive changes have not been translated into a better standard of living or a reduction in rates of poverty for residents. A factor in this underemployment.

The ONS Labour Force Survey classifies a person as underemployed if they satisfy all three of its underemployment criteria:

1. Willing to work more hours
2. Available to work more hours
3. Worked fewer than the specified hours of work threshold

Using this criteria and a set of survey questions, the ONS calculate that the rate of unemployment in the UK between July and September 2018 was 7.7% (nearly double the rate of unemployment – 4.2%). If the same rate is applied to the economically active population of Greenwich, it would equate to roughly 11,500 people being underemployed in the Borough\(^20\).

However, this definition is limited as it focusses solely on the hours worked and does not take into account other ways in which an individual could be underemployed. Therefore, this Delivery Plan proposes a definition for underemployment in Greenwich which encompasses the broader issues that come under the umbrella of underemployment:

**Underemployment is where an individual feels that:**

- Their employment is not providing them with enough working hours;
- Their employment is not remunerating them adequately for the number of hours worked;
- Their employment is not providing a level of work or responsibility in line with the individual’s skills, qualifications or experience;

---

\(^9\) ONS, Official labour market statistics, economically active, Greenwich NOMIS (2018)

\(^20\) ONS, Underemployment and Overemployment (2018); ONS, Labour market economic commentary (2018)
• They are unable to realise new opportunities due to their physical access to the job market i.e. through poor transport links or a lack of suitable transport based on their needs;

• They are unable to work more hours when offered to them by their employer. This may be due to specific individual barriers such as caring responsibilities or childcare arrangements

Under this new definition, the rate of underemployment in Greenwich would be likely to be significantly higher.

Being underemployed can leave individuals struggling to pay bills, in positions of uncertainty and can be seen as a measure of the number of people who are not achieving their potential even though they have a desire to do so.

The flip side to underemployment is overemployment. Overemployment is defined by the ONS as those who would like to work fewer hours for less pay. As of July to September 2018, 10% of the UK working population considered themselves overemployed\(^\text{21}\). Overemployment has been shown to be damaging to physical and mental health\(^\text{22}\). Therefore, this Delivery Plan proposes a solution which looks to take working hours from staff who view themselves as overemployed and offer them to staff who view themselves as underemployed.

### Recommendation 7

To conduct an annual survey of staff to understand rates of underemployment and overemployment in the Council, and use the feedback from this survey to develop models that can support these individuals.

More information is needed to be able to develop an approach and practices that can reduce levels of over and underemployment. Specifically: who these individuals are, what jobs they are in, their skill sets, training needs and personal commitments. Without understanding these factors any solutions will remain imprecise and their effectiveness will be limited.

Whilst it is difficult to establish levels of, or make interventions to effect changes in under and overemployment in independent businesses in the Borough, the Council can, as one of the Borough’s largest employer, survey its staff to understand the picture internally.

The current Staff Survey only covers employees’ attitudes to the Council, their directorates and teams. It does not cover attitudes towards the hours they work, their earnings and to flexible working as a whole. This recommendation seeks to address this by creating an additional survey that focusses on the aforementioned issues.

The survey would enable the monitoring of the number of people who feel that they do not work the amount of hours that suit them and would like to work more flexibly in this regard. Additionally, this survey would focus on the wider wellbeing of the workforce and how the

\(^{21}\) ONS, Overemployment and Underemployment (2018)

\(^{22}\) ONS, Characteristics of the underemployed and overemployed in the UK (2010)
Council can better support this as well as establish awareness of the support on offer currently. This survey would ideally be done annually so it can highlight any issues with an employee’s working pattern or health and wellbeing in a shorter space of time.

The objectives of the survey would be:

- To establish general level of underemployment or over employment in the Council.
- To establish if there are particular areas within the Council where job share or other flexible working schemes could be particularly beneficial.
- To establish other barriers that the workforce may face that is reducing their ability to work the hours they may want to.
- To establish the number of people who want to work more flexibly, especially those who want to do a job share.
- To establish the number of people who may feel that their skills and experience are underutilised.
- To establish the workforce’s awareness of the ability to work flexibly and the support that is on offer by the Council.
- To establish the levels of health and wellbeing in the Council’s workforce.
- To establish the workforce’s awareness of the support available from the Council for health and wellbeing and to current experience of the workforce when they use these services.

Offer Opportunities for Staff to Expand their Skills and Experience

For an individual to realise their full potential in employment, they need to have the opportunity to move into new, more rewarding posts that are commensurate with their skills, experience and ability.

Through an innovative professional development model, the Council could provide opportunities for its staff to develop skills and experience, outside their day to day work. This would be done through scheme whereby an employee, with the demonstrable ability, has the opportunity to carry out a piece of project work, in a separate service area, providing them with skills and experiences to help them secure future employment opportunities.

Recommendation 8

To develop a model where short-term projects can be advertised to existing staff.
This would differ from a secondment because the work would not be full-time and staff would remain within their existing role and would receive the same pay.

This scheme would enable employees who may have the skills and ability to carry out a role, but not the experience to spend one or two days a week away from their commensurate post, to support or lead on a time limited project. The individual would remain in their commensurate post and therefore their pay would remain the same but the work would provide them with the experience that may enable them to secure a new post and progress their career. This will give individuals the ability to develop transferable skills and support talent in remaining in the organisation.

In cases where further technical training is required it will be investigated as to whether funds from the apprenticeship levy can be used to support training of these employees.

There are additional benefits to the Council as these projects may otherwise be carried out by private consultancies or added to the workload of existing staff who may not have capacity.
Schools are currently experiencing another round of funding cuts, following years of austerity policies. The Institute of Fiscal Studies reports that per-pupil funding has dropped by 8% since 2010, despite a rise in pupil numbers. A substantial proportion of these cuts are to local authority support and sixth forms, where funding has been cut by 55% and 25% respectively. As schools’ budgets are increasingly stretched due to funding cuts, more importance has been placed on their core responsibilities and less on fostering skills and experiences for when children leave school.

In particular, careers education is often neglected or sidelined due to an overemphasis on exam results. Approaches often differ from school to school; the absence of any meaningful monitoring or accountability has meant that the quality varies. Children and young people who are fortunate to have the right networks and opportunities through their families and friends will utilise these in addition to the available options on offer at their school or college. However, many young people – particularly disadvantaged young people – may not have access to networks of people to support them with the right kind of guidance, advice and work experience opportunities. The Social Mobility Commission has found that young people without these networks are less likely to make the best and most informed decisions about their careers and are less prepared for the labour market.

The transition from education and training into employment is a crucial milestone in children and young people’s lives. It is vital the right support is offered to ensure everyone can achieve their full potential, regardless of their background or social connections. Information locally on the number of students who are not in education, employment and training (NEET) and pathways children take when leaving school is one way of measuring how they are supported in this next stage.

### NEET and End Destinations

As at the end of 2016, 2.9% of all 16-17 year olds in Greenwich were known to be NEET, while the activity was unknown for a further 2.1%. In the period of October-December 2017, around 10.4% of 16-24 year olds in London were recorded as NEET (this data is not available at Borough level).

Furthermore, in 2017 approximately 7% of students in Greenwich did not sustain their ‘end destination’ for longer than two terms. This is slightly lower than the previous cohort, where 10% of students did not sustain their destination. End destination refers to the chosen pathway students take after completing Key Stage 4, such as further or higher education.

---

24 Social Mobility Commission, State of the Nation 2017: Social Mobility in Great Britain (2017)
25 Sub-Committee on Education, Skills and the Economy, Careers education, information and guidance (2016)
26 Ibid.; Social Mobility Commission, State of the Nation 2017: Social Mobility in Great Britain (2017)
28 Department for Education, Destinations of KS4 and KS5 pupils 2017 (cohort 2015/16)
employment, and training. There is work taking place with schools to improve destination data recording.

This indicates that students in Greenwich are potentially struggling deciding which pathway to take when leaving school. An effective way to support a student’s understanding of their next steps and future employment is through work experience. It is important that young people receive opportunities to experience the workplace and have chance to undertake meaningful work placements to boost their skills and experience. This can have a positive influence on their choices and ensure students are able to make well-informed decisions. In addition, it can greatly increase their chances of getting a job.

**Careers advice, education and guidance**

Like many schools nationally, research found that secondary schools in the Borough have their own tailored approach to careers education. Feedback from schools on their offers revealed differing levels of support. All schools have a careers education programme, but the type of support offered ranges considerably. Whilst some schools provided work experience placements for their students and had formalised links with businesses, others did not. It was also difficult to gauge feedback on the quality of careers programmes.

For students who do not have large networks to draw on, work experience can provide a lifeline into employment and building on their networks. Good quality work placements provide a valuable opportunity to experience the world of work. They offer the practical element of learning how to apply for jobs, undertake work-based tasks and to experience the day-to-day running of a workplace for two weeks. Ideally, they may also spark an interest in an area of work or career path for the student.

In addition, work experience will make a student stand out when applying for jobs, further education or training, helping to improve their prospects when leaving school. Recent
research conducted on 1,000 UK employers found that two thirds of recruiters look for graduates or young people with relevant work experience. Employers valued this as it shows the candidate has demonstrated their skills in a practical setting, indicating they have a better understanding of the world of work. The newly introduced Gatsby Benchmarks provide a national standard for schools to follow in their careers education programmes. The Benchmarks have formalised the requirement for students to undertake work experience and for students to have more interactions with employers.

We want to ensure that all children, regardless of their background or circumstances, are able to access opportunities to experience the workplace and employment to help support their transition from school to work. This element of careers education should not be reliant on who you know or your personal connections.

As one of the largest employers in the Borough, the Council is well placed to provide high quality work experience placements across many different sectors within the organisation and its partners, particularly to students who struggle to find their own placements. The Council currently offers placements, but analysis has shown that placements are not as varied as they could be, and uptake of placements is mixed. It is important that placements are offered in areas that students are interested in, and that areas which are ‘hard to fill’ are promoted as options.

In the 2017/18 academic year, the Royal Borough of Greenwich offered 100 work experience placements. The graph below shows the distribution of placements across the Council and its partners, GS Plus and Greenwich Leisure Limited (GLL). While 100 placements were offered, not all were taken up. In total, 57 placements were positively booked and 43 were not used. This is shown in the graph below.

![Figure 4: Work experience placements by division/Directorate showing positive and negative take up](image)

29 UCAS, Is work experience important? (2018)
30 Royal Borough of Greenwich, 2018, Work experience placements by division
Currently, placements are provided to schools that use the Work Experience service and given to students who have been unable to source their own placements.

Recommendation 9

Create more work experience placements across Greenwich, advertise placement opportunities online and provide specific support to in-need groups, such as Care Leavers, around securing work experience and future employment opportunities.

The Council will undertake a number of steps to improve the current work experience offer for students in the Royal Borough of Greenwich:

- Get feedback from the Secondary School forum on what students would like to do for their placements and present opportunities available in the Council.
- Work internally with departments that have been identified as high demand to create more quality placements.
- Work with large employers in the Borough, our contractors and partners to increase the number of work experience placements offered, particularly in high demand areas as identified by the forum.
- Advertise placement opportunities online, requiring students to complete a short application form and upload their CV. This will help students experience applying for a job and to understand the processes involved. Opportunities will be signposted specifically to students who have been unable to find their own work experience placement. In addition, moving placement applications online will help to reach more students.
- Where 2-week work experience placements are not suitable (e.g. due to safeguarding issues), develop ways students can interact with this area of work, such as a shadowing day, industry days, presentations at schools or mixed work experience placements.
- Create a borough-wide survey for schools to help improve monitoring of careers education locally.
- Offer interview training schemes to in-need groups (such as care leavers) and where possible offer guaranteed interviews for apprenticeship positions to these groups.

Without this support and access to experience, many young people will struggle to find a route suitable for them and potentially encounter periods of unemployment, or fall into low-paid and insecure work. Studies have shown that time spent not in education, employment or training (NEET) can have a long lasting and damaging impact on individuals’ lives. It can be detrimental to both physical and mental health and increases the likelihood of unemployment, low wages and low quality of work later on in life.

Moreover, it is also important that students who are struggling to find their next step, who are (or at risk of being) NEET or without networks to draw on, are provided with a range of
options to support their development. This includes offering more non-traditional routes into training and employment.

**Recommendation 10**

**Establish a Sports Coaching trainee programme for 16-25 year olds who are NEET, at risk of being NEET, from low-income households, care leavers and looked after children**

This programme has the potential to improve the employability of some of our most vulnerable young people. Sport Coaching offers an alternative route into employment, providing qualifications and practical skills. This programme is linked to the ‘Improve Health and Wellbeing Through Community Networks’ group, who have been exploring ways to encourage physical activity in the Borough.

The 3 year programme would be targeted at 20 vulnerable young people each year – those who are (or at risk of being) NEET, looked after children, care leavers and from low-income households. Starting an ‘activator course’ and mentoring, providing some basic skills in coaching. The activator courses provide a good introduction to coaching and will also help learners to develop valuable transferable skills such as communication, organisation and teamwork.

Upon completion of each course, learners will be required to give back an agreed number of voluntary hours (e.g. 10 hours) with a local sports organisation or club, such as GLL. This will allow the learners to put their learning into practice, whilst also developing contacts with a potential future employer.

**Formal qualifications are as follows:**

- NGB Level 1 courses (assistant coach level)
- Community Sport Leadership award (Level 2 qualification)
- Higher Sports Leadership Award (Level 3 qualification, UCAS points)

Further voluntary work experience will be required to complete the above qualifications with project partners such as GLL, CACT, Peabody and Cray Wanderers. In addition, there is an opportunity to link in with other Social Mobility work, such as providing support to the Play Streets scheme. Additional training offered will also be offered, such as First Aid, Safeguarding and coaching disabled people.

This programme would support a number of aspects of social mobility, notably employability, health and community building. It would be aimed at local young people who are in need of some additional support in finding employment. The programme will equip them with formal qualifications, increase their employability, provide valuable work experience and empower them to give back to their communities through volunteering. In turn, helping to connect communities through physical activity.
Support for Small and Medium Sized Enterprises

Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs) are the backbone of the British economy. In 2018, over 99% of businesses in the UK were Small or Medium Sized businesses, employing 60% of the UK’s employees and delivering 52% of all private sector turnover\(^{31}\). Therefore, the success of SMEs is key to ensuring an area has a thriving economy that delivers jobs and prosperity for its population. It is vital that the Council supports the growth and development of SMEs in the Borough so that they can deliver greater numbers of high quality jobs that offer fair wages, good working conditions and good prospects for the residents of Greenwich.

In 2018, there was a total of 11,265 enterprise units in Greenwich, of which 30 employed more than 250 members of staff\(^{32}\). This means that 99.7% of business units in the Royal Borough of Greenwich are classed as an SME. The table below shows the breakdown of local units by staff headcount for 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>10-49</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>50-249</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SME</td>
<td>250+</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, within the last year, Greenwich borough has seen a decrease in its number of local units from 11,435 in 2017 to 11,265 in 2018. This is the first decrease in the previous 4 years which had seen 32% increase from 2014 to 2015 an 11% increase from 2015 to 2016 and a 9% increase from 2016 to 2017.

![Number of Enterprise Units in Greenwich from 2014-2018](image)

Figure 5: Number of Enterprise Units in Greenwich from 2014-2018


This reduction has not been seen consistently across all industries as figure 6 shows. Between 2017 and 2018 there has been over a 20% reduction in the number of business units with a focus on healthcare, over a 10% reduction for those in the education sector and other significant reductions in the sectors of Finance and Insurance, Professional and Scientific and Business Administration and Support.

This reduction in business units over the past year is of concern. Changes to non-domestic rates in 2017 will have increased the pressure felt by many businesses in the Borough. This, tied to the wider stagnation of wages and reductions in public spending over the past decade, has led to a more challenging climate for many SMEs in London and Greenwich borough.

Whilst factors such as the reduction in public spending, reductions in consumer spending and changes to non-domestic business rates are out of the control of the Council, there are some actions that can be taken to support SME growth in the Borough. One of the key barriers to growth of SMEs across the borough is access to adequate and affordable commercial space. Over the past two decades, the borough has seen significant levels of growth and high numbers of new developments. In many of these developments it is a requirement that commercial space is also delivered. However in a significant number of cases this space has not made it to the market, or has been completed in a way that is not suitable to the market’s needs, resulting in them remaining vacant.

---

33 Federation of Small Business, FSB Voice of Small Business Index Quarter 4 2018 (2018)
Figure 6: Number of VAT/PAYE Units in Greenwich in 2017 and 2018 and the Percentage Change Between 2017 and 2018
Bringing Suitable Business Space to the Market

The Borough has seen high levels of redevelopment over the past few decades. In many of these developments it is a requirement that commercial space is also delivered. During this time, it has been standard practice for developers to seek flexible use permissions for the commercial space in new build residential-led developments.

A flexible permission enables the commercial space to be marketed to, and used by, a range of different industries, effectively meaning that a space can be occupied by a restaurant, office or retail unit. The case for a flexible permission is that the unit can be marketed to a wider range of occupiers, thereby increasing the likelihood that the units will be occupied.

While a flexible permission is often an appropriate response to the uncertain commercial climate, there are a number of potential problems associated with flexible permissions. Such as resulting in units being designed in a generic way which means do not meet the needs of any of the intended occupiers, with the result being that fit out costs are generally unaffordable for businesses that may wish to occupy the space.

Regardless of the type of permission, there have also been situations where landlords may deliberately hold units vacant (i.e. not market them by keeping them in an ‘incomplete’ condition or even market them at much higher than the market rent) in the hope of securing permission to change the commercial space to residential use. The information currently available to the Council means there is no mechanism for accurately monitoring the extent of situations such as this.

The Council does have the ability to serve a completion notice on commercial space in new developments meaning that it must start to be marketed. However, without accurate information on the position of the development, the Council will not have the necessary evidence to serve these notices.

This situation means that currently there is commercial space in the Borough that is suitable to be marketed but is not which is limiting the availability of business space in the Borough. A secondary impact of this is the Council and Borough as a whole will miss out on potential business rates which would be received by this space being occupied.

Recommendation 11

To offer an LLW paid internship to local planning students to conduct an annual survey of Borough-wide starts and completions of commercial space in new developments. To use this survey data to proactively link upcoming and vacant business space to SMEs looking for space.

This survey would create a verified annual baseline of the status of new developments in the borough, which would be used in a number of ways:
- Where a development site is under construction, the council could carry out further checks to determine if the commercial space was being actively marketed and connect developers with SMEs requiring space in the borough. While it may not be possible to secure a pre-let in all cases, engaging early could reduce the fit out and other associated costs for the end occupier.

- Where a development is complete but there is no obvious marketing material visible on-site, the Council can promote its advertising and link the developer with SMEs requiring space in the borough.

- Where a non-residential unit with a flexible permission was occupied, the end occupier would be recorded. This information would enable us to understand the long term effect of flexible use permissions and enable us to review our policies in this area.

- The survey would provide information about vacant units in our town centres that could potentially be occupied by SMEs requiring space as well as assessing the health of town centres.

The survey information would provide evidence to support revisions to future planning policy, for example more defined criteria about the design of commercial ground floor space and areas of the borough where it was important to prioritise certain commercial over other types of commercial space.

The borough is commencing Local Plan review in Summer 2019, so it is particularly important to have this detailed information over the next few years to support the development of robust policies.

The surveys would be carried out over 8 weeks in the summer by two interns in the Planning Policy Team (DRES), paid at the London Living Wage. This approach to recruitment would ensure that the individuals undertaking the survey had the appropriate planning knowledge, whilst also offering valuable work experience to those pursuing the planning profession by improving their skills, experience and employability.

Supporting our High Streets and Town Centres
Greenwich is fortunate to have a number of high streets and three significant town centres; Woolwich, Eltham and Greenwich. Each town centre has its own unique feel and offer. Woolwich is a community focussed town centre with a number of independent shops providing a mix of products and services to the local community. Eltham is a significant local retail space, attracting individuals from the wider area. Whereas Greenwich is an international tourist destination, hosting independent shops and Greenwich market, which are primarily focussed and visitors from the rest of the country and abroad.
The majority of Greenwich’s town centres, especially those of Woolwich and Eltham, are made up of traditional retail units that occupy relatively large units that attract high rents. In recent years, the rise of online shopping has placed the retail sector under significant pressure, which in turn has affected both high streets and town centres.

Nationally, this has seen vacancy rates for commercial properties increase to 9.9%. In Greenwich, the vacancy rates of our town centres vary from 3.5% in Greenwich, 5% in Eltham and 7.9% in Woolwich\(^{34}\). Whilst these rates are below that of the national average, they still remain significant and, in some cases, the vacant properties can be large in size meaning the visual impact of their vacancy is more significant.

Vacant shops have a negative effect on the surrounding environment, with high rates of vacant shops linked to increases in crime and a general sense of economic stagnation which can both act to further reduce footfall on a highstreet and exacerbate the issues further\(^{35}\). Therefore, it is important that the Council continues to work towards ensure the number of vacant shops in our town centres remains as low as possible.

Due to the pressure on the retail market, the Council must look to attract new industries to our town centres\(^ {36}\). One of the challenges is that vacant space in the Town Centres has a relatively large floor space and subsequently attracts a relatively high rent. This prevents many businesses, specifically those in service industries that require a smaller floor space, from being able to locate to the Town Centres.

Recommendation 12

The Council should look to take the head lease of large vacant units on our high streets and break up these units into smaller sizes to enable local SMEs to locate to our town centres.

Where there are vacant units on our high streets that have little interest from the market (e.g. large ex-retail units) the Council should assess the potential of taking the head lease of these units and dividing the space to make the unit suitable for smaller SMEs to locate to.

As part of this assessment, the Council, through its business engagement team, should identify SMEs that would like to locate to one of our town centres but have not been able to find suitable space offered. This insight will then support the identification of suitable sights based on the need of SMEs that are looking to start up or expand in the Borough.

This approach would enable SMEs who are looking for business space in our town centres, be that permanent or pop-up, to access appropriate space that otherwise would not have been available to them.

---

\(^{34}\) The Royal Borough of Greenwich, Cabinet Performance Report Q2 (2019)

\(^{35}\) London Councils, Empty Shops Member Briefing (2012)

\(^{36}\) Deloitte, Retail Trends 2019 (2019)
Digital Inclusion

The invention of the internet and improvements in digital technology have, in the last 30 years, dramatically changed the way in which we communicate, shop, work and live. In the UK in 2019, digital skills and access to the internet can be seen as essential for a large number of everyday tasks such as accessing public services, socialising, shopping or managing finances.

In 2018, 8.4% of the British adult population had never used the internet\(^{37}\). Whilst this is down from 17.5% in 2011, there is still a significant proportion of the population who have never used the internet. Within this group, there is significant overrepresentation of both the elderly and disabled, meaning that both of these groups are at specific risk of being digitally excluded.

In addition to this, the variety of tasks that can now be carried out online (or using digital technology) means that not all individuals who have used the internet will have an adequate level of skill or access to mean they are not digitally excluded. For example, an individual may feel confident about going online to look at social media but may not be able to bank online, complete forms or write a CV and therefore can be seen as digitally excluded. It is important, therefore, when looking at digital inclusion, to take into account all of the reasons someone may be digitally excluded and develop solutions that combat these barriers.

The UK Digital Inclusion Strategy\(^ {38}\) broke out the four key factors that can cause an individual to be digitally excluded:

1. **Access** - This refers to the ability of individuals and organisations to connect to and use the internet.
2. **Skills** - This refers to the skills required to use and engage with content and transactions on the internet.
3. **Motivation** - This refers to people’s attitudes and choice for being offline.
4. **Trust** - This relates to people’s fear of the risk of online crime, or not knowing the credible services available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Digital</td>
<td>Financial benefits</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Health &amp; wellbeing benefits</td>
<td>Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{37}\) ONS, Internet users in the UK 2017 (2017)

\(^{38}\) Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, Digital Skills and Inclusion – giving everyone access to the digital skills they need (2017)
These barriers help to define the broad reasons as to why someone may be digitally excluded but, without linking them to the specific activities an individual may carry out online, it is difficult to develop solutions to combat them.

The reasons why an individual might use digital technology or the internet have been broken down into two groups: ‘essential’ activities and ‘non-essential activities’. ‘Essential activities’ can be seen as key day-to-day tasks that require sensitive information to be used and often need to be carried out at short notice. ‘Non-essential activities’ are activities that are primarily focused around entertainment or communication. These have significant wellbeing benefits and can help to build confidence in using the internet and digital technology. Examples of activities that fall into these categories are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Non-Essential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing finances</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying for jobs</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing benefits</td>
<td>Accessing news and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing Health Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Emails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using evidence derived from the UK Digital Inclusion Strategy and other research, the following two (high-level) in-need cohorts for Greenwich were identified. Their characteristics, digital needs and barriers are summarised below.
Population

No Issue

| Has some Digital Skills and does use the Internet, but not to its full potential |

Cohort Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Likely to have no digital skills or experience in using digital technology.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Likely to not have any digital technology or access to the internet at home. Additionally this cohort is less likely to be mobile and therefore accessing public IT facilities may be challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Unlikely to have a motivation to use the internet or digital services as historically they have been able to access these services in person or on the phone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Unlikely to trust using the internet or digital technology in their day to day lives, specifically in managing finances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohort most likely to be Elderly and or Learning Disabled

Cohort's Digital Needs

To be supported in completing the ‘essential’ activities, often on a 1-1 basis

To gain skills and experience in using digital technology and the internet through ‘less risky’ ‘non-essential’ activities to build confidence and skills and enable them to enjoy some of the social benefits of these activities.

Cohort's Barriers

This group will have significant access issues. They are unlikely to have any personal digital technology, personal access to the internet and may find it challenging traveling to places where public facilities are available.

This cohort may have specific health challenges which mean that they are unable to use digital technology themselves

This cohort are likely to have significant fear around using digital technology to carry out both ‘essential’ and ‘non-essential’ activities
### Cohort Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Likely to have some digital skills and experience in using digital technology, most likely smart phones. Language can, for some of this group, be a significant barrier in developing their skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Likely to have access to a internet enabled phone but less likely to have a laptop or personal PC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>This cohort is likely motivated to use the internet and digital technology for social media, entertainment and other &quot;non-essential&quot; day to day activities. But less likely to be motivated to use the internet and digital technology for &quot;essential&quot; services such as managing finances, finding employment etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Unlikely to trust using the internet or digital technology in their carrying out &quot;essential&quot; day to day activities but do have trust in using the internet and digital technology for some &quot;non-essential&quot; activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohort most likely to be working age population, in lower income, who are more likely than average to be unemployed.

### Cohort's Digital Needs

To enhance their digital skills, experience and confidence in regards of 'essential' activities, this includes; managing finances, managing benefits, searching and applying for jobs.

### Cohort's Barriers

- Inability to afford access to this internet or appropriate IT equipment
- Unaware of adult learning courses available to them and the benefits derived from using digital technology and the internet for 'essential' activities
  - For some in this cohort language and literacy will be barriers
- Motivation will be a significant barrier for this group and therefore the offer should look to demonstrate the benefit that can be derived from the time spent taking up this offer
Digital Inclusion in Greenwich
The Council, currently, does not have a digital inclusion strategy or model. A number of services, such as adult and community learning, community and voluntary sector and advice and benefits provide services that are aimed at improving the digital skills and access of our ‘in need’ residents, but there is no service that has co-ordination or overall responsibility for this topic. Because of this, efforts in this area can often occur discretely from other pieces of work, this leads to missed opportunities with regards to co-ordination of activities and subsequently a reduction in effectiveness.

**Recommendation 13**

To implement and refine a Digital Inclusion model and to put into place a dedicated ‘Digital Inclusion Officer’ to oversee the implementation of this model

The model will look to interlink a ‘Digital Champion’ approach with our adult and community learning offer and our public access offer to ensure that it improves residents’ skills, access, motivation and trust to and in digital technology and the internet. This model will focus on the two in-need cohorts defined above and develop solutions that meet their specific requirements.

**Digital Champion Model**

As mentioned earlier, the actions which an individual will need to undertake online can be broken down into ‘essential’ and ‘non-essential’. It is important that when looking at supporting people in carrying out these actions, or teaching them the skills to enable them to carry them out themselves, the sensitivity of these actions are taken into consideration.

For ‘essential’ actions (online banking, claiming of benefits etc.) that use sensitive information it is important that an individual is supported or trained by someone with appropriate knowledge and responsibility. These actions often must be carried out urgently, and the individual may be unable to wait for support via a training class to carry out this action.

For ‘non-essential’ activities, such as using social media, accessing the news or watching TV or films online, the approach can be different. These activities are not sensitive in nature and are also less urgent. Therefore, training classes in these activities could be carried out by volunteer staff on a periodic basis.
Using this logic, the following Digital Inclusion model has been developed which creates the roles of both ‘Embedded’ and ‘Community’ Digital Champions.

**Embedded Digital Champions**

These are front line employees in specific roles who come into contact with in need cohorts. These champions are primarily aimed at supporting the cohort that have never, and likely will never, use digital technology or the internet. In accordance with their roles, these staff will deal with the public on a day to day basis. By training and equipping them with the relevant skills to support people in carrying out ‘essential’ tasks, they can become a huge asset that can support thousands of residents who have no digital skills and no friends or family to support them in carrying out these tasks.

These champions will work in a relatively ad-hoc nature as they will be called upon to support individuals as they present themselves. Therefore, it is important that they are based in locations which are accessible and frequented by those seeking support, an example of such a location is a Library or one of the three Council Centres. These champions will work through the task with the individual and then look to signpost them to either the adult community learning service (if they have some IT skills) to enable them to carry out this task in the future...
themselves or to the relevant Council or public support services that will be able to help them with this task in the long term.

**Community Digital Champions**

These will be community volunteers who will be trained to become a digital champions. This group will work to train and support individuals in completing ‘non-essential’ activities. These activities will be wellbeing focused and are aimed at improving an individual’s confidence in using digital technology and the internet. It is anticipated that the work of these champions will also see benefits in regards to reducing social isolation and community network building.

A further development of the model could include linking schools with elderly digitally excluded residents. In need residents could be paired up with digital savvy school children to learn how to carry out some basic ‘non-essential’ tasks, helping to foster intergenerational relationships whilst also building confidence in using digital technology and the internet.

**Adult Community Learning Offer**

The Council currently commissions a number of digital skills based adult learning courses. These courses vary from focussing on basic computer skills to very specific courses (e.g. 3D printing courses). There are currently over 10 courses that specifically focus on building skills to support the carrying out of ‘essential’ activities. The majority of these courses are advertised as improving an individual’s generic skills as opposed to supporting them in completing specific ‘essential’ activities.

Whilst these generic courses are useful for individuals who are generally looking to improve their skills, the lack of courses with specific focusses around certain tasks may mean that some of the population feel discouraged from enrolling as they do not understand the benefits.

For example, a resident looking for manual jobs may have no experience in using a computer and will not be required to use a computer within their job. This individual would be unlikely to sign up for a course advertised as ‘Digital Employability’ (as currently offered) as this titling implies that it is designed for an individual who would be using digital technology within their job. They may be more likely to sign up to a course titled ‘How to find and apply for jobs online’ as they are now able to see the benefit to them individually.

Therefore, as part of the implementation of this model, there should be a review of the adult learning courses offered and potentially a ‘re-branding’ or adjustment of the courses offered to ensure they meet residents’ needs and that the benefits to be gained are understood. In turn, this should increase uptake.

**Digital Inclusion Officer**

Currently, no one service in the Council has responsibility for the Digital Inclusion agenda. This means that whilst there are significant efforts to support those who have poor, or no digital skills, these actions not currently joined together in one model. The above model creates a framework where in-need residents can be supported in completing a range of digital tasks as well as improving their basic digital skills, either in an ad-hoc or planned way. It
also creates feedback loops between the services offered which will enable in-need residents to be better understood which can lead to the support offered to them being adapted or refined, hopefully leading to a reduction in the overall levels of digital exclusion in the borough.

It is the Digital Inclusion Officer’s role to oversee this model, this would include:

- Review of the service users to understand if the current offer is reaching all of the target groups.
- Understanding the evolving barriers residents face to digital inclusion.
- Informing the provision and syllabus of adult community learning courses to ensure it meets the needs of residents.
- Commissioning the training for digital champions.
- Co-ordinating and overseeing the approach of digital champions.
- Co-ordinating all Council activity in regards to digital inclusion in the borough.

Without this post, there will remain no officer for overall responsibility for this agenda and many of the synergies and potential benefits of this model will not be realised.

If agreed this model will be built into the Council IT strategy.

Assistive Digital Technology

Assistive technology is the umbrella term given to devices that support the elderly or people with disabilities in their day to day lives. Assistive technology can act to lessen the effects of disabilities and support an individual in carrying specific tasks, or generically helping them to continue to live independently. These can include hearing aids, prosthetics, or wearable technology.

The last few years have seen significant changes in technology in the home, the advent of smart speakers and smart watches mean that it is increasingly easy to access the benefits of technology and the internet. This has created an opportunity whereby this relatively affordable technology can be used to support individuals with disabilities or health challenges as a form of assistive technology.

The benefits of this technology are already being explored by social care providers and local authorities. For example, Hampshire County Council in 2017 began a trial using Amazon Echo smart speakers to support residents who live independently and suffer from memory issues such as dementia. In this trial the smart speaker would remind the individual of specific tasks they may need to do such as take medication. Additionally, it would answer questions from
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39 Local Government Association, Hampshire County Council: pushing the boundaries by using Amazon Echo (2018)
the individual such as whether a social worker was visiting that day or would log if they had run out of a prescription. As well as these medical benefits, the speaker would also provide wider ‘wellbeing benefits’ to the resident such as to enable the individual to call relatives, check the news and listen to the radio or music all with their voice, which in turn reduces the risk of falls or trips.

Smart watches are another form of technology that has the potential to benefit individuals who are at risk of trips or falls. For example, the technology company Apple have specifically designed their latest smart watch to register when a person may have fallen and contact the emergency service\(^40\). Smart watches can also monitor an individual’s heart rate, activity and can provide GPS location data which can help protect residents with memory issues who leave their home and get lost by alerting carers, relatives and if necessary the emergency services as to where they are.

This relatively low-cost technology has the potential to dramatically change both the lives of residents living with certain conditions, and the care services that support them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and trial new forms of assistive digital technology that can improve the lives of residents with specific needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{40}\) The Guardian, Apple shows off three new iPhones and smartwatch to detect heart problems (2018)
Help at Home

The cost of living has become increasingly expensive, as wages have stagnated and the costs of utilities and basic needs have risen. Average income nationally in 2016-17 was estimated at just 5% above its 2007-08 level\textsuperscript{41}. This means in 2017, real wage growth was more than 10% below what was reasonably expected before the recession, based on the prior sustained growth rate. The Institute for Fiscal Studies has reported that this is the equivalent of nearly £5,000 less a year per household. This disproportionately affects those on lower incomes, where a higher proportion of that is spent on essentials.

In particular, fuel and food can be an added burden on many households. Often, low-income households are forced to sacrifice one (if not both) of these things in order to make ends meet. This is demonstrated by a sharp increase in the number of foodbanks and their usage, with foodbanks also increasingly providing cash for energy meters\textsuperscript{42}.

The impact of this can range from a cold house, less food, poor quality food, lack of fuel to cook food and no electricity. The effects of these pressures on an individual’s wellbeing are detrimental, to both physical and mental health.

Research has found that living in damp, cold conditions can cause cardiac and respiratory illnesses as well as stress, and has been linked to an excess in winter deaths. Similarly, lack of good, nutritious food causes many health problems. Teachers have reported that children arriving hungry or eating poor quality food find it harder to concentrate, become more tired and have lower attainment. The long-term impact harms overall development and potentially puts children suffering from food poverty at a huge disadvantage later on in life.

These same families are also likely to experience what is known as the ‘Poverty Premium’. This is the additional cost people or households on low-incomes pay on top of basic goods and services. This can be in the form of expensive payment methods, such as rent-to-buy and pre-payment energy meters, and expensive food options due to lack of affordable shops close by. This is often done to enable close day-to-day budgeting, and frequently because no other options are open to low-income households\textsuperscript{43}.

Fuel Poverty

Fuel poverty is measured by the ‘low income high costs’ indicator, which identifies low-income households that also experience high energy costs. Out of 32 London boroughs, Greenwich has the 14\textsuperscript{th} highest proportion of fuel poverty. An estimated 10,600 households in Greenwich are fuel poor\textsuperscript{44}.

\textsuperscript{41} Institute for Fiscal Studies, Income and Inequalities: the last decade and the next Parliament (2017)

\textsuperscript{42} All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) on hunger (2018); The Trussell Trust, End of Year Stats (2018)

\textsuperscript{43} University of Bristol, The Poverty Premium (2016)

\textsuperscript{44} Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, Fuel Poverty in the UK, Fuel Poverty Statistics (2018)
Research by the University of Bristol found that low income households were more likely to pay higher rates for their energy and utilities, with them citing energy as “single biggest area contributing the Poverty Premium”.

In London, research by the Greater London Authority (GLA) estimated that almost 100,000 of the 346,000 households in fuel poverty in London used pre-payment meters for electricity. In 2016, the Financial Conduct Authority conducted a review into pre-paid metres and found that the cheapest available prepayment deals were £260 to £320 a year more expensive than those available for direct debit households.

There are no exact figures for the number of households in Greenwich using pre-paid meters. However, anecdotal evidence points to a substantial number of Council properties using this payment method. Some of these households may have pre-payment meters imposed on them due to arrears, others may be using them because they need to budget closely, which pre-payment meters enable.

Additionally, research has shown that low-income households are less likely to switch energy providers to find better deals. These issues are likely connected to issues regarding digital
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46 University of Bristol, The Poverty Premium (2016)
exclusion and financial capabilities. Households who do not switch lose up to £200-300 a year by not seeking the best deal49. Take up in Greenwich of the Big London Energy Switch (a scheme designed to use collective bargaining to reduce energy bills) has been low, despite high average annual savings of £218.

**Recommendation 15**

Take a proactive approach to reducing energy bills for residents. This includes proactively engaging energy providers to install smart meters when a Council property becomes void and explore the use of funds available to the Council to improve the energy efficiency of housing.

Smart meters are designed to monitor energy use, providing information and advice on how the user can make their energy use more efficient, and in turn reduce fuel costs and carbon emissions. The new second generation of smart meters are suitable for switching between energy suppliers, meaning that schemes such as the Big London Energy Switch can also be promoted to tenants.

Fuel poverty can also be triggered by inefficient or older heating systems, which can be slower and not as effective. This can drive up fuel cost for many households, as they end up leaving their heating on more regularly and for longer periods. Additionally, the Council, via the Council's Carbon Offset Fund (derived from contributions made from new developments), has ring-fenced funding available to it to reduce carbon emissions in the borough. The use of this funding to improve the energy efficiency of boiler and heating systems in council homes should be explored as this will act to both reduce carbon emissions of these building and decrease energy bills for Council tenants.

Alongside these proactive measures, the Big London Energy Switch should be advertised more widely across the Borough including the private sector as well as Council homes.

**Food Poverty**

A healthy and balanced diet is central to people’s lives, supporting both general physical health and mental wellbeing. For households living on a stretched budget, this is harder to maintain.

Good quality, nutritious and affordable food has become increasingly inaccessible for many households. Income after housing costs fell 10.7% nationally between 2002-03 and 2016-17. Over the same period of time, food prices (in real terms) increased by 4.3%. An increase in food prices is harder to manage for low-income households to cope with, as it represents a greater proportion of their overall income. Therefore, a rise in food prices (in real terms) has a significant impact on money available for low-income households to spend elsewhere50.
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49 University of Bristol, The Poverty Premium (2016)
Food poverty has been defined by the Department of Health as “the inability to afford, or to have access to, the food needed for a healthy diet. It is also important that people can access food in a way that is dignified and socially acceptable”\(^{51}\).

Research by the Good Food in Greenwich Food Poverty subgroup identified a number of barriers that households in Greenwich experience with regards to access to food. This includes areas of the Borough which are ‘coldspots’ – poorly connected areas that are under a ten minute walk from affordable supermarkets and fresh fruit and vegetable stalls. A shopping basket study (comparison of costs of key items) found that the average weekly shop in these areas was much more expensive than a weekly shop in a larger supermarket. Interviews with residents and frontline workers revealed that many households in this situation skip meals, buy cheaper and less nutritious food (fast food, sweets and starchy foods) and/or sacrifice their heating or other household expenses\(^{52}\).

The Greenwich Food Bank often steps in for those in crisis, providing a total of 6,433 three-day emergency food supplies in 2017\(^{53}\). While Food Banks provide emergency support for people in crisis, increasingly many households are living in sustained food poverty. Food Banks can only provide a temporary relief and are not a long-term solution to the entrenched and continual food poverty many households are living with.

Food pantries provide an opportunity to provide affordable and good quality food in high need areas, which currently have poor access. For a £3 a week, members get a weekly ‘shopping bag’ containing 10 items of good quality food at a subsidised rate in addition they also receive as much fruit and vegetables as they would like. This is used as a top up to their existing shopping, helping to reduce the cost and providing access to a more affordable and balanced diet. The pantry can also be used as a hub to offer other information, advice and support to residents on welfare rights and fuel poverty. As discussed, households affected by food poverty will likely experience issues around welfare rights and fuel poverty as well, low income being a key factor linking these.

Criteria of ‘high need area’ and eligibility:

- Poor access to affordable and nutritious food, referred to as ‘coldspots’ – an area that does not have a large supermarket and/or fresh fruit and vegetable stall within ten minutes walking distance (as outlined and identified in the Food Poverty Needs Assessment)
- Lower super output areas (LSOAs) that score highly on the Index of Multiple Deprivation
- Wards or LSOAs with entrenched low income, i.e. areas with an annual median household income of £25,000 or less
- LSOAs that have high rates of fuel poverty

The overall aim is to provide a service that tackles sustained food poverty and other linked issues, which cannot be resolved through emergency supplies from the Food Bank.
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\(^{51}\) Department of Health (2018)
\(^{52}\) Royal Borough of Greenwich, Food Poverty Needs Assessment (2016)
\(^{53}\) The Trussell Trust, End of Year Stats (2018)
**Recommendation 16**

**Establish a model for food pantries in the Borough, specifically assessing the potential of a co-operative model**

A model should be developed for food pantries in the Borough that enable them to be set up in different high need locations across the Borough.

This is a significant project and as such a number of questions on the model need to be properly researched before this can be implemented. This includes the day to day running of the pantry, as well as coordinating supplies and volunteers, identifying suitable locations, identifying eligible residents, managing payments and engaging internal and external partners. Further, a co-operative model of pantry membership and management will be explored.

Research by the All Party Parliamentary Group on Hunger has shown the detrimental impact a poor diet can have on children’s school attainment. According to research, children who arrive at school hungry find it harder to concentrate, are more tired and perform less well academically. The effects of this are far-reaching, potentially impacting children’s development and harming later prospects in their working lives.

There are existing benefits available for families with children that aim to mitigate this problem. Healthy Start Vouchers and Free School Meals are available to families who are in receipt of benefits such as Income Support, Child Tax Credit and Universal Credit. Healthy Start Vouchers are available to women who are at least 10 weeks pregnant and to families with children under four who are in receipt of certain benefits. The vouchers are for buying milk, fresh fruit and vegetables and vitamins. Free School Meals are offered to all children in state infant schools (reception to year 2). Thereafter, they are available for children whose parents receive certain benefits. In addition, schools receive funding (pupil premium) for each child that claims Free School Meals.

However, the uptake of those eligible in Greenwich is not as high as it could be and has decreased since 2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of Total school roll recorded as being FSM eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

54 Royal Borough of Greenwich, Free School Meal eligibility data (2018)
Recommendation 17

Carry out an annual mail out to families who are eligible for, and not claiming Healthy Start Vouchers and Free School Meals to increase their uptake

New software has enabled Council data to be brought together can be used to identify those who are eligible but not using Healthy Start Vouchers and Free School Meals to coordinate an annual mail shoot among other targeted communications to increase uptake.

This will also be built a wider communications strategy aimed at reducing food poverty in the borough.

School holidays can be a struggle for many families. Children eligible for Free School Meals do not have a guarantee of a hot and nutritious meal every day during the school holidays, as they do at school. For households on a stretched budget, providing meals during the holidays is an additional burden. National and local research has found that children often return to school in poorer health following longer periods without regular Free School Meals.

The Royal Borough of Greenwich, over the last Easter and Summer school holidays, commissioned the Greenwich Cooperative Development Agency (GCDA) to deliver a holiday hunger scheme across the Borough. It provided meals across ten venues, totalling 4,560 meals over the summer holidays. This scheme has so far been run on an ad-hoc basis and it has been proposed that a sustainable model should be developed for implementation for the Easter holidays in 2019.

Recommendation 18

Establish a 3 year holiday meals programme

The proposed long-term model will provide access to holiday meals and activities across the Borough. When mapping the existing venues it was found that last year’s venues were clustered in certain areas of the Borough, with little coverage over areas such as Kidbrooke, Eltham and Charlton. The inclusion of the proposed venues in the model would enable a more even geographical spread, so that more children and parents are in...
closer geographical distance to centres.

The blue markers show where existing provision has been provided; the red markers show additional proposed locations.

The map has also broken the borough down into 13 geographical areas (not linked to ward boundaries). Each area would have one venue based within it. The majority of newly proposed venues are GLL run centres such as Sutcliffe Sports Centre, the Greenwich Centre and the Eltham Centre. In addition, some community facilities such as community centres and youth clubs are also being proposed.

The model also ensures coverage across all days in the working week, so children in any given part of the Borough are able to access a meal and some activities every day. To achieve this, some centres will be open Monday and Tuesday; Thursday and Friday and some Wednesday. This ensures an even geographical spread in provision. The map above details the days each venue will be open and the yellow rings identify the three areas that are joined to create provision for every working day. Greenwich will operate for three days as opposed to two due to geographical challenges.

This model proposes 23 sessions per week in total, spread evenly around 13 venues in the Borough. Each centre can accommodate around 30 children a day, adding up to approximately 150 meals a day across centres and 690 per week and 8,280 per year across the Borough. The
holiday meals and activities are proposed to be available during the summer, Easter, Christmas and Half Term holidays.

Household Appliances and Basic Technology

Many household appliances can be seen as essential for day-to-day living, needed for refrigerating and preparing healthy and nutritional meals, storing medication, heating the home and washing clothes. Other items, such as computers and laptops, are also needed to manage bills and finances, for children to complete homework, or to use when applying for jobs. These appliances and pieces of basic technology are expensive to purchase and repair. If one breaks, many households will either go without or rely on old appliances, which could be potentially dangerous (i.e. an old boiler leaking gas). In addition, older appliances are not as energy efficient, and will cost more to run.

The upfront cost of these items means that many low-income households will resort to purchasing them through companies that offer weekly repayments through ‘rent-to-buy’, at a much higher mark-up, as they do not have the savings to react to unplanned needs. The weekly repayment option is a manageable choice for many households who cannot afford the upfront cost. However, comparing the product price to the total paid amount after weeks of repayment (ranges from 156 weeks to 52 weeks) increases the cost greatly. For customers who choose longer repayment periods, the price of products nearly doubles. This is represented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Product price</th>
<th>Weekly repayment</th>
<th>Number of weeks</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>Total paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6kg washing machine</td>
<td>£235.50</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>£468.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55cm fridge freezer</td>
<td>£235.50</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>£468.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50cm single oven</td>
<td>£235.50</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>£468.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer laptop</td>
<td>£339.98</td>
<td>£6</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>£624.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acer tablet</td>
<td>£226.65</td>
<td>£6</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>£416.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Table showing household product prices through a rent-to-buy company

Many will inevitably turn to the options that they can afford – such as rent to buy (with long repayment periods) or pay day loans, both of which end up costing a lot more in the long term.

55 Turn2us, Charitable grants for white goods (2017)
56 University of Bristol, Poverty Premium (2016)
Recommendation 19

Investigate the potential for creating a co-operative model that will enable residents to buy discounted essential appliances and basic technology.

There is a need to explore how costs can be reduced for low-income residents who rely on rent-to-buy as a payment plan for white goods. Co-operative models provide the opportunity to utilise economies of scale and purchase goods or services at more affordable prices.
Building more Social and Affordable Homes and Improve the Quality of Housing

Having a safe, warm and stable home is a vital part of people’s lives. Good housing helps people to flourish, acting as an anchor that supports many aspects of their wellbeing. Conversely, poor housing can be detrimental to people’s physical and mental health, financial stability and development. Poor housing includes cold and/or damp conditions, overcrowding, inadequate and unsafe kitchen facilities (e.g. lack of a fridge/freezer or oven or no safe place to prepare food) and insecure tenancy (e.g. risk of eviction, temporary accommodation). The wider socio-economic impacts of poor housing have been linked to damaging children’s educational attainment and development, an increase in anti-social behaviour and breakdown of community trust.

Those who are more likely to be affected by poor and unstable housing are households on low-incomes and in insecure work. Particular attention should also be given to vulnerable groups, such as children, older people, and disabled people. The Council’s ‘Housing Strategy for people with Learning Disabilities 2018-2022’ is an example of how the Council works to support in need groups.

While owner-occupiers and social renters can, and do, experience poor housing conditions, the private rented sector has been found to have higher instances of poor housing. The private rented sector is harder to regulate and tends to be more insecure (in terms of both tenancy and people’s rights), and thus more open to failings. In recent years, the increase in low and middle earners living in the private rented sector has highlighted an area of concern. This is due to the rise in house prices.

Over the past 10 years, house prices in London have become increasingly unaffordable, especially when compared to the rest of the country. In 2017, full-time employees would need to spend roughly 13 times their yearly salary to buy a home in London. ONS statistics show that out of the 10 least affordable local authorities in England and Wales, seven were in London. Figure 1 outlines the housing affordability ratio (ratio of earning to house prices) over a 20 year period from 1997-2017, comparing affordability in England, London and Greenwich.

58 British Gas and Shelter, Happier and healthier: improving conditions in the private rented sector (2017)
59 ONS, Housing Affordability in England and Wales (2018)
Due to the growing unaffordability of owning your own home, more people are living in the private rented sector and staying in it for longer. In 2005/06 just over 10% of households were of ‘private rented’ tenure 10 years later this has increased to 20% whilst rates of ‘buying with a mortgage’ tenure have dropped from just below 40% to 29% over the same time period.60 This is more pronounced in London. House prices here are some of the highest in the UK and private renting more commonplace.

Figure 10: Housing tenure by percentage in Greenwich, 201661

Rates of home ownership and social housing tenancy have declined particularly among the younger generation. The Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) found that in the mid-1990s, only 12% of 25-34 year olds lived in the private sector; this has now increased three-fold to 37%.62 Unaffordable house prices and the loss of social homes through Right to Buy have both

---

61 ONS, Housing Tenure of Households (2018)
contributed to the high levels of young people and families living in private rented accommodation.

Whilst also offering less stability, renting from the private rented sector in cities is often more expensive. The IFS found that overall in the period of 2013-15, real median private rent in Great Britain was 33% higher than two decades previously, rising by 53% in London and 29% in the rest of Great Britain. The Family Resource Survey reported that London was also the only region where the median private sector rent, £247 per week, was significantly greater than the median mortgage payment of £197 per week. In London, the IFS estimate that, on average, renters are spending 40% of their income on rent.

Furthermore, low-income households in the UK spend a higher proportion of their income on housing compared to higher earners. Even where households receive housing benefit, this increasingly falls short of the actual cost of rent. This makes it difficult for private renters to build up savings for a deposit.

### Recommendation 20

Support on-going building of affordable homes and continue to increase the number of Council owned houses built.

There are currently 17,000 people on the Council housing waiting list and 800 people living in temporary accommodation. In response to this, the Royal Borough of Greenwich is currently embarking on a scheme to build 750 socially rented homes, all starting before 2022. The Council is also working closely with Meridian Home Start, taking up the number of new socially rented homes to 1,000.

The Council should continue to ensure that it maintains at least an average of 35% affordable properties in all new private developments.

All relevant Council services, such as Public Health and Sustainability should input into the planning process to ensure new developments meet the needs of residents and our healthy places to live.

### Quality

Higher house prices and increases in private sector rent have not led to better quality housing. In fact, research has shown the quality of housing, particularly in the private rented sector, has failed to improve. Reports by both Shelter and British Gas has found that more than a quarter of private rented sector homes do not meet the Decent Homes Standard. Private

---

65 Social Mobility Commission, Social Mobility policies between 1997 and 2017: time for change (2017)
66 British Gas and Shelter, Happier and healthier: improving conditions in the private rented sector (2017)
rented sector homes have higher instances of damp and cold, with private sector homes also more likely to not have central heating or energy efficient boilers. Cold and damp homes have been linked to an increase in respiratory conditions (such as asthma), aches and pains, headaches, stress and depression⁶⁷.

The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy estimate that as of 2016⁶⁸ (most recent data published), there were an estimated 2.55 million households in fuel poverty in England. Fuel poverty tends to be more prevalent in older buildings, households with poor insulation, and in the private rented sector households. The most recent statistics estimate that 19.3% of households in the private rented sector experience fuel poverty, compared to 7.7% in privately owned homes⁶⁹. Households in the private rented sector also tend to be deeper in fuel poverty, with an average fuel poverty gap of £383, compared to £205 for those in local authority homes.

![Figure 11: Proportion (%) of household tenure (owner occupied, private rented and social housing) which are fuel poor in England](image)

In addition to higher rates of fuel poverty, private rented sector homes are more hazardous, having a higher risk of having no working fire alarms, no carbon monoxide alarms and faulty white goods (contributing to fuel poverty)⁷⁰.

The impact of living in these conditions has been found to harm children’s health, educational attainment and social development. Children living in cramped, cold conditions are more likely to be sick, miss days off school and struggle to find places to do homework. Shelter also stated that children found it harder to maintain friendships, as they were likely to move house more

⁶⁷ ECOTEC, Social impact of poor housing (2010)
⁷⁰ British Gas and Shelter, Happier and healthier: improving conditions in the private rented sector (2017)
often and so could not establish connections to their school or to friends. This impact at such an early stage in a child’s life can be detrimental\footnote{Ibid.; ECOTEC, Social impact of poor housing (2010)}.

**Insecure tenancy**

One of the other challenges facing households renting in the private sector is the insecurity of their tenancy. Owner-occupiers face lower rates of evictions/repossessions due to lower interest rates and stricter checks from mortgage lenders and thus are less likely to experience the fear and disruption of losing their home. In comparison, private renters commonly have short-term tenancy contracts, usually six-months or a year. At the end of the tenancy agreement, landlords are within their rights to sell the property or increase the rent. Therefore, leaving the tenant with no option but to move. Alternatively, in the case of a rent increase, tenants are forced to pay more money or find a new home that is more affordable. This insecurity means that private sector renters are more cautious of making complaints or asking landlords to make improvements to the accommodation for fear of being evicted.

As mentioned earlier, an increasing number of households are living in the private sector, and therefore, improving standards is a key area of focus in regards to Social Mobility. The knock-on effects of poor, unstable and insecure housing affect people at all ages of their lives, from childhood to older years. It impacts on many aspects of people’s lives, from their health and wellbeing, financial security and stability.

**Licensing**

Since The Housing Act of 2004, the UK has had a mandatory House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) licence. This requires all private sector HMOs to apply for a licence and comply with a set of certain standards and obligations. This licence contains requirements regarding the ability to heat the property to an ‘adequate’ temperature as well as other conditions that act to protect the tenant and improve the quality of the housing\footnote{Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Licence: House in Multiple Occupation (2018)}.

However, this licensing scheme is only mandatory for HMOs (properties that have at least five tenants and the toilet, bathroom or kitchen facilities are shared between tenants) which make up a small proportion of the total private rented sector\footnote{Ibid.}.

Additional and Selective licensing can be used by local authorities to help further regulate HMOs and other properties in the private rented sector and improve standards. Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs) are already subject to regulation under the HMO licensing scheme. Additional licensing is a discretionary scheme that can be applied to any HMO that does not meet the government definition (i.e. a property that has 3 or 4 tenants living in 2 or more households). Selective licensing is a further discretionary scheme that requires private sector landlords (who do not meet the criteria for mandatory HMO licence and Additional
licensing) to license their property. Selective licensing can be introduced as a borough-wide license, or can target specific areas of the Borough where there are known to be issues\textsuperscript{74}.

Both these discretionary licensing schemes allow Local Authorities to set a minimum set of standard of housing and require landlords to provide fair and legal tenancy agreements. This could be used to combat fuel poverty (e.g. ensuring all homes have an EPC rating above E), improve kitchen facilities and provide more secure and transparent tenancy agreements.

These schemes have been successful in improving standards in neighbouring boroughs, such as Newham and Bexley. Newham estimated that landlords receive more than £600million in private sector rents each year, as well as housing benefits. Before licensing, Newham Council had little influence over the quality, security and standards of these homes. Landlords are required to pay a licence fee (similar to HMO licensing) which is set by the Council\textsuperscript{75}.

Once schemes have been started, they become self-financing as a fee is applied to the landlord when applying for the licence.

**Recommendation 21**

Explore the use of Additional and Selective licensing in the Borough to improve standards for residents in the private rented sector

\textsuperscript{74} Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Selective licensing in the private rented sector: a guide for local authorities (2015)

\textsuperscript{75} Newham Council, Borough wide Property Licensing 2016/17 (2016); London Borough of Bexley, Rent it Right – promoting Bexley’s private renting (2018)
Improve Health and Wellbeing and Build Community Networks

Physical and mental health are integral to a person’s overall wellbeing, but if not maintained, can be significant barriers which can prevent people from being able to realise their full potential at all stages of their lives. Poor physical health can contribute to, or even worsen, mental health (and vice versa) contributing to significant problems such as social isolation. Other factors such as financial stress, insecure work and poor quality and expensive housing are also important to wellbeing. Communities have a strong influence on our lives, providing the social inclusion and support to motivate people to live outward looking and rewarding lives. Research has drawn attention to the impact of growing up and living in deprived areas, where life expectancy is much lower. Therefore, supporting communities to be at the centre of initiatives to improve health and wellbeing can be seen to make a valuable contribution to the social mobility of those living in these areas.

Poor physical health can be the result of a number of factors such as: lack of exercise, unhealthy eating, disease, illness or injury, and can lead to an exacerbation of existing conditions and a range of further health problems which can become life threatening. The increased rate of childhood obesity in the Royal Borough of Greenwich is particularly worrying, especially given the links to deprivation and poverty. In 2017/18, 26.5% of reception-aged children in the Borough were overweight or obese, rising to 40.5% of children starting secondary school. The Royal Borough of Greenwich currently offers weight management programmes for school-aged children. However, there is a need to build on these early interventions to further encourage active lifestyles in communities. Regular and fun exercise for up to one hour a day can help to keep children happy and healthy, also supporting their mental health and overall wellbeing. Instilling this behaviour at a young age encourages healthier habits later on in life. In Greenwich, where there are highly populated areas without convenient access to green spaces, the availability of activities can sometimes be limited.

Play Streets is an initiative where residential roads are closed to traffic for a few hours each week, allowing children to play close to their homes and in their neighbourhoods. These have been set up in the past couple of years by parents who volunteer to monitor the children and let cars in and out of the street as necessary. These have a positive impact in encouraging play and increasing the likelihood of children achieving one hour of exercise a day. It also helps communities to interact and become better connected, as parents and children mix more widely. A survey by Play Out found there to be an increase in other social activities as a result of Play Streets, including Christmas parties and play dates.

---

76 These are explored further in the Financial Resilience, Support for Underemployed and Unemployed and Help at Home and Build More Social and Affordable Homes and Improve the Quality of Housing themes
78 Food poverty and actions to address this are explored further in the Help at Home section of this Delivery Plan
79 NHS, Children from poorer backgrounds more affected by rise in childhood obesity (2018)
However, the uptake of the scheme has been predominantly in the more affluent areas of the Borough – Greenwich, Blackheath and Charlton. There is currently very limited or no uptake in more deprived areas, where there is also a lower rate of physical activity.

**Recommendation 22**

*Increase the number of Play Streets in the borough and develop a ‘Play Estate’ scheme in areas with high deprivation and low physical activity*

The Council is in the process of developing an understanding of areas of the Borough with levels of high deprivation and low physical activity, to identify suitable streets and estates for a proactive expansion of the Play Streets scheme. Communities living in these areas would benefit from regular Play Streets, which encourage accessible and fun activities for children. The Council will reach out to residents in these areas, targeting them through social media and other forms of advertising to encourage sign up to the scheme.

To incentivise uptake of the scheme, the Council would look to provide a pack of basic games and play equipment to communities who organise Play Streets.

Additional support could be provided from the proposed Sports Coaching programme, as outlined in recommendation 10.

It is important that healthy activities and play spaces are promoted more widely around the Borough, to incorporate healthy living into the lives of children and families as much as possible. It is important to map the current provision of play and activities available, including understanding how accessible these are for hard-to-reach groups, and identify gaps and barriers in provision.

**Recommendation 23**

*Develop a Borough-wide Play Strategy*

The Strategy will look at ways in which the Council can encourage participation in play, through improving and increasing access to spaces, activities and services. The overall aim is to improve physical activity levels of children and families more widely. This further helps to reduce social isolation, encouraging the gathering of children, parents and carers, fostering relationships and reducing loneliness.

The Strategy will encourage a cross-directorate approach to play so that it can be integrated into decisions made, such as planning applications and regeneration programmes. This would help the development of community networks through activities and shared spaces, bringing people together and revitalising communities. Integrating play as part of daily life, will help to support children and families’ physical and mental wellbeing.

Currently, there is limited information on the levels of physical activity of residents in the Borough. To help measure the impact of schemes like Play Streets, and the Council’s wider
services related to physical activity, it is necessary to improve our understanding of participation rates of physical activity in the Borough.

**Recommendation 24**

Expand the scope of the Residents’ Survey or use another suitable route to improve data collection on levels of physical activity in the Borough, to understand the effectiveness of current services and new schemes

Questions on children’s and adult’s level of physical activity, and the barriers they may experience in becoming more active, should be measured through either the Residents’ Survey or another suitable route.

Once survey results have been collated and compared to other equality information on protected characteristics, it will enable the Council and GLL to review current service provision and look at if there need to be changes to support uptake in physical activity.

For some residents, physical activity can become difficult later on in life. Poor physical health and difficulty with mobility can lead to social isolation as this can limit a person’s interaction with their community. There are high levels of social isolation within the older population, especially for those living in care homes. This can contribute to loneliness, which can have a detrimental impact on health. Research in recent years has compared the health implications from loneliness to the equivalent of smoking 15 cigarettes a day. Finding ways to increase social interaction and access to the community for this group is therefore essential.

Studies have highlighted the benefits of linking nurseries with care homes for children and elderly people to mix for intergenerational activities. These benefits include decreasing loneliness, delaying mental decline and, in turn, reducing potentially life-threatening illnesses in older populations. For children, activities such as this have been found to improve their behaviour, language development, reading and social skills. Moreover, many children do not have significant connections to the older generation with the interactions providing them with valuable insight into life from a different perspective.

**Recommendation 25**

Establish a set of intergenerational activities, beginning with linking nursery classes and residential care home residents.

The first step to establish intergenerational activities in the Borough, is to link a nursery class with a local care home and arrange visits and activities designed for the benefit both for the nursery children and the care home residents.

These activities will be developed in conjunction with the curriculum manager in the nursery and the activities manager in the care home. The activities will be structured using the Early.

---

80 Age UK, Loneliness in later life (2015)
81 Campaign to End Loneliness, About loneliness (2018)
Years Foundation Stage Framework so they will ensure that they feed into the learning and development of the children.

An essential part of this project is that the meetings between the children and care home residents happen on a regular basis. Research has shown that the greatest benefit for both parties occurs when they take place regularly and consistently. Additionally, this would separate it from other visits that may take place on an ad hoc basis. To this end, it is expected that the visits are set up to take place weekly to produce the best results and enable relationships to develop between the children and the care home residents.

Further benefits of this initiative could be obtained by expanding the scope beyond nursery aged children through the incorporation of primary and secondary schools. For primary schools, the focus could be on activities where the residents support the children in learning, such as reading, writing and arithmetic. Secondary schools however, could encourage children to volunteer to take part in sessions with care home residents. Activities for this group could be much more varied and could include: sharing digital skills (building on the community digital champion model of recommendation 13), sharing of past experiences and cooking classes\(^\text{82}\).

\(^{82}\) The Guardian, How the elderly can help the young – and help themselves (2019)
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Equality Impact Assessment
Social Mobility Delivery Plan

What are its main objectives?

The Social Mobility Delivery Plan presents 25 recommendations which seek to improve opportunities and access for marginalised and disadvantaged groups across a number of areas, including employment, education, financial resilience, housing, health, digital inclusion and community participation. The Delivery Plan explores how inequalities create barriers that often prevent sections of our community from accessing opportunities equally and reaching their full potential.

The recommendations are a combination of new initiatives and alterations to existing services that are ambitious, achievable and go beyond business as usual to help implement real change. Recommendations will not reduce the service already provided, but will aim to make services and opportunities more accessible and responsive to the needs of our communities.

What is Social Mobility?

“Social Mobility is about ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to build a good life for themselves regardless of their family background. In a socially mobile society, every individual has a fair chance of reaching their potential”

The continued development across London and our Borough bring a wealth of opportunities, but these opportunities have not reached everyone. We recognise that some of our residents experience barriers in achieving their full potential, whether it be in their education, their career or their home life.

Social Mobility takes into account these different layers of people’s lives, mapping key life stages and levels of inequality. Importantly, this framework helps us to identify barriers that could be preventing people from achieving their full potential and to develop solutions to address this. As inequalities are often complex and interlinked, the deliverables and objectives of the Royal Borough of Greenwich’s Social Mobility work will seek to target overlapping issues.

An equality framework is central to this approach. Where available, local demographic and service user data on protected characteristics have been utilised to inform analysis. This has drawn attention to potential gaps in service delivery and, therefore, areas of need. Where information is not available on a local level, reliable national sources have been used. This is made clear in the text and referencing.

1 Social Mobility Commission, State of the Nation (2017)
Criteria: is this function designed to meet the specific needs of groups with protected characteristics?

The Social Mobility Delivery Plan is designed to meet the specific needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups in our Borough. The plan aims to remove barriers these groups face, and proposes recommendations that are specific to different needs and designed to improve access to opportunities for vulnerable groups.

All the recommendations will support people regardless of their background and characteristics, including their sex, race, disability, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, caring responsibilities, pregnancy and/or maternity, religion or belief or marital status.

There are 25 recommendations in total, all seeking to provide targeted support and equal opportunities to vulnerable or marginalised groups according to their particular needs. As the recommendations have been developed from this premise, this Equality Impact Assessment will highlight some of the key characteristics that cut across the themes.

Income

While income status is not a formally recognised protected characteristic, low-income is used as a way to measure poverty and is a key factor that cuts across all protected characteristics and communities. Low-income is widely defined as 60% of the median income (£25k) there are approximately 48,000 households in Greenwich whose income is estimated to be below this. This cuts across many of the themes, and recommendations seek to improve the financial resilience of our residents through support, advice and education.

Age

The Delivery Plan explores the barriers experienced at different points during our lives, referred to by the Social Mobility Commission as ‘life stages’. This has encouraged an understanding and analysis of how age-groups (e.g. children and the elderly) are affected in different ways and need support that is specific to their needs at that stage in their life. This has included developing recommendations to reduce social isolation through intergenerational activities between nurseries and care homes, improving digital inclusion in the elderly population and creating a sustainable holiday hunger model for school-aged children during the holidays.

Race

Research and analysis has been mindful of differences in outcomes and access to opportunities between groups, and all of the recommendations have been based on need as identified by service data and local and national research. All recommendations aim to support our residents in education, employment and in their home lives regardless of their race.
Sex

Due to historical and entrenched gender roles, women continue to provide the majority of unpaid care. As a result, women are more likely to work part-time and in casual roles as they provide the flexibility needed to fit around caring responsibilities. Some of the recommendations in the Support for the Unemployed and Underemployed seek to remove these barriers and encourage more inclusive working practices. This will more widely support others (not just women) who have caring responsibilities.

Disability and long-term health conditions

Particular attention has been paid in developing recommendations that are inclusive of the needs of people with disabilities and long-term health conditions. This includes supporting people with disabilities into employment, encouraging more supportive and inclusive working practices and more broadly building in the recommendations the need to provide tailored support to an individual’s needs.

The intended impact of all of the recommendations is to ensure our residents, regardless of their background, are able to access opportunities equally.

Methodology and consultation

The Strategy and Delivery Plan is the result of extensive research, which has used a number of consultation methods to identify areas of need and develop recommendations in response to the need. This has included consultation (both public and internal) to establish the broad vision and objectives of the Delivery Plan – helping to identify the 8 themes. Previous work by the Greenwich Fairness Commission and subsequent Review and Development Group also helped to inform analysis.

Following consultation, in-depth analysis of national, local and service-specific data and information on the 8 themes were reviewed and analysed in cross-Directorate working groups, specific to each theme. Over 50 Council officers contributed to this work, helping to develop and shape the recommendations.

Monitoring implementation and impact

A Social Mobility Board will support and oversee implementation of the recommendations. It is anticipated the Board will develop further the Social Mobility Agenda beyond the scope of this delivery plan. The Board will also be in a position to measure the success and impact of recommendations.
Social Mobility Board
Terms of Reference

Background
The Social Mobility Board has been set up to provide strategic guidance and oversight for the successful delivery and ongoing development of the Council's Social Mobility Agenda, following the agreement of Cabinet to the Social Mobility Delivery Plan.

Due to the scale of the social mobility agenda, the board will identify specific topics of focus prior to each meeting.

Role of the Board

- To oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the Social Mobility Delivery Plan
- To provide a platform for the development of further initiatives which arise through the actions contained within the Delivery Plan
- To make recommendations for further actions/initiatives to drive forward the Social Mobility Agenda through evidence of need, gaps in provision and good practice
- To provide oversight and a mechanism for collaboration across services to ensure that the Council works with other partners and the community and voluntary sector to improve the social mobility of our residents
- To consider resource and financial implications of initiatives and make recommendations
- To monitor implementation of actions and recommendations

Frequency of meetings
The Board will meet every two months.

Membership
- Chair - Councillor Danny Thorpe - Leader of the Council
- Councillor Averil Lekau - Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health & Anti-poverty
- Katrina Delaney - Director of Communities & Environment and Deputy Chief Executive

The Chair can add any other permanent members to the board as required. Additionally, the Chair will also invite other Cabinet Members to attend as required.
1. **Decisions required**

   This report makes the following recommendations to the decision-maker:

1.1 Cabinet is asked to comment on the eight recommendations of the Communities and Local Government Committee Report on the Effectiveness of Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees. (Appendix A).

1.2 Cabinet is asked to note the Government response to the Communities and Local Government Committee report recommendations. (Appendix B).

1.3 Cabinet is asked to note that new guidelines on Scrutiny were due to be published by Government in November 2018 but these are still awaited.

1.4 Cabinet is asked to agree the request of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that Scrutiny should report directly to Full Council by presenting update reports from each panel on a rotational basis.

2. **Purpose of Report and Executive Summary**

2.1 To comment on the recommendations of the Communities and Local Government Committee Report on the Effectiveness of Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees, (Appendix A) and give their views on whether any of the recommendations should be adopted in Royal Borough of Greenwich.
3. **Introduction and Background**

3.1 The Communities and Local Government Report was published in December 2017 and resulted in them giving a series of recommendations to Government. (Appendix A).

3.2 The Government published their responses to these recommendations in March 2018 (Appendix B) which broadly advise that the way scrutiny is run and how it is supported is up to each individual authority to decide for itself.

3.3 The Government was due to publish new guidelines for Scrutiny in November of last year, but this is still awaited.

3.4 The report and the Government response were discussed at the Overview and Scrutiny meeting of 17 September 2018, and it was requested that a report be brought to Cabinet for comment before the item is discussed again at Overview and Scrutiny on 30 April 2019.

3.5 One of the recommendations in the Select Committee report is that Scrutiny should report directly to Full Council. Members would like Cabinet to endorse this and arrange for update reports from each panel to be taken to Full Council meetings on a rotational basis.

3.6 At their meeting on 17 September 2018, Overview and Scrutiny members also discussed the support of scrutiny by officers and raised some concerns about the new support arrangements which were put in place following a reorganisation in April 2018.

3.7 Since April 2018 Scrutiny has been supported by 8 officers (7.6 fte), two of whom are senior managers. With the exception of the Head of Service, these officers are also responsible for the servicing of other meetings as well as Scrutiny, and it was this that gave Scrutiny members some concern. Even so, there was still slightly more support to Scrutiny than with the previous arrangement before the reorganisation.

3.8 The level of work expected from the department has increased substantially from the previous year. There have been three in-depth reviews undertaken with more expected; five call-ins have been arranged; several visits have been undertaken; and over a dozen reports have been written by Corporate Governance Officers since last April.
3.9 As a result of Scrutiny Members’ concerns and the level of work expected of Corporate Governance Officers, another member of staff was recruited on a PO2 salary on a short-term contract and this will be reviewed at the end of six months. This now means that there are 9 officers (8.6fte) supporting the Scrutiny function over the next six months. It should be noted, however, that the additional post is not budgeted for.

3.10 A comparison with other London boroughs was undertaken in September 2018 which showed the complete disparity there is both between the numbers of scrutiny panels in each authority (which range from 1 to 8), and the officer support given to those panels. The average number of council officers across London working with Scrutiny is 3.5 fte compared to 8.6 fte in Greenwich.

3.11 Approximately fifty percent of London boroughs also combine scrutiny support with other committee work.

4. **Available Options**

4.1 Cabinet can agree the request of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that Scrutiny should report directly to Full Council by presenting update reports from each panel on a rotational basis.

4.2 Cabinet can decide that the current reporting arrangements are appropriate and not agree to the request from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

4.3 Cabinet can agree to await the new guidelines on Scrutiny before making a decision but it should be noted that these were originally scheduled to be published in November 2018.

5. **Preferred Option**

5.1 Cabinet should agree to the request of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that Scrutiny should report directly to Full Council by presenting update reports from each panel on a rotational basis.

6. **Reasons for Recommendations**

6.1 It will increase the transparency of the reports produced by the Council’s Scrutiny Panels.
### 7. Consultation Results

7.1 None.

### 8. Cross-Cutting Issues and Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Sign-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal including Human Rights Act</td>
<td>Section 9F of the Local Government Act 2000 sets out the legal requirements for a local authority in terms of its overview and scrutiny arrangements. This report provides feedback from the Parliamentary Select Committee consultation, together with Government feedback, and a specific recommendation from RBG’s Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee. Cabinet is able to choose one of the three available options for its decision at recommendation 1.4.</td>
<td>John Scarborough, Head of Legal 08.03.2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and other resources including procurement implications</td>
<td>There are no financial implications arising as a result of the recommendations within the report. The government response (Appendix B) is clear that it is a matter for local authorities regarding the resourcing of their scrutiny committees. Greenwich, along with many other authorities, has a number of staff engaged in various corporate governance roles (para 3.11 refers). The corporate governance budget is forecast to overspend by £56k in the current financial year and overspend pressures on this budget are likely to continue into 2019/20, which will be exacerbated by the additional six-month placement (para 3.9 refers).</td>
<td>Damon Cook, Asst Director Finance &amp; Deputy s151 Officer, 07.03.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equalities</td>
<td>The decisions recommended through this</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no apparent equality impact on end users.

9. **Report Appendices**

9.1 The following documents are to be published with and form part of the report:

- **Appendix A**: - Communities and Local Government Committee Report on the Effectiveness of Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees.
- **Appendix B**: - Government Response to the Communities and Local Government Committee Report on the Effectiveness of Local Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

10. **Background Papers**

None.
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Effectiveness of local authority overview and scrutiny committees

Summary

Overview and scrutiny committees were introduced by the Local Government Act 2000 and were tasked with acting as a counterweight to the increased centralised power of the new executive arrangements. Whilst some authorities were not covered by the changes brought in by the Act, the Leader and Cabinet system is the predominant model of governance in English local authorities. However, since the Localism Act 2011, councils have had the option of reverting to the committee system of governance. Some authorities that have chosen to do so have expressed dissatisfaction with the new executive arrangements, including concern at the limited effectiveness of scrutiny. Noting these concerns, and that there has not been a comprehensive assessment of how scrutiny committees operate, we decided to conduct this inquiry. The terms of reference placed an emphasis on considering factors such as the ability of committees to hold decision-makers to account, the impact of party politics on scrutiny, resourcing of committees and the ability of council scrutiny committees to have oversight of services delivered by external organisations.

We have found that the most significant factor in determining whether or not scrutiny committees are effective is the organisational culture of a particular council. Having a positive culture where it is universally recognised that scrutiny can play a productive part in the decision-making process is vital and such an approach is common in all of the examples of effective scrutiny that we identified. Senior councillors from both the administration and the opposition, and senior council officers, have a responsibility to set the tone and create an environment that welcomes constructive challenge and democratic accountability. When this does not happen and individuals seek to marginalise scrutiny, there is a risk of damaging the council’s reputation, and missing opportunities to use scrutiny to improve service outcomes. In extreme cases, ineffective scrutiny can contribute to severe service failures.

Our inquiry has identified a number of ways that establishing a positive culture can be made easier. For example, in many authorities, there is no parity of esteem between the executive and scrutiny functions, with a common perception among both members and officers being that the former is more important than the latter. We argue that this relationship should be more balanced and that in order to do so, scrutiny should have a greater independence from the executive. One way that this can be achieved is to change the lines of accountability, with scrutiny committees reporting to Full Council meetings, rather than the executive. We also consider how scrutiny committee chairs might have greater independence in order to dispel any suggestion that they are influenced by partisan motivations. Whilst we believe that there are many effective and impartial scrutiny chairs working across the country, we are concerned that how chairs are appointed can have the potential to contribute to lessening the independence and legitimacy of the scrutiny process.

Organisational culture also impacts upon another important aspect of effective scrutiny: access of committees to the information they need to carry out their work. We heard about committees submitting Freedom of Information requests to their own authorities and of officers seeking to withhold information to blunt scrutiny’s effectiveness. We believe that there is no justification for such practices, that doing so is in conflict with the
principles of democratic accountability, and only serves to prevent scrutiny committees from contributing to service improvement. We have particular concerns regarding the overzealous classification of information as being commercially sensitive.

We also considered the provision of staff support to committees. Whilst ensuring that sufficient resources are in place is of course important, we note that if there is a culture within the council of directors not valuing scrutiny, then focussing on staff numbers will not have an impact. We are concerned that in too many authorities, supporting the executive is the over-riding priority, despite the fact that in a time of limited resources, scrutiny’s role is more important than ever. We also consider the skills needed to support scrutiny committees, and note that many officers combine their support of scrutiny with other functions such as clerking committees or executive support. It is apparent that there are many officers working in scrutiny that have the required skills, and some are able to combine them with the different skill set required to be efficient and accurate committee clerks. However, we heard too many examples of officers working on scrutiny who did not possess the necessary skills. Decisions relating to the resourcing of scrutiny often reflect the profile that the function has within an authority. The Localism Act 2011 created a requirement for all upper tier authorities to create a statutory role of designated lead scrutiny officer to promote scrutiny across the organisation. We have found that the statutory scrutiny officer role has proven to be largely ineffective as the profile of the role does not remotely reflect the importance of other local authority statutory roles. We believe that the statutory scrutiny officer position needs to be significantly strengthened and should be a requirement for all authorities.

We believe that scrutiny committees are ideally placed and have a democratic mandate to review any public services in their area. However, we have found that there can sometimes be a conflict between commercial and democratic interests, with commercial providers not always recognising that they have entered into a contract with a democratic organisation with a necessity for public oversight. We believe that scrutiny’s powers in this area need to be strengthened to at least match the powers it has to scrutinise local health bodies. We also call on councils to consider at what point to involve scrutiny when it is conducting a major procurement exercise. It is imperative that council executives involve scrutiny at a time when contracts are still being developed, so that all parties understand that the service will still have democratic oversight despite being delivered by a commercial entity. We also heard about the public oversight of Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs), and have significant concerns that public scrutiny of LEPs seems to be the exception rather than rule. Therefore, we recommend that upper tier councils, and combined authorities where appropriate, should be able to monitor the performance and effectiveness of LEPs through their scrutiny committees.

We recognise that the mayoral combined authorities are in their infancy, but given the significance of organisational culture in effective scrutiny, it is important that we included them in our inquiry to ensure that the correct tone is set from the outset. We are therefore concerned by the evidence we heard about an apparent secondary role for scrutiny in combined authorities. Mayors are responsible for delivering services and improvements for millions of residents, but oversight of their performance is currently hindered by limited resources. We therefore call on the Government to ensure that funding is available for this purpose. We also argue that when agreeing further
devolution deals and creating executive mayors, the Government must make it clear that scrutiny is a fundamental part of any deal and must be adequately resourced and supported.
Introduction

1. This inquiry was initially launched in January 2017 by our predecessor committee. However, the dissolution of Parliament and the General Election prevented any oral evidence sessions from taking place. Following the Committee’s reconstitution, we considered carefully which issues we should initially pursue in our work and how best we could build on the work of our predecessors. It was clear to us from the level of interest and concern expressed in the evidence received that the effectiveness of overview and scrutiny committees in local authorities was something that we should investigate as an immediate priority. We therefore relaunched the inquiry in September 2017 and undertook to take account of the wealth of written evidence provided by councils, officers, members and stakeholders prior to the election.

2. We are extremely grateful to everyone who contributed to our inquiry. Scrutiny varies significantly across the country, and the level of interest in the inquiry has enabled us to hear from a wide range of authorities and form a representative picture of local authority scrutiny in England. To assist us in forming this picture, and to ensure we spoke with as many authorities as possible, we supplemented our oral evidence sessions with a less formal workshop event in October 2017. Our workshop was attended by over 45 councillors and officers working in scrutiny across the country and we thank them all for their attendance and contributions.

3. This report will consider why scrutiny is important and what the role of scrutiny committees should be in local authorities. We do not believe that certain models should be imposed on councils, but we do believe that there should be an organisational culture that welcomes constructive challenge and has a common recognition of the value of scrutiny, both in terms of policy development and oversight of services. In order to achieve this, we believe that scrutiny committees must be independent and able to form their own conclusions based on robust and reliable data, and that decision-makers should not seek to obstruct their role by withholding information. We also consider the role of the public in local scrutiny, both in terms of their participation in committees’ work and in how scrutiny committees can represent their interests to service providers, even when those providers are external commercial organisations. The final chapter of this report considers the role of scrutiny in the recently created mayoral combined authorities in an attempt to help these organisations to establish positive working practices as early as possible. Throughout this report we call on the Government to revise the guidance on scrutiny that it issues local authorities. For clarity, the specific points that we believe should be covered by such a revision are listed below.
Proposed revisions to Government guidance on scrutiny committees

- That overview and scrutiny committees should report to an authority’s Full Council meeting rather than to the executive, mirroring the relationship between Select Committees and Parliament.

- That scrutiny committees and the executive must be distinct and that executive councillors should not participate in scrutiny other than as witnesses, even if external partners are being scrutinised.

- That councillors working on scrutiny committees should have access to financial and performance data held by an authority, and that this access should not be restricted for reasons of commercial sensitivity.

- That scrutiny committees should be supported by officers that are able to operate with independence and offer impartial advice to committees. There should be a greater parity of esteem between scrutiny and the executive, and committees should have the same access to the expertise and time of senior officers and the chief executive as their cabinet counterparts.

- That members of the public and service users have a fundamental role in the scrutiny process and that their participation should be encouraged and facilitated by councils.
1 The role of scrutiny

4. Before considering whether scrutiny committees are working effectively, it is important to consider what their role is and what effective scrutiny looks like. Local authorities are currently facing a number of challenges and competing demands, from an ageing population to budget shortfalls to promoting local growth in an often-hostile economic environment. It is therefore imperative that all expenditure is considered carefully and its impact is measured. However, measuring the impact of overview and scrutiny committees can be a significant challenge. Whilst identifying ‘good’ scrutiny is not always possible, the consequences of ineffectual scrutiny can be extreme and very apparent.

5. The Francis Report¹ was published in 2013 following failings at the Mid Staffordshire NHS Trust. Whilst the failings were not attributed to local committees, the report was critical of local authority health scrutiny, highlighting a lack of understanding and grip on local healthcare issues by the members, little real interrogation and an over-willingness to accept explanations. Similarly, the Casey Report² in 2015 on Rotherham Council cited particular failings in Rotherham’s approach to scrutiny, noting that “Inspectors saw regular reports to the Cabinet and Scrutiny committees, but not the effective challenge we would expect from elected Members.”³ The report also found that scrutiny had been undermined by an organisational culture that did not value scrutiny and that committees were not able to access the information they needed to hold the executive to account. Mid Staffordshire and Rotherham are two of the most high-profile failures of overview and scrutiny committees, but the issues raised in the two reports can easily occur in other local authorities, and we consider some of them in this report.

6. Overview and scrutiny committees were created by the Local Government Act 2000 and were designed to off-set increased centralised power established by the new executive arrangements. The Act replaced the committee system whereby decisions were made either by meetings of the full council or in cross-party committees which managed council services. For proponents of the committee system, one of its strengths was that all members had an active role in decision-making. However, as Professor Colin Copus from De Montfort University told us, it was “an illusion of power. If you put your hands up at the end of a meeting you feel, “I am powerful. I am making something happen”. I am sure I am not giving any trade secrets away, but most of those decisions are made two nights before in the majority party group meetings.”⁴ With the exception of councils with a population under 85,000, the 2000 Act created a requirement for authorities to establish an executive of a leader, or elected mayor, and cabinet members.⁵ Mirroring the relationship between Parliament and government, the Act also required the non-executive members of councils to scrutinise the executive by creating at least one overview and scrutiny committee.

¹ Report of the Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust Public Inquiry, HC947, February 2013
² Report of Inspection of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, HC1050, February 2015
³ Report of Inspection of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, HC1050, February 2015 p65
⁴ Q38
⁵ There was also initially an option for Mayor and council manager executive, but this was later repealed. Smaller authorities were able to retain the committee system, as long as there was at least one overview and scrutiny committee. The Localism Act 2011 extended this option to all authorities, but the requirement of a designated scrutiny committee was removed.
However, beyond some statutory requirements (for example designating committees to scrutinise health bodies, crime and disorder strategies, and flood risk management), how councils deliver scrutiny is a matter of local discretion.

7. Some councils have multiple committees that broadly align with departmental functions, while others have fewer formal committees but make greater use of time-limited task and finish groups. Similarly, as the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) identifies, different councils use different labels for their scrutiny work, including “select committees, policy development committees, or a number of other names. The use of different terminology can prove confusing [but] This is probably a good thing–it reflects the fact that scrutiny has a different role in different places, which reflects local need rather than arbitrary national standards”.6 Throughout this report references to ‘scrutiny’ and ‘scrutiny committees’ mean all committees and work associated with the overview and scrutiny committees required by the Local Government Act 2000.

8. Whilst acknowledging that scrutiny fulfils different roles in different areas, we believe that at its best, scrutiny holds executives to account, monitors decisions affecting local residents and contributes to the formation of policy. We therefore support CfPS’s four principles of good scrutiny, in that it:

- Provides a constructive “critical friend” challenge;
- Amplifies the voices and concerns of the public;
- Is led by independent people who take responsibility for their role;
- Drives improvement in public services.7

9. We believe that as well as reacting to decisions and proposals from local decision makers, effective scrutiny can also be proactive and help to set a policy agenda. For example, Birmingham City Council’s Education and Vulnerable Children Overview and Scrutiny Committee carried out a review of the council’s work to tackle child sexual exploitation. As a result of the Committee’s work, the executive responded and addressed the issues raised:

   The committee heard much harrowing evidence but produced a hard hitting report containing 19 strong recommendations. As a result of the report extra resources were allocated to the team co-ordinating CSE on behalf of the city. The council also undertook to strengthen its approach to safeguarding children by reviewing its statement of licensing and being more pro-active in using its executive powers of “the protection of children from harm”.8

10. Pre-decision scrutiny is also a vital part of a committee’s role. By commenting on and contributing to a decision before it has been made, scrutiny committees are able to offer executives the benefit of their ability to focus on an issue in greater depth over a longer period of time. For example, the London Borough of Merton’s Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel considered a site proposal for a new secondary school. As a

---
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result of its work, the Panel was “able to provide a detailed reference to Cabinet focusing on how to optimise use of the selected site and mitigate any negative impact”, helping the Cabinet to make a more informed and considered decision.9

11. The role of scrutiny has evolved since its inception. The 2000 Act empowers committees to review decisions made by the executive and to make reports and recommendations for the executive’s consideration. In the seventeen years since, the way in which scrutiny committees perform their function has understandably changed. One such way has been an increase in scrutiny of external bodies, most notably health bodies. Councils have delivered services through increasingly varied partnership arrangements - including contracting to private companies, creating arms-length bodies or working with other public bodies - and scrutiny has responded by adjusting how it scrutinises the issues that matter to local residents. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) highlights that “To support local councils adopting good practice, the Department for Communities and Local Government issues statutory guidance, to which councils must have regard when developing their localist scrutiny arrangements.”10 This guidance was last issued in 200611 and predates several legislative changes as well as changes to ways of working such as an increasing focus on external scrutiny and public participation (both discussed later in this report). When we asked Marcus Jones MP, Minister for Local Government, about the guidance, he told us:

It has been some time since we looked at the guidance on scrutiny ... The initial evidence that you have taken indicates that in many places scrutiny is working well, but there are also instances in which overview and scrutiny committees could improve. It is therefore important that once we see the outcome of this Committee in the report that you provide, I take those recommendations very seriously. If there are areas where it is sensible and pertinent to update the guidance, we will certainly consider that.12

12. We welcome the Minister’s willingness to consider our recommendations carefully. We believe that there are many instances across the country where scrutiny committees are operating effectively and acting as a voice for their communities, however there remains room for improvement for too many and we believe that updated guidance from the Department is long overdue. We therefore recommend that the guidance issued to councils by DCLG on overview and scrutiny committees is revised and reissued to take account of scrutiny’s evolving role.

13. Throughout our investigations, we heard about a range of positive examples of effective scrutiny, some of which we have referenced in this report. We call on the Local Government Association to consider how it can best provide a mechanism for the sharing of innovation and best practice across the scrutiny sector to enable committees to learn from one another. We recognise that how scrutiny committees operate is a matter of local discretion, but urge local authorities to take note of the findings of this report and consider their approach.

---
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10  Department for Communities and Local Government (OSG122) para 5
11  Department for Communities and Local Government, New council constitutions: guidance to English Authorities (May 2006)
12  Q111
2 Party politics and organisational culture

Organisational culture

14. As discussed above, councils across the country deliver scrutiny in a wide range of different ways. We are of the view that whichever model of scrutiny a council adopts it is far less important than the culture of an organisation. Council leaders, both politicians and officials, have a responsibility to set the tone and create an environment that welcomes constructive challenge and democratic accountability. Jacqui McKinlay from the CfPS explained to us:

If you have buy-in to scrutiny at the top of the organisation—that is the leader, the cabinet and the chief executive—it tends to follow that scrutiny is resourced … However, if you do not get buy-in to a scrutiny approach—that openness and transparency and the willingness to be questioned, seeing the value of scrutiny—it tends to follow that it is not resourced as well and you do not get that parity of esteem … If your leadership is closed to that sort of challenge, it does not just affect scrutiny; it affects a lot of how the organisation is run.13

15. The Minister for Local Government echoed this view when he told us:

I think that where scrutiny is done properly in local authorities that have the right culture, and where scrutiny is taken seriously, it can perform an excellent function in relation to how the executive works by holding them to account and putting them in a position where they probably make decisions that are more in the interests of the people they represent and local residents than they otherwise might be.14

16. All of the examples of effective scrutiny that we have heard about have in common an organisational culture whereby the inherent value of the scrutiny process is recognised and supported. Senior councillors and officers that seek to side-line scrutiny can therefore miss out on the positive contributions that scrutiny is capable of, and put at risk a vital assurance framework for service delivery. The Nottingham City Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee explains that:

there can be a perception that overview and scrutiny is an ‘add on’ rather than an integral part of the organisation’s governance arrangements… [with the executive arrangements] there can be a tendency for council officers to feel that they are primarily accountable to one councillor which risks overlooking the important role of other councillors, including those engaged in scrutiny activities, within the decision making structure. As a result the function is not always afforded the prominence it deserves and opportunities to make the most of its potential can be missed.15
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The relationship between scrutiny and the executive

17. We are concerned that the relationship between scrutiny and the executive has a tendency to become too unbalanced. With decision-making powers centralised in the executive, scrutiny can be seen as the less-important branch of a council’s structure. Professor Copus highlighted that there is no parity of esteem in the eyes of many councillors:

One of the things I have noted in all of the work I have done on scrutiny since 2002 is I have only ever once come across a councillor who said, “If you offered me a place in the cabinet, I would reject it. I want to stay a chair of scrutiny”. I am sure there are more than the one I have met, but that is an indication.16

18. Professor Copus argued that this imbalance in esteem is also reflected in council officers:

I found many officers will know the council leader’s name and the name of the portfolio-holder for their particular area of interest, but they might not know the scrutiny chairperson’s name. Once you start to see that, you see the whole thing begin to crumble.17

19. If neither councillors or officers explicitly recognise the importance of the scrutiny function, then it cannot be effective. Part of the challenge lies in identifying what effective scrutiny actually looks like, as discussed earlier in this report, as councils are more likely to allocate diminishing resources to functions where there can be a quantifiable impact. However, all responsible council leaderships should recognise the potential added value that scrutiny can bring, and heed the lessons of high profile failures of scrutiny such as those in Mid Staffordshire and Rotherham.

20. Council leaderships have a responsibility to foster an environment that welcomes constructive challenge and debate. However, opposition parties also have a key role to play in creating a positive organisational culture. We agree with the Minister who told us that:

At the end of the day, if an opposition takes a reasonable view on these things and treats the executive with respect, but challenges them when challenge is necessary, rather than just for the sake of challenge, I think you can get to a situation where you have—not much of an agreement politically, probably, but there could be mutual respect. That would serve the scrutiny function well.18

The role of Full Council

21. Parliamentary select committees have a well-established independence from the executive in that they do not report to the Government, but to the House of Commons as a whole. In contrast, it is less clear where local authority scrutiny committees report to, with most reporting to the executive that they are charged with scrutinising. The Institute
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of Local Government Studies (INLOGOV) at the University of Birmingham argues that it should be made clear in guidance that scrutiny reports and belongs to Full Council, not the executive:

As of now, most scrutiny committees report to the Executive—with only some inviting the scrutiny chair and members who have written a report to present it. A few present reports to the full council. When they do so, this has the opportunity to create a relevant and interesting debate on a matter of local concern which has been investigated in depth by a group of councillors. Such a debate enables other councillors to see what scrutiny has done, and to add their own experiences. Councils should be required to have Reports from scrutiny on all council agendas.19

22. Cllr Mary Evans told us that she welcomed the suggestion that scrutiny should be accountable to Full Council. We also heard from Cllr John Cotton from Birmingham City Council, whose scrutiny committees do report to Full Council. He told us that:

speaking from Birmingham’s perspective, due to the fact that everything reports through to full council we have been able to preserve some of that independence of approach, but from the conversations I have been having that certainly needs to be echoed in other authorities.21

23. To reflect scrutiny’s independent voice and role as a voice for the community, we believe that scrutiny committees should report to Full Council rather than the executive and call on the Government to make this clear in revised and reissued guidance. When scrutiny committees publish formal recommendations and conclusions, these should be considered by a meeting of the Full Council, with the executive response reported to a subsequent Full Council within two months.

The impact of party politics

24. Scrutiny committees must have an independent voice and be able to make evidence-based conclusions while avoiding political point-scoring. In order to do this, they need to be sufficiently resourced, have access to information (both discussed in greater detail below) and operate in an apolitical, impartial way. Committees of local councillors will always be aware of party politics, but sometimes this can have too great an influence and act as a barrier to effective scrutiny. Jacqui McKinlay from the CfPS told us that “We often say that local government scrutiny is a perfect system until you add politics to it. In our last survey, 75% of people say that party politics affects scrutiny.”22 Professor Copus also recognised the party-political dynamic to scrutiny when he described to us:

members from opposing political parties, one seeing their role as using scrutiny to attack the executive and the other seeing it as a forum in which to defend the executive. If that is the interaction, you are not going to get executive accountability ... In terms of a lot of the issues that are problematic for overview and scrutiny, the interplay of party politics is often at the
heart of it. I will quite often hear councillors, even from majority groups, admitting that one of the reasons scrutiny is not as effective as it can be is because of the relationship between the opposing groups.\footnote{Q12}

25. The Local Government Act 2000, and the guidance issued by DCLG, specifies that members of a council’s executive cannot also be members of overview and scrutiny committees. A Private Members’ Bill in 2009\footnote{Local Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny) Bill 2009–10} made provisions to allow executive members to sit on committees during scrutiny of external bodies (on the basis that in such instances, it was not the executive that was being scrutinised). The Bill did not pass through the House of Commons, and we are wary of any such attempts to dilute the distinction between executive and scrutiny functions. We heard of instances at the workshop of executive councillors effectively chairing scrutiny committee meetings where the NHS was under scrutiny, and are concerned by such practices. We believe that executive members should attend meetings of scrutiny committees only when invited to do so as witnesses and to answer questions from the committee. Any greater involvement by the executive, especially sitting at the committee table with the committee, risks unnecessary politicisation of meetings and can reduce the effectiveness of scrutiny by diminishing the role of scrutiny members. \emph{We therefore recommend that DCLG strengthens the guidance to councils to promote political impartiality and preserve the distinction between scrutiny and the executive.}

\section*{Committee chairing arrangements}

26. Political impartiality can also be encouraged through the process for appointing chairs of committees. Overview and scrutiny committees are required to have a membership that reflects the political balance of a local authority, but there are a range of different approaches for appointing the chairs and vice chairs of committees. Many authorities specify that committee chairs must come from opposition parties, others allocate chair positions proportionally among the parties on the council and others reserve all committee chair positions for the majority party. The Centre for Public Scrutiny states that:

\begin{quote}
Legally, the Chairing and membership of overview and scrutiny committees is a matter for a council’s Annual General Meeting in May. Practically, Chairing in particular is entirely at the discretion of the majority party. Majority parties can, if they wish, reserve all committee chairships (and vicechairships) to themselves … the practice of reserving all positions of responsibility to the majority party is something which usually happens by default, and can harm perceptions of scrutiny’s credibility and impartiality.\footnote{Centre for Public Scrutiny (OSG098) paras 130–132}
\end{quote}

27. Chairs from a majority party that are effectively appointed by their executive are just as capable at delivering impartial and effective scrutiny as an opposition councillor, but we have concerns that sometimes chairs can be chosen so as to cause as little disruption as possible for their Leaders. \emph{It is vital that the role of scrutiny chair is respected and viewed by all as being a key part of the decision-making process, rather than as a form of political patronage.}
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28. Cllr Mary Evans, chair of the scrutiny committee at Suffolk County Council, told us of her efforts to keep party politics out of scrutiny as a chair from a party with a sizeable majority: “We do it by involving the membership of the scrutiny committee at every point of an inquiry … we had a workshop just after our elections in May to look at what our forward work programme would be. The membership together has picked the programme.” When asked whether the size of her party’s majority made this easier, Cllr Evans explained that “When I first chaired scrutiny, in 2015, we had a majority of only one. I wanted to work across the committee. I did not have the luxury of a large majority … We try to be as open and transparent as scrutiny should be, so the membership is engaged and involved in every aspect of the inquiry.”

Cllr John Cotton, lead scrutiny member at Birmingham City Council, is also a scrutiny chair from a majority party and he told us that whilst it is important to acknowledge the role of party politics, scrutiny works best when non-partisan:

In terms of the discharge of the scrutiny function, certainly we proceed on a very non-partisan basis. All of our full scrutiny reports go to full council. I can only recall one occasion in the last 15 years where we have had a minority report because there has been a partisan division. Frequently those reports are moved by the chair and seconded by a member from an opposition party. You then have collective ownership of those recommendations, because they are taken by full council. The scrutiny process draws its strength from the fact that we have those inputs from members across the piece … There is a little bit of grit in the system, if you like, which comes from the party-political roots of members, which you do not want to remove entirely.

29. Cllr Sean Fitzsimons, chair of the Scrutiny and Overview Committee at Croydon Council, echoed this view when he told us that as a chair from a majority party that made critical recommendations of his executive “you have to go along with it if you believe that scrutiny is a function of the backbenches and that you have to put aside your party loyalties in the short term.” However, Cllr Fitzsimons argued that scrutiny is at risk of becoming more partisan and that the process for choosing a chair needed consideration:

My worry is that, as people have drifted away, over time, from what the original aspect of overview and scrutiny was, party politics have played a greater role. If I was looking at this issue, I would look at the political culture of each political party. In the Labour group, under the standing orders of the national party, [scrutiny chairs are] not appointed by the leadership of the Labour group, so I am independent of my leader, so I have a little bit of leeway. My two best chairs that I ever had from the opposition group were so good at scrutiny that they were sacked by their political leader when he was in power. Within the Conservative group, chairs of scrutiny can be appointed effectively by the leader of the council or by the cabinet, and I do think the political cultures of the parties really influence it.
30. We believe that there are many effective and impartial scrutiny chairs working across the country, but we are concerned that how chairs are appointed has the potential to contribute to lessening the independence of scrutiny committees and weakening the legitimacy of the scrutiny process. Even if impropriety does not occur, we believe that an insufficient distance between executive and scrutiny can create a perception of impropriety. We note, for example, the views of the Erewash Labour Group:

The Scrutiny Committee in this Authority protects the Executive rather than holding them to account. If they are ever held to account it is within the privacy of their own Political Group Meetings which are not open to the public. Most of the important decisions are first made in the Group Meetings ... The opposition have made some very sensible suggestions during Scrutiny debates only to be told “We have already decided this.” Cabinet Members may not attend Scrutiny Meeting unless by the invitation of the Chair. This rule was brought in to stop Cabinet Members exerting any undue pressure on members by their presence. Now they simply exert pressure in other ways such as by the choice of member selection and also the selection of the chair.  

31. It is clear to us that scrutiny chairs must be seen to be independently minded and take full account of the evidence considered by the committee. We note the evidence from the Minister who outlined the Government’s prescription that chairs of scrutiny in the new mayoral combined authorities must be from a different political party to the executive mayor in order to encourage effective challenge.  

Similarly Newcastle City Council where all scrutiny chairs are opposition party members, states that:

This has taken place under administrations of different parties and we believe that it adds to the clout, effectiveness and independence of the scrutiny process; it gives opposition parties a formally-recognised role in the decision-making process of the authority as a whole, more effective access to officers, and arguably better uses their skills and expertise for the benefit of the council.  

32. In 2010, recommendations from the Reform of the House of Commons Committee’s report ‘Rebuilding the House’ were implemented to change the way Parliament worked. One such recommendation was the introduction of elections for select committee chairs by a secret ballot of all MPs. In 2015, the Institute for Government published an assessment of parliamentary select committees and their impact in the 2010–15 Parliament. The report found that electing chairs had helped select committees to grow in stature and be more effective:

Every chair we spoke to told us that, since the introduction of elections for committee chairs, they had felt greater confidence and legitimacy in undertaking committee work because they knew they had the support of their peers rather than pure political patronage.
33. The positive impact of elected chairs for parliamentary committees has led some to suggest that local authority scrutiny chairs should also be elected by their peers. Under such a system scrutiny chairs, regardless of whether they come from the majority party or the opposition, are more likely to have the requisite skills and enthusiasm for scrutiny by virtue of the election process. Electing chairs would also dispel the notion that being appointed scrutiny chair is a consolation prize for members not appointed to the cabinet. The CfPS argue that:

such a process would encourage those seeking nomination and election as chairs to set out clearly how they would carry out their role; it would also mean that they would be held to account by their peers on their ability to do so. The legitimacy and credibility that would come from this election could also embolden chairs to act more independently.\(^{36}\)

34. When we asked the Minister about the prospect of electing scrutiny chairs, he was concerned that doing so could actually increase political pressures, but stated that “The important thing is that we have the right person chairing a scrutiny committee with the requisite skills, knowledge and acumen to take on the functions and achieve the outcomes that the scrutiny committee needs to achieve.”\(^{37}\)

35. We believe that there is great merit in exploring ways of enhancing the independence and legitimacy of scrutiny chairs such as a secret ballot of non-executive councillors. However, we are wary of proposing that it be imposed upon authorities by government. We therefore recommend that DCLG works with the LGA and CfPS to identify willing councils to take part in a pilot scheme where the impact of elected chairs on scrutiny’s effectiveness can be monitored and its merits considered.

\(^{36}\) Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) para 133
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3 Accessing information

36. Fostering the positive organisational culture discussed in the previous chapter can also determine another important aspect of effective scrutiny: access to information. When we asked Jacqui McKinlay whether scrutiny committees are able to access the information they need, she told us that:

The very determined ones can. I met one last week that had put an FOI request in to its own organisation in order to get the information. You should not have to do that, but there are ways there. There needs to be persuasion and influence in order to say, “This is an issue around flooding”, or whatever it might be, “that is really important”.38

37. Scrutiny committees that are seeking information should never need to be ‘determined’ to view information held by its own authority, and there is no justification for a committee having to resort to using Freedom of Information powers to access the information that it needs, especially from its own organisation. There are too many examples of councils being uncooperative and obstructive. For example a submission from a spouse of a scrutiny chair argues that it can seem to not be in council officers’ interests to divulge information freely:

There is an element of ‘siliosis’ within the Authority whereby Directors or Heads of Service do not release, explain or otherwise divulge their operational objectives, strategies or tactics for fear of being challenged. This makes it almost impossible to scrutinise, for after all how can one scrutinise what you don’t know? There is also a reluctance by officers to divulge operational (in)efficiencies in case it shows that there is an excess of staff ratios for particular tasks. It leads to obfuscation of such measures in order to protect their fiefdom.39

38. Similarly, the Minister told us of the example of an authority to which he used to belong and how culture can affect councillors’ ability to scrutinise:

When I was in opposition on the district authority of which I was a member, the controlling group at the time had this unfortunate situation where they used to bring out their budget at the budget-setting council in March. They used to bring it out through the cabinet at 4 o’clock. That mini-meeting used to finish at 5 and then we used to go straight into the full council at 6 to approve the budget. Where you have that type of culture, even if you have resource and access to information, you are not going to get the outcomes that are in people’s best interests.40

39. Professor Copus highlighted to us another challenge for scrutiny committees seeking to understand an issue:

I often think, “If someone is willing to give you something you have just asked for, what are they hiding? Why are they being overly enthusiastic?” It is because it is not causing them any problems. The information that
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scrutiny really needs is the stuff that people are a little bit more reluctant to hand over, whether that is the council itself or an external body. I hear quite often … of councillors using FOIs against their own council for the want of any other way. It is a sign of an immense frustration among members that they have to do that.41

Commercial confidentiality

40. A particular challenge for councillors wishing to access information in order to scrutinise an issue is related to commercial confidentiality. Jacqui McKinlay told us that “Every councillor I meet will talk about the barrier of commercial confidentiality. They will talk about, “We cannot give that information” and a lack of transparency.”42 Local authorities are required by statute to publish all information relating to decisions taken and service delivery, however there are certain categories of information that they can withhold. For example information relating to an individual’s circumstances is considered exempt, as is information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person - including the authority holding that information. As a consequence, many councils argue that publicly releasing specific details of a contract or a procurement framework such as cost or the details of rival bidders for a contract are withheld on the basis that such information is commercially sensitive and exempt from the access to information rules. Professor Copus told us that:

Commercial confidentiality is always another cloak behind which people who do not want to provide information can hide. There is a need for a much tighter definition of what is acceptable as an exemption for commercial confidentiality. It is not just not wanting to tell somebody what they have asked you. There needs to be a much tighter definition for scrutiny purposes.43

41. Whilst we acknowledge that it is not always in the public interest for local authorities to publish all information and make it available to the public, we cannot see a justification for withholding such information from councillors. Councillors have regular access to exempt or confidential information, often distinguished on agendas by use of different colour paper. As Cllr Marianne Overton told us, “Councils are used to dealing with confidential information, and we recognise if it is on pink paper it is confidential. There is no question about it. There should not be any problem with sharing information with elected members. We are already under rules.”44 Councils should be reminded that there should always be an assumption of transparency wherever possible, and that councillors scrutinising services need access to all financial and performance information held by the authority.

42. Legislation dictates what information should and should not be released to councillors. Regulations in 201245 clarified the position and granted additional access rights to members of overview and scrutiny committees. The Regulations state that
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scrutiny members can access any confidential material if they can demonstrate a ‘need to know’ in that it relates to any action or decision that that member is reviewing or scrutinising, or on any subject included on a scrutiny work programme. **We do not believe that there should be any restrictions on scrutiny members’ access to information based on commercial sensitivity issues. Limiting rights of access to items already under consideration for scrutiny limits committees’ ability to identify issues that might warrant further investigation in future, and reinforces scrutiny’s subservience to the executive. Current legislation effectively requires scrutiny councillors to establish that they have a ‘need to know’ in order to access confidential or exempt information, with many councils interpreting this as not automatically including scrutiny committees. We believe that scrutiny committees should be seen as having an automatic need to know, and that the Government should make this clear through revised guidance.**

### Getting data from multiple sources and external advisors

43. Council officers are the primary source of information for many committees, however if they do not present the full picture, then those committees can get very limited assurances about the service they are scrutinising. Whilst scrutiny should be able have access to whatever information it needs, this also serves to emphasise the importance of scrutiny committees seeking to use data from multiple sources and challenge that which they are told. Professor Copus described to us how effective scrutiny should operate:

> In some councils … they are too reliant on officers and too reliant on a single source of advice. In too many councils the flexibility that scrutiny has over the committee system is not used … sometimes, when you examine scrutiny agendas and scrutiny reports, and observe scrutiny meetings, what you see is a committee, and a one-off event that leads to not very much. In other councils, those that have really supported and understood scrutiny, you get a process … Where you get scrutiny viewed as not a single event but a process, then the outcomes are much more effective, and there is a greater access to a wider range. What scrutiny should be doing is not taking one source of evidence and going, “That is from the officers. Great. That is okay. We agree the recommendations”. They should be looking at conflicting evidence. There is always conflicting evidence with big policy issues. They need to sift that evidence.46

44. Cllr Marianne Overton, Leader of the Independent Group of the LGA, agreed that effective committees seek to triangulate data to build a fuller picture: “That is part of what scrutiny is about … one of the issues about scrutiny is that the whole point is that you can call all kinds of different witnesses … You are not just sitting, looking at the papers that you have been fed.”47 We are concerned that too many committees are overly reliant upon the testimonies of council officers, and that they do not make wider use of external witnesses. Very few councils have the resources to provide independent support to both the executive and scrutiny, and in light of the uneven balance between the two functions discussed earlier, most resources are prioritised upon the executive. This means that officers working in a service department are supporting executive members to develop and implement decisions, and the same officers are then supporting scrutiny committees as
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they seek to understand the impact of decisions and performance of departments. Whilst departmental officers may be able to distinguish the two roles and cater their support accordingly, we are concerned that too few councils are hearing alternative perspectives. However, we acknowledge that councils are operating on reduced budgets and that making use of specialist advisors can come at too high a cost for many committees. The LGA explains that:

Employing specialist external advice as part of oversight and scrutiny arrangements is not common … Where councils do bring in external experts, it is because specific knowledge and skills are needed that are not available in house. Procuring specialist advice comes at a cost and, given the pressures on council budgets, not all committees have funding available to increase their standard staffing compliment, commission professional advice, secure external witnesses or even refresh recruitment of co-optees.48

45. We are disappointed that committees do not make greater use of expert witnesses. At the informal workshop event hosted by the Committee, we spoke with councillors and officers on their use of experts such as local academics. One attendee told us that it could sometimes be possible to engage a local academic at the start of an inquiry to help members understand an issue, but it was seldom possible to sustain this engagement throughout the life of an inquiry. We note that few committees make regular use of external experts and call on councils to seek to engage local academics, and encourage universities to play a greater role in local scrutiny.

Service users’ perspective and public experiences

46. While recognising the constraints that committees operate under, we believe that it is possible to bring in a wider range of perspectives for limited expenditure, and that the benefits of doing so are significant. We note, for example, the case study presented by the LGA of Brighton & Hove City Council’s scrutiny panel on equality for the transgender community:

The panel’s review was underpinned by an effective and sensitive engagement strategy enabling the views of a hard to reach community to inform recommendations for action. The panel worked in partnership with the Council’s Communities team, the city’s LGBT Health Improvement Partnership, and a local charity which supported transgender people, co-opting experts to help better inform the process, and directly engaging through community events and specially designed workshops. A significant amount of time was devoted to the consultation process which was pivotal in helping to build up trust. The Panel’s findings were well received by the transgender community and partners, with all 37 recommendations adopted by the Cabinet.49

47. Bringing in the perspectives of service users undoubtedly leads to more effective scrutiny, both in developing policy such as the example from Brighton & Hove and in monitoring services. Officers from the London Borough of Hackney described an example of effective scrutiny in their monitoring of services for disabled children in the borough.

48 Local Government Association (OSG081) paras 10.1–10.3
49 Local Government Association (OSG081) paras 13.8 – 13.10
Rather than only using the testimony of the council officers delivering the service, “A major part of the evidence base for this review was the views of parents and carers of disabled children, as well as disabled children and young people themselves about the services they receive and the barriers they face in accessing current services.”50 We commend such examples of committees engaging with service users when forming their understanding of a given subject, and encourage scrutiny committees across the country to consider how the information they receive from officers can be complemented and contrasted by the views and experiences of service users.

50 Overview and Scrutiny team, London Borough of Hackney (OSG110) page 9
4 Resources

Reducing council budgets

48. Local government has experienced significant reductions in funding in recent years, leading many authorities to choose to reduce their scrutiny budgets. Whilst understandable in the context of wider reductions, it is regrettable that the resources allocated to scrutiny have decreased so much. The Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) explains that:

There are now significantly fewer “dedicated” scrutiny officers employed by English councils. In 2015 this dropped below one full time equivalent officer post providing policy support to scrutiny per council. In many councils, there might be only 0.2 or 0.3 FTE to carry out this role—or nothing at all. (We would describe a “dedicated” scrutiny officer as one whose sole duties involve providing policy advice to scrutiny councillors.)

49. Cllr John Cotton from Birmingham City Council also described a significant reduction in resources in recent years:

if I look at staffing for scrutiny in Birmingham, if we go back to 2010–11, we had 19.4 full-time equivalent staff. We are now working with 8.2, so there has clearly been a substantial reduction and we have seen a similar reduction in the number of committees and so forth … it does come back to this issue that, if you value something, you have to invest in it.

50. Birmingham City Council explain that this reduction in resources has matched a reduction in the amount of scrutiny carried out:

Birmingham has had five standing O&S Committees for the last two years, whereas there were on average ten committees in the ten years prior to that. Whilst this is line with the reduction in council budgets overall, it should be noted that the main impacts are the negative effect on the breadth and depth of work that can be covered by each committee, plus the reduced capacity to research, reach out to external partners and to residents and service users—and so to “act as a voice for local service users.”

Officer support models and required skill sets

51. The CfPS also note that increasingly the officers providing day to day support to scrutiny committees are those whose role is combined with wider democratic services functions or with a corporate policy or strategy role. Whilst those working in combined roles are able to provide effective support to scrutiny, there is a significant risk that non-scrutiny functions can take precedence. For example, democratic services officers supporting scrutiny must balance effective guidance, research and advice with the immediate time pressures and statutory deadlines of agenda publication and meeting administration. In such roles there is a risk that scrutiny is relegated to an ‘add-on’ that is only done once
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all other tasks are complete. Several officers attending our workshop expressed this view, with one officer explaining that she worked full time but her time was split with a wider corporate policy role and she estimated that no more than a quarter of her time was spent working on scrutiny matters. The ability of council officers to effectively support scrutiny can often depend entirely upon the personalities and enthusiasm of those officers. For example, when we asked Cllr Mary Evans from Suffolk County Council whether she felt that she had sufficient officer support, she told us: “I would say, “Yes, but”. Yes, we are adequately resourced, but it depends upon the fact that we have two extremely dedicated and experienced scrutiny officers who are working at full stretch.”

52. We heard evidence that the skill sets of officers is just as important as the number of officers allocated to support scrutiny. Professor Copus for example told us that when considering whether an authority’s scrutiny function is effective, he asks:

Is the scrutiny function well supported by officers and by the right sort of officers? I used to be a committee clerk, so I am not decrying that grand profession, but scrutiny committees need access to policy officers; they need access to people who can manipulate statistics, for example. They need the right sort of support.

53. Jacqui McKinlay also highlighted that certain skills are needed to effectively support scrutiny. She told us that:

We used to say a dedicated scrutiny officer [was the optimum approach, but] … As long as they have the passion, dedication and commitment to the principle of scrutiny and the specialist skills to do it, I would say we should leave councils to configure how that happens. We do need to acknowledge that we do now have the internet, and the days of research and how that happens have changed. However, it is wrong to presume that councillors themselves will have the time and the capacity to do the level of research that is sometimes needed to do good scrutiny on complex issues. Fundamentally, it needs the bedrock of good scrutiny skills within the team to do that.

54. From speaking with officers and councillors at our workshop, it is apparent that there are many officers working in scrutiny that have these skills, and some are able to combine them with the different skill set required to be efficient and accurate committee clerks. However, we heard too many examples of officers working on scrutiny who did not possess the necessary skills. One councillor told us that in her authority scrutiny officers had become little more than diary clerks, with reports and data now coming from the service departments across the council, which were invariably overly optimistic about performance and unchallenging of the status quo.
Scrutiny’s profile and parity with the executive

55. Whilst we regret that the level of resources allocated to scrutiny has diminished, we believe that the bigger issue relates to our earlier conclusions on organisational culture. In this respect, we agree with Cllr Sean Fitzsimons from Croydon Council who told us:

Yes, it clearly does make a difference where the level of resource is, but it is too easy to put the blame on scrutiny not being at its best because we do not have the right officer or the right amount of resource in place. To me, it is clear that it is the power relationship between scrutiny, the executive and the officers. That really is the focus of where strengths and weaknesses are. You could have a very well-resourced scrutiny with officers who know their subject, but if you cannot get the chief executive or the executive director of a department to feel that you have a legitimate role, you can bang your head against the wall for as long as you like. For me, resources would come if we had that power balance right, rather than starting to look at resources first.58

56. We are concerned that in many councils, there is no parity of esteem between scrutiny and the executive. Resources and status are disproportionately focussed around Leaders and Cabinet Members, with scrutiny too often treated as an afterthought. Professor Copus told us that:

in many councils, scrutiny lacks a parity of esteem with the executive. As a consequence, resources and focus are placed on the executive. For example, chief executives will find the time and have little problem in working directly with a council leader or with the cabinet. Expecting a chief executive then to work with the scrutiny process is always somewhat problematic. As soon as you differentiate between scrutiny and the executive with its officer base and its officer support, you start to chip away at the esteem that scrutiny has. One way around that, without expecting chief executives to work with every scrutiny committee, is to make sure that the scrutiny function has the resources to be able to produce evidence-based policy suggestions that the executive want to take on board, because they recognise scrutiny has done something they have not, which is spend three or four months looking at a particular issue in detail; cabinets cannot do that.59

57. As well as the disproportionate allocation of resources, we are also concerned that the uneven relationship between executives and scrutiny committees means that those officers supporting scrutiny can find themselves conflicted. Scrutiny officers can find themselves in the position of having to balance corporate or administration priorities with the challenge role of scrutiny, conscious that those they are scrutinising can make decisions regarding future resourcing and their personal employment prospects. Advice from officers must be impartial and free from executive influence. Cllr Fitzsimons told us that:

You have to trust your officers and you also have to understand that they will have careers outside scrutiny … We need to make certain that they do not become part of the rock-throwing contingent, and that they are not seen
as part of the group of officers supporting councillors who are making life difficult. I believe officers can be impartial, but they need to network and to network strongly within the council. If you really want to know what is going on in a department, you need an officer advising you in scrutiny who has those contacts within that highways department, as well as being good with the figures and being able to produce a report. You need impartiality, but you also need great networking skills.

58. We believe that if a local authority does not adequately resource the scrutiny function, such impartiality is harder to ensure. With officers supporting both the executive and scrutiny, there is a significant risk that real or perceived conflicts of interests can occur. For example, an officer from a London Borough explained that in her authority following reductions in scrutiny support, designated senior officers from service departments act as ‘scrutiny champions’:

The scrutiny champion’s role includes supporting the committee with finalising its work programme for the municipal year, and includes directing departmental officers to produce the scoping report for the area the Committee will undertake an ‘in-depth’ scrutiny review on in that year. As the same officers provide direct support to the executive, one can immediately see the defect in this model—officers supporting the scrutiny function are not independent of, and separate from, those being scrutinised.

### Allocating resources

59. Councils are under extreme budgetary pressures, but we are concerned that decisions regarding the resourcing of overview and scrutiny can be politically motivated. Professor Copus told us that:

In some councils, councillors have said to me, “It is a deliberate ploy that we under-resource scrutiny so that it cannot do anything and it cannot challenge the executive. It has very little role to play.” Because of the financial constraint, supporting scrutiny is a soft and obvious target for reductions. It is a false economy, because good, effective scrutiny can save councils money, and indeed save other organisations money as well.

60. When we asked the Minister about resourcing scrutiny committees, he told us:

What we have to consider here is that we have not got a scrutiny function that is in the pockets of the executive and the senior management team. We need a scrutiny function where those senior officers have a relationship with the scrutiny function and the people conducting the scrutiny get to see how the executive works and understand the executive, but that does not take away the fact that we need to make sure that scrutiny committees are properly resourced. That is not necessarily, in certain places, about having a
dedicated officer; it is more about having access to the information, support and, at times, research, to make sure that they do a good job of scrutinising the executive.63

61. We acknowledge that scrutiny resources have diminished in light of wider local authority reductions. However, it is imperative that scrutiny committees have access to independent and impartial policy advice that is as free from executive influence as possible. We are concerned that in too many councils, supporting the executive is the over-riding priority, with little regard for the scrutiny function. This is despite the fact that at a time of limited resources, scrutiny’s role is more important than ever.

62. We therefore call on the Government to place a strong priority in revised and reissued guidance to local authorities that scrutiny committees must be supported by officers that can operate with independence and provide impartial advice to scrutiny councillors. There should be a greater parity of esteem between scrutiny and the executive, and committees should have the same access to the expertise and time of senior officers and the chief executive as their cabinet counterparts. Councils should be required to publish a summary of resources allocated to scrutiny, using expenditure on executive support as a comparator. We also call on councils to consider carefully their resourcing of scrutiny committees and to satisfy themselves that they are sufficiently supported by people with the right skills and experience.

The role of the Statutory Scrutiny Officer

63. The Localism Act 2011 created a requirement for all upper tier authorities to create a statutory role of designated scrutiny officer to promote scrutiny across the organisation. The Act does not require that the officer be of a certain seniority, or be someone that works primarily supporting scrutiny. The Institute of Local Government Studies (INLOGOV) at the University of Birmingham explains that:

> The intention was to champion and embrace the role of scrutiny. In reality, in most councils, the designated post-holder, while willing, is a shadow of the other posts required by legislation–the Head of Paid Service, Section 151 Officer, and Monitoring Officer. It is seldom an officer with a level of seniority sufficient to ensure that scrutiny is taken seriously when the Executive (both cabinet members and senior council staff) seek to close ranks.64

64. We believe that the role of a statutory ‘champion’ of scrutiny is extremely important in helping to create a positive organisational culture for an authority. However, we are concerned that the creation of this role has resulted in too many instances of Statutory Scrutiny Officers fulfilling the role in name only, with little actual activity. At our workshop, councillors described to us how Statutory Scrutiny Officers were often ‘too low down the food chain’, while officers told us of the need for a higher profile for the role, arguing that officers from across the council should know who their Statutory Scrutiny Officer is in the same way they do for monitoring officers. We agree with INLOGOV that the creation of the post has “proved largely ineffective”65 and believe that reform
is needed in order to achieve the aspirations of the Localism Act 2011. The Association of Democratic Services Officers (ADSO) argue that the profile of the Statutory Scrutiny Officer role should be on a par with the Statutory Monitoring Officer\(^66\) and the County and Unitary Councils’ Officer Overview and Scrutiny Network argue that the requirement for a Statutory Scrutiny Officer should be extended to all councils.\(^67\) We note the positive example of Stevenage Borough Council choosing to fund a scrutiny officer despite not being covered by the provisions of the Act:

Some years ago this authority created a post of Scrutiny Officer and this has greatly helped with the running of an effective scrutiny function. We have prioritised this over other funding options. It is increasingly difficult to do so as this is not a statutory function at a District level, and the further funding cuts we face over the next three years place extreme pressure on existing budgets.\(^68\)

65. **We recommend that the Government extend the requirement of a Statutory Scrutiny Officer to all councils and specify that the post-holder should have a seniority and profile of equivalence to the council’s corporate management team. To give greater prominence to the role, Statutory Scrutiny Officers should also be required to make regular reports to Full Council on the state of scrutiny, explicitly identifying any areas of weakness that require improvement and the work carried out by the Statutory Scrutiny Officer to rectify them.**

\(^66\) Association of Democratic Services Officers (OSG123) page 7

\(^67\) Council and Unitary Councils’ Officer Overview and Scrutiny Network (OSG114) para 8.1

\(^68\) Stevenage Borough Council (OSG060) page 1
5 Member training and skills

The importance of training

66. Unlike the quasi-judicial council committees of planning and licensing, members of scrutiny committees are not required to have any specialist skills or knowledge. We have heard evidence suggesting that this can hinder the effectiveness of committees, and are concerned that some councillors might not take their scrutiny role as seriously as others. For example, an anonymous spouse of a scrutiny chair states that:

Whilst most Authorities have educational classes for members they are not well attended for the following reasons. Members who are in full time employment are not willing to attend in their ‘nonworking hours’; those who are long standing members think it beneath them and those who work for a political party are ‘instructed’ by the party’s position on the subject.69

67. If scrutiny members are not fully prepared and able to ask relevant questions, the committee will not be able to fully interrogate an issue and committee meetings can become little more than educational sessions for councillors to learn about a service, rather than scrutinise it. An officer from a London Borough explains that scrutiny meetings are:

typically between scrutiny members and senior officers where the temptation to ask questions to simply learn more about a subject matter is greater … The Council’s Member Development Officer, together with Democratic Services Officers, do arrange training for scrutiny members when opportunities arise; but this has proved insufficient as members infrequently display the required level of listening and questioning skills to make scrutiny impactful. Too many discussions at meetings are based on requests for more information, without expressing why it is required or how it will facilitate good scrutiny.70

68. Jacqui McKinlay from CfPS explained that training for scrutiny members usually fell into one of two categories:

One is the generic skills element—questioning skills, and understanding data and performance management information. We then also run training, which is around children’s services, understanding health and social care integration, whatever it might be. We are getting into the nitty-gritty then to give people enough knowledge… [However,] it is about who comes forward and accesses that. The people who come forward and access that tend to come from good organisations.71

The suitability of training provided

69. Without the legal requirement for training such as on quasi-judicial committees, councils are not able to ensure that scrutiny members have all of the skills or knowledge

---
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that they need to deliver effective scrutiny, and those that need it most are the least likely to engage. However, we also note the view of Professor Copus, who highlighted that the value of councillors is that they are lay persons:

There is a danger that we end up training councillors to be elected officers, and that has to be avoided. Officers are there to do their role. Councillors require a different type of skill and training. I am a great fan of council officers and I am not unfairly criticising them, but in many cases the training that is provided to members is what officers need members to understand, rather than what members need to understand.72

70. We agree that councillors require a different type of training from officers and that knowing a subject is not sufficient to ensure good scrutiny. The ability to question effectively, as well as actively listen to responses, is fundamental to successful scrutiny. Cllr Fitzsimons told us:

Indeed, some of the simpler questions are some of the most pertinent questions going. Someone coming in not knowing too much about a subject can almost get more from a session than someone who has drifted into data nirvana or something like that, where they are really drilling down and finding out why this figure does not match this other one.73

The quality of training available and DCLG oversight

71. We are concerned that there is no mechanism to ascertain whether scrutiny councillors are able to fulfil their vital role or that the training they do receive is fit for purpose. We asked councillors about the training and support that they had received from the Local Government Association (LGA), and responses were mixed. Cllr Fitzsimons for example told us:

the LGA runs some really interesting courses, which I have attended. They outsource some of it to the Centre for Public Scrutiny. I am not particularly a fan of the way they do things, and their training has not really moved on for a long time. The skills training that a councillor has for a meeting about questioning-and-answering skills are good training sessions.74

72. He argued that fundamental requirements for training included more emphasis on a self-reflective approach:

I remember going to do a training session with the London Borough of Richmond in 2006, and my challenge to the councillors who were doing scrutiny was, “How much backbone do you have?” and I just do not see that within the training. Are you willing to ask difficult questions? Are you willing, in your own political group, after you have done a scrutiny meeting, to have people say to you, “You were a bit harsh on the leader”? They do not get that self-reflective type training about, “What is your role? Are you really going to hold to account?”75
73. Cllr Fitzsimons also criticised national conferences and networking events for having an insufficient emphasis on frontline scrutiny members:

> You do not see ordinary councillors leading the events … ultimately the LGA is focused on the executive and their whole setup. Scrutiny, I believe, is an add-on, and that is just a reflection of the way it works, because the people who are influential in LGA are more likely to be council leaders and cabinet members than the ordinary scrutiny people. Individual training is good, but overall I do not think it is hitting the mark.76

74. The Minister told us that the Department allocated £21 million to the LGA “so that it could support various activities to improve the governance in local authorities; and it is why we are absolutely committed to working with the LGA and its delivery partners—organisations such as the Centre for Public Scrutiny”.77 DCLG states that:

> The Government does not monitor the effectiveness of overview and scrutiny committees—which is a matter for the authorities themselves. However, the Secretary of State may intervene in authorities which have failed in their best value duty, as happened in 2014 in Tower Hamlets and in 2015 in Rotherham.78

75. We are concerned that DCLG gives the LGA £21 million each year to support scrutiny, but does not appear to monitor the impact of this support or whether this investment represents best value. When we questioned the Minister about his Department’s monitoring of scrutiny effectiveness and the extent to which this was delegated to the LGA, he told us that DCLG “will look very carefully at the recommendations that are made by the Committee.”79

76. It is incumbent upon councils to ensure that scrutiny members have enough prior subject knowledge to prevent meetings becoming information exchanges at the expense of thorough scrutiny. Listening and questioning skills are essential, as well as the capacity to constructively critique the executive rather than following party lines. In the absence of DCLG monitoring, we are not satisfied that the training provided by the LGA and its partners always meets the needs of scrutiny councillors, and call on the Department to put monitoring systems in place and consider whether the support to committees needs to be reviewed and refreshed. We invite the Department to write to us in a year’s time detailing its assessment of the value for money of its investment in the LGA and on the wider effectiveness of local authority scrutiny committees.

---
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6 The role of the public

77. Earlier in this report, we discussed the need for scrutiny committees to have greater legitimacy and independence from their executives. A key way of delivering this is to ensure that members of the public and local stakeholders play a prominent role in scrutiny. By involving residents in scrutiny, the potential for a partisan approach lessens and committees are able to hear directly from those whose interests they are representing. Many local authorities have been very successful in directly involving their residents through open meetings, standing agenda items and public appeals for scrutiny topics. Other authorities, and indeed parliamentary select committees, can learn from such positive examples.

Case studies of public engagement

78. Devon County Council argues that “Scrutiny serves as almost the only bastion of opportunity for local people to voice an opinion on changes to a wide range of services, not just those provided by the Council.” The authority also cites an example where scrutiny considered a national issue which had a local manifestation. Search and Rescue services were previously provided by RAF Chivenor, but when this changed “Local People were very concerned about the loss of the service and scrutiny reviewed the evidence in an independent way. The subsequent report helped to reassure local people that the evidence supported the change as well as to establish a baseline from which to challenge future incidents.”

79. At its most effective, we believe that scrutiny amplifies the concerns of local residents and of service users. A positive example of this is in Exeter where the City Council established a ‘Dementia Friendly Council’ task and finish group. As part of its work, the group “invited members of the Torbay Dementia Leadership Group to visit the Customer Service Centre to observe the front line service and facilities from the point of view of a person with dementia and to see if the Council could make any improvements to the existing customer experience.” Subsequent recommendations to improve the service have since been made.

80. At our workshop with councillors and officers, one councillor explained that she did not like the term ‘public engagement’ and instead preferred to think of it as ‘listen and learn’. This approach was evident in the example of Surrey County Council, cited by the LGA. Surrey conducted extensive pre-decision scrutiny of the authority’s cycling strategy to help inform the final strategy. Following an independent consultation, it was apparent that there were mixed views on the proposals within the strategy and a joint meeting of two scrutiny committees was held to consider them, with a public forum to allow residents to express their views. The outcome was a better-informed and more successful strategy:

Having heard and considered the voice and concerns of the public on the Council’s proposed Cycling Strategy, the committees made recommendations to ensure the final strategy was acceptable to Surrey residents. These included: ensuring benefits for local businesses; including

---
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cycling infrastructure schemes on highways maintenance programmes; lobbying central government so that unregulated events were regulated; working with boroughs & districts to develop cycling plans; and amending the strategy to ensure roads would only be closed with strong local support.\textsuperscript{83}

**Digital engagement**

81. The examples above are illustrations of the value that greater public involvement can bring both to the scrutiny process and an authority’s decision making process. However, we are also aware that the majority of scrutiny committees across the country are not well-attended by the public. Involving the public in scrutiny is time and resource intensive, but the rewards can be significant. In this context, it should also be noted that many members of the public do not want to engage with public services in the same way that they used to. Digital engagement is becoming increasingly important, with some councils embracing new media better than others (for example the twitter feed of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council recently received national attention for effective engagement regarding the naming of two gritters\textsuperscript{84}). Jacqui McKinlay told us:

> There are some real challenges about what public engagement looks like in the future. It is not necessarily the village hall where we are expecting people to turn up on a wet Wednesday. We need to start to accept that when we engage with people they do not necessarily always speak the same language as we do, particularly on contentious issues. People are very angry. They are very upset. In scrutiny and public services generally, we have to think about what engagement looks like in the future. We are also in a digital and social media world where the conversations now, probably in the last six months, are happening in WhatsApp. They were happening in Facebook earlier. That is something that scrutiny is really going to have to manage if it is going to stay relevant and part of the dialogue.\textsuperscript{85}

82. The Government should promote the role of the public in scrutiny in revised and reissued guidance to authorities, and encourage council leaderships to allocate sufficient resources to enable it to happen. Councils should also take note of the issues discussed elsewhere in this report regarding raising the profile and prominence of the scrutiny process, and in so doing encourage more members of the public to participate in local scrutiny. Consideration also need to be given to the role of digital engagement, and we believe that local authorities should commit time and resources to effective digital engagement strategies. The LGA should also consider how it can best share examples of best practice of digital engagement to the wider sector.

---
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\textsuperscript{84} “David Plowie or Spready Mercury? Council asks public to name its new gritters”, The Telegraph, 17 November 2017
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7 Scrutinising public services provided by external bodies

The conflict between commercial and democratic interests

83. We heard a lot of evidence that scrutiny committees are increasingly scrutinising external providers of council services, both in an attempt to avoid politically ‘difficult’ subjects and as a reflection that services are being delivered in increasingly diverse ways. We believe that scrutiny committees are ideally placed, and have a democratic mandate, to review any public services in their area. However, we have heard of too many instances where committees are not able to access the information held by providers, or the council itself, for reasons of commercial sensitivity (as further discussed in Chapter 3 of this report). Jacqui McKinlay from CfPS told us that there can be an “unbelievable barrier” with commercial organisations as they “do not recognise they are contracting with a democratic organisation that has democratic governance processes.”

84. The conflict between commercial and democratic interests means that many companies are not set up to accommodate public accountability. This is in contrast with health services, which have a more established history of engagement (backed up by legislative requirements). The London Borough of Hackney explains that:

Health scrutiny has been luckier than other areas in that the duties to attend meetings and engage with scrutiny are well established and accepted. For health scrutiny in Hackney there is an understanding that if invited to attend to be held to account on an issue, the invitation cannot be refused. Where service providers have appeared reluctant to attend scrutiny is often linked to their accountability to local government and whether their management structures are local. We have found where structures are regional or national and the organisation has very limited local accountability there can be difficulty with engagement in the local scrutiny function.

Scrutiny powers in relation to external organisations

85. Overview and scrutiny committees have a range of powers that enable them to conduct scrutiny of external organisations. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 gives local authorities the power to scrutinise health bodies and providers in their area or set up joint committees to do so. They can also require members or officers of local health bodies to provide information and to attend health scrutiny meetings to answer questions. Scrutiny also has powers with regard to the delivery of crime and disorder strategies, with those bodies which are delivering such strategies also being required to attend meetings and respond to committee reports. However, for all other organisations delivering public services, be they public bodies or commercial entities, their participation depends upon their willingness of both parties to do so and the ability of scrutiny committees to forge a positive working relationship. Attitudes to local scrutiny are varied, as Cllr Sean Fitzsimons from Croydon Council explained to us:

---
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I would say that the smaller the organisation the better they are at coming along. The most difficult one I ever dealt with was probably the Metropolitan Police. Borough commanders do not think we have any legitimacy. Sometimes, you can see they are thinking about other things. As someone who has sat on a riot review panel, led by a judge, to get someone there was an effort. They may want to come and talk about a certain thing, but the moment you ask them anything specific it is like, “I cannot talk about it”. Policing is a really difficult area, and it is actually within our remit. The fire brigade has been quite a useful organisation, and they are quite keen. The ambulance service is desperate to turn up.89

Scrutinising council contracts

86. A significant obstacle to effective scrutiny of commercial providers is an over-zealous classification of information as being commercially sensitive (as discussed in relation to council-held information in paragraph 40). Council officers are wary of sharing the terms of contracts as they do not want to prejudice future procurements, and contractors do not always see why they should share information. As discussed earlier in this report, we can see no reason for withholding confidential information from scrutiny councillors, who can then consider it in a private session if necessary. We believe that councils and their contractors need to be better at building in democratic oversight from the outset of a contract. We note for example the views of Cllr Fitzsimons, who argued that scrutiny often gets involved in contracting situations too late:

It is only when the major recommendations can go to cabinet that you can say, “I am unhappy with that and I will bring it in.” My experience, particularly in my local authority, is that the failure of the authority, at the time, to engage in scrutiny early on in the process so that we could help shape the outcomes meant that a decision had been taken by the relevant cabinet member, and really it allowed itself to drift into party political flag-waving, to say, “We are just not happy with the letting of this contract.” If we had been allowed to look at it six months or a year beforehand, we may have been able to have had some influence for the betterment of the service. I have found that contractors are quite keen to talk, but what it again goes back to is how comfortable the executive is having their decisions challenged, when they may have done 18 months or two years of private work on it and they think they already have the answer.90

87. It is imperative that executives consider the role of scrutiny at a time when external contracts are still being developed, so that both parties understand that the service will still have democratic oversight, despite being delivered by a commercial entity. Scrutiny committees have a unique democratic mandate to have oversight of local services, and contracting arrangements do not change this. We therefore support the recommendations made by the scrutiny committee at Suffolk County Council, as described to us by Cllr Evans:
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We had a task and finish group that did a lot of work on procurement and contracting, and we are asking that, in future, when the council signs any contracts, those people who are making the contract are aware that we could well expect to see them in front of scrutiny at some point. They cannot sign a contract with the authority and expect never to be put on the spot and be accountable.91

88. We heard examples where committees had successfully engaged external providers, such as Suffolk County Council where the contractors for highways and for social care come to scrutiny willingly.92 However this is not always the case and such variance is an issue of concern for us. We are of the view that scrutiny committees must be able to scrutinise the services provided to residents and utilise their democratic mandate and we therefore agree with the Minister, who told us:

When councils put contracts out to external bodies, they should look at that in the context of how open and transparent those arrangements can be. That can quite often be difficult because of commercial confidentiality, but, as I say, that should not be a cover-all for everything. I think that that should be considered in the context of when a contract is let, in terms of making sure that a particular provider can be called to a scrutiny committee. However, when a particular local authority lets a contract to a particular company, I do not think it should lead to a situation where that particular local authority is able to sit back and just blame its contractor. The local authority in question should, when tendering out, put together a process over which it has a level of control that enables it to scrutinise a particular contractor and take enforcement action should that contract not be fulfilled.93

Following the ‘council pound’

89. The CfPS highlight the difficulties that scrutiny committees can have monitoring services delivered in partnership, and notes that scrutiny has been effective when its formal powers give it a ‘foot in the door’:

We would therefore like to see these powers balanced across the whole local public service landscape. We would like to see the law changed and consolidated, to reflect the realities that local authorities now face—particularly the fact that much council business is now transacted in partnership. We would like to see an approach which uses the “council pound” as the starting point for where scrutiny may intervene—that is to say, that scrutiny would have power and responsibilities to oversee taxpayer-funded services where those services are funded, wholly or in part, by local authorities.94
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90. **Scrutiny committees must be able to monitor and scrutinise the services provided to residents.** This includes services provided by public bodies and those provided by commercial organisations. Committees should be able to access information and require attendance at meetings from service providers and we call on DCLG to take steps to ensure this happens. We support the CfPS proposal that committees must be able to ‘follow the council pound’ and have the power to oversee all taxpayer-funded services.

**Scrutiny of Local Economic Partnerships**

91. We are also extremely concerned at the apparent lack of democratic oversight of Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs). There are 39 LEPs in operation across England, tasked with the important role of promoting local economic growth and job creation. However, we fear that they vary greatly in quality and performance, and that there is no public assurance framework, other than any information they themselves choose to publish. LEPs have been charged with delivering vital services for local communities and do so using public money, and so it is therefore right and proper that committees of elected councillors should be able to hold them to account for their performance. LEPs are key partners of mayoral combined authorities and we note that the relationship in London seems established. Jennette Arnold OBE AM, Chair of the London Assembly, told us:

> The responsibility for the LEPs falls within the Mayor’s economic strategy, so for us the buck stops with the Mayor. He then has a LEP board. There are local authority councillors and businesspeople on that. There is a Deputy Mayor who is charged with business and economic growth in London. Both members of that LEP board and that Deputy Mayor have appeared in front of our Economy Committee. We also had questions about skills, because skills was linked, so our education panel raised questions. Business as usual for us is that where there is a pound of London’s money being spent, we will follow that and we will raise any issues as relevant.\(^95\)

92. We applaud this approach and welcome the oversight of the London LEP provided by the London Assembly. In the next chapter we will consider the role of scrutiny in combined authorities, where we have concerns over the capacity of the newer organisations. Their relative infancy when compared to the London Assembly is reflected in unclear relationships with their local LEPs. Cllr Peter Hughes, Chair of the West Midlands Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee, told us:

> There are non-voting LEP representatives on the board of the combined authority and there has been since the day it started. I have LEP representatives on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Again, they are non-constituent members, as are some of the rural authorities. Their commitment to overview and scrutiny and to audit is patchy, to say the least. There is one big authority or LEP area that does not contribute to scrutiny or audit … We have not done so yet, but I am sure before the 12 months are up that the LEP involvement in the combined authority’s work will be looked at.\(^96\)

\(^{95}\) Q103

\(^{96}\) Qq104–106
93. Whilst we welcome the established arrangements in London and the intentions of the newer mayoral combined authorities, we are concerned that there are limited arrangements in place for other parts of the country. We do note that examples exist, and call for such arrangements to be put in place across the country. Wiltshire Council states that:

   Wiltshire Council is one of the few local authorities nationally to have a OS task group actively engaging with the region’s Local Enterprise Partnership, providing extra public accountability to the LEP funding spent within the county. All LEP reports and expenditure are published to facilitate further scrutiny by members of the public.97

94. In October 2017, a review of LEP governance arrangements was published by DCLG. The review makes a number of recommendations and noted that while many LEPs have robust assurance frameworks, approaches vary. For example, LEPs are required to publish a conflict of interest policy and the review found that “Whilst LEPs comply with this requirement, the content of policies and approach to publication varies considerably and is dependent on the overall cultural approach within the organisation.”98 The review also noted that:

   A number of LEPs, but not all, refer to the role of scrutiny in overseeing their performance and effectiveness. Some LEPs are scrutinised from time to time by their accountable body Overview and Scrutiny function. This is an area for further development which would give increased independent assurance. Given the different structures across LEPs it is not appropriate to specify any particular approach to scrutiny. It is an area which could benefit from the sharing of good practice/’what works’ to assist LEPs in shaping their own proposals.99

95. When we asked the Minister about the democratic oversight of LEPs, he told us that local authorities will usually have representation on LEP boards and that expenditure will often be monitored by the lead authority’s Section 151 finance officer. When we asked him about more public methods of scrutiny, he told us that:

   in terms of the scrutiny there are ways in which a LEP can be scrutinised. At this point I do not believe that those arrangements need to be changed, but I will certainly be interested—I know you have asked this of a number of the witnesses at this Committee—in their views on local enterprise partnerships. Certainly that will be a Government consideration once the Committee has submitted its report.100

96. In light of our concerns regarding public oversight of LEPs, we call on the Government to make clear how these organisations are to have democratic, and publicly visible, oversight. We recommend that upper tier councils, and combined authorities where appropriate, should be able to monitor the performance and effectiveness of LEPs through their scrutiny committees. In line with other public bodies, scrutiny committees should be able to require LEPs to provide information and attend committee meetings as required.

97 Wiltshire Council (O5G034) para 10
98 Department for Communities and Local Government, Review of Local Enterprise Partnership Governance and Transparency (October 2017), para 6.1
99 Department for Communities and Local Government, Review of Local Enterprise Partnership Governance and Transparency (October 2017), para 9.3
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8 Scrutiny in combined authorities

97. We recognise that the mayoral combined authorities are in their infancy, but given how important organisational culture is, it is important that we include them in our inquiry to ensure that the correct tone is set from the outset. We are therefore concerned by the evidence we heard about an apparent secondary role for scrutiny. Mayors will be responsible for delivering services and improvements for millions of residents, but oversight of their performance will be hindered by limited resources.

The London Assembly

98. The London Assembly has 25 members elected to hold the Mayor of London to account and to investigate any issues of importance to Londoners. London Assembly Members are elected at the same time as the Mayor, with eleven representing the whole capital and fourteen elected by constituencies. The Mayor holds all executive power and the Assembly’s ability to override decisions is limited to amending budgets and rejecting statutory strategies. The most visible accountability tool is Mayor’s Question Time, when the Mayor of London is required to appear in public before the Assembly ten times a year to answer for decisions made and their outcome. Oversight is also provided by ten thematic scrutiny committees. In 2016/17 the London Assembly controlled a budget of £7.2 million, of which £1.5 million was allocated to scrutiny and investigations, with the remainder used for other member services and democratic services functions. This compares with the Mayor’s budget of around £16 billion. The Chair of the Assembly, Jennette Arnold, told us:

You will see that we have been learning and changing over the last 16 years. I would say we are a much more robust body than we were, say, eight years previously because we have taken on learning. We set out to make sure that the centrepiece of our work, which is detailed scrutiny, is evidence-based, well resourced and is disseminated as widely as possible. We have two tracks: the first track is to follow the Mayor, i.e. we ensure mayoral accountability; and the other track we have is about any issue of public concern to London. I would say the combined authorities should look and see the clarity that we have. This is what good scrutiny looks like: it is separate; it has its own officers; it has its own budget; and there is money that is required to do that work.

The mayoral combined authorities

99. We welcome and applaud the approach of the London Assembly, however the wide discrepancy in the approach to scrutiny in the newer mayoral combined authorities which has come to light during our inquiry is an issue of concern. Combined authorities have a far smaller budget and do not have an equivalent body to the London Assembly, with scrutiny instead being performed by members of the constituent councils. The Local Government Research Unit at De Montfort University argue that:

102 Q83
An opportunity was missed in the creation of combined authorities—because of the focus on leadership—to recreate a London Assembly style directly elected body with the responsibility to hold the mayor of any combined authority (and other organisations) to account. A directly elected scrutiny body with its own staff and resources may seem an expensive innovation, but … serious governance failures resulting in damage to public services and the public can occur where O&S is inadequate or fails.103

100. In contrast with the London Assembly, Cllr Peter Hughes of the West Midlands Combined Authority told us:

The regulations for the combined authority actually state “a scrutiny officer”, as it stands at the moment. This has been the case for the last 18 months. The combined authority scrutiny chair, whether it is me or anybody else, is supported by a part-time person who is lent out from our own authority. That is the case across all of the other issues. Effectively, the West Midlands Combined Authority is run on the basis of good will and people, chief executives and directors, giving up their time. That is exactly the same with scrutiny. At the moment, we have a person who is lent, with no financial refund to Sandwell, to the combined authority. That has not yet been formalised.104

101. We recognise that the resourcing levels are not necessarily decisions for the combined authorities themselves, with Government funding dictating that they be organisations with minimal overheads. However, we also acknowledge that the absence of an allocated budget or a directly-elected scrutiny body does not mean that the approach to scrutiny in combined authorities is necessarily wrong. Cllr Hughes for example told us how he will be measuring the effectiveness of his committee:

Part of scrutiny is not just the questioning and scrutiny aspect of it; it is also that we are adding value to the work of the combined authority. As you have just said, it is in the very early stages at the moment. We feel that we can actually add value to some of the policy decisions that are being taken or being formed by actually taking specific pieces of work and drilling down and calling upon evidence from the local authorities beneath us to add value to the work of the combined authority itself.105

102. Susan Ford, Scrutiny Manager of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, also told us that successful scrutiny in Greater Manchester will enable the Mayor and officers to:

understand the value that scrutiny can bring, and… sense-checking what might cause issues in particular districts and bringing that kind of wealth of in-depth knowledge that scrutiny members bring in with them. The scrutiny function also has a duty to the public to try to simplify some of what can be seen as a very complicated governance arrangement. Having different governance arrangements across different devolved areas has not helped. Mayors in different city region areas have different powers, so

103 Local Government Research Unit, De Montfort University (OSG022) para 4
104 Q87
105 Q85
there is a duty to members of the public. There is also a duty to broaden the engagement in terms of thinking about things like younger people and the way in which elected members actually engage with their constituents. We have to support them to be able to make devolution governance and decision-making intelligible.\textsuperscript{106}

103. We raised the issue of scrutiny of combined authority mayors with the Minister, who argued that the scrutiny arrangements were sufficient:

I consider that the scrutiny arrangements in that sense are stronger than they are for local authorities … Certainly the powers that were being transferred to Mayors were generally powers that hitherto had been held by Secretaries of State and, therefore, on a virtually daily basis when this House was sitting there was a method, potentially, of scrutinising the decisions that were being made, and their outcomes … That said, and I have mentioned this a number of times, I do not think there is any room, in this sense, for complacency. I would say that, in the same way as we are now talking about the scrutiny arrangements from the Local Government Act 2000 having bedded in … the question is: should there now be more changes to update things because time moves on? There will legitimately be the question, as time moves on: how have those scrutiny arrangements worked? Do we need to change anything going forward to make sure that we are responding to circumstances that arise?\textsuperscript{107}

104. We welcome the approach to scrutiny by new mayoral combined authorities such as the West Midlands and Greater Manchester, but we are concerned that such positive intentions are being undermined by under-resourcing. This is not a criticism of the combined authorities - which have been established to be capital rich but revenue poor - as they do not have the funding for higher operating costs. However, we would welcome a stronger role for scrutiny in combined authorities, reflecting the Minister’s point that the Mayors now have powers hitherto held by Secretaries of State. \textit{We are concerned that effective scrutiny of the Metro Mayors will be hindered by under-resourcing, and call on the Government to commit more funding for this purpose. When agreeing further devolution deals and creating executive mayors, the Government must make clear that scrutiny is a fundamental part of any deal and that it must be adequately resourced and supported.}
Conclusions and recommendations

The role of scrutiny

1. We therefore recommend that the guidance issued to councils by DCLG on overview and scrutiny committees is revised and reissued to take account of scrutiny’s evolving role. (Paragraph 12)

2. We call on the Local Government Association to consider how it can best provide a mechanism for the sharing of innovation and best practice across the scrutiny sector to enable committees to learn from one another. We recognise that how scrutiny committees operate is a matter of local discretion, but urge local authorities to take note of the findings of this report and consider their approach. (Paragraph 13)

Party politics and organisational culture

3. However, all responsible council leaderships should recognise the potential added value that scrutiny can bring, and heed the lessons of high profile failures of scrutiny such as those in Mid Staffordshire and Rotherham. (Paragraph 19)

4. To reflect scrutiny’s independent voice and role as a voice for the community, we believe that scrutiny committees should report to Full Council rather than the executive and call on the Government to make this clear in revised and reissued guidance. When scrutiny committees publish formal recommendations and conclusions, these should be considered by a meeting of the Full Council, with the executive response reported to a subsequent Full Council within two months. (Paragraph 23)

5. We believe that executive members should attend meetings of scrutiny committees only when invited to do so as witnesses and to answer questions from the committee. Any greater involvement by the executive, especially sitting at the committee table with the committee, risks unnecessary politicisation of meetings and can reduce the effectiveness of scrutiny by diminishing the role of scrutiny members. We therefore recommend that DCLG strengthens the guidance to councils to promote political impartiality and preserve the distinction between scrutiny and the executive. (Paragraph 25)

6. It is vital that the role of scrutiny chair is respected and viewed by all as being a key part of the decision-making process, rather than as a form of political patronage. (Paragraph 27)

7. We believe that there are many effective and impartial scrutiny chairs working across the country, but we are concerned that how chairs are appointed has the potential to contribute to lessening the independence of scrutiny committees and weakening the legitimacy of the scrutiny process. Even if impropriety does not occur, we believe that an insufficient distance between executive and scrutiny can create a perception of impropriety. (Paragraph 30)

8. We believe that there is great merit in exploring ways of enhancing the independence and legitimacy of scrutiny chairs such as a secret ballot of non-executive councillors. However, we are wary of proposing that it be imposed upon authorities by government.
We therefore recommend that DCLG works with the LGA and CfPS to identify willing councils to take part in a pilot scheme where the impact of elected chairs on scrutiny’s effectiveness can be monitored and its merits considered. (Paragraph 35)

Accessing information

9. Scrutiny committees that are seeking information should never need to be ‘determined’ to view information held by its own authority, and there is no justification for a committee having to resort to using Freedom of Information powers to access the information that it needs, especially from its own organisation. There are too many examples of councils being uncooperative and obstructive. (Paragraph 37)

10. Councils should be reminded that there should always be an assumption of transparency wherever possible, and that councillors scrutinising services need access to all financial and performance information held by the authority. (Paragraph 41)

11. We do not believe that there should be any restrictions on scrutiny members’ access to information based on commercial sensitivity issues. Limiting rights of access to items already under consideration for scrutiny limits committees’ ability to identify issues that might warrant further investigation in future, and reinforces scrutiny’s subservience to the executive. Current legislation effectively requires scrutiny councillors to establish that they have a ‘need to know’ in order to access confidential or exempt information, with many councils interpreting this as not automatically including scrutiny committees. We believe that scrutiny committees should be seen as having an automatic need to know, and that the Government should make this clear through revised guidance. (Paragraph 42)

12. We note that few committees make regular use of external experts and call on councils to seek to engage local academics, and encourage universities to play a greater role in local scrutiny. (Paragraph 45)

13. We commend such examples of committees engaging with service users when forming their understanding of a given subject, and encourage scrutiny committees across the country to consider how the information they receive from officers can be complemented and contrasted by the views and experiences of service users. (Paragraph 47)

Resources

14. We acknowledge that scrutiny resources have diminished in light of wider local authority reductions. However, it is imperative that scrutiny committees have access to independent and impartial policy advice that is as free from executive influence as possible. We are concerned that in too many councils, supporting the executive is the over-riding priority, with little regard for the scrutiny function. This is despite the fact that at a time of limited resources, scrutiny’s role is more important than ever. (Paragraph 61)
15. We therefore call on the Government to place a strong priority in revised and reissued guidance to local authorities that scrutiny committees must be supported by officers that can operate with independence and provide impartial advice to scrutiny councillors. There should be a greater parity of esteem between scrutiny and the executive, and committees should have the same access to the expertise and time of senior officers and the chief executive as their cabinet counterparts. Councils should be required to publish a summary of resources allocated to scrutiny, using expenditure on executive support as a comparator. We also call on councils to consider carefully their resourcing of scrutiny committees and to satisfy themselves that they are sufficiently supported by people with the right skills and experience. (Paragraph 62)

16. We recommend that the Government extend the requirement of a Statutory Scrutiny Officer to all councils and specify that the post-holder should have a seniority and profile of equivalence to the council’s corporate management team. To give greater prominence to the role, Statutory Scrutiny Officers should also be required to make regular reports to Full Council on the state of scrutiny, explicitly identifying any areas of weakness that require improvement and the work carried out by the Statutory Scrutiny Officer to rectify them. (Paragraph 65)

Member training and skills

17. It is incumbent upon councils to ensure that scrutiny members have enough prior subject knowledge to prevent meetings becoming information exchanges at the expense of thorough scrutiny. Listening and questioning skills are essential, as well as the capacity to constructively critique the executive rather than following party lines. In the absence of DCLG monitoring, we are not satisfied that the training provided by the LGA and its partners always meets the needs of scrutiny councillors, and call on the Department to put monitoring systems in place and consider whether the support to committees needs to be reviewed and refreshed. We invite the Department to write to us in a year’s time detailing its assessment of the value for money of its investment in the LGA and on the wider effectiveness of local authority scrutiny committees. (Paragraph 76)

The role of the public

18. The Government should promote the role of the public in scrutiny in revised and reissued guidance to authorities, and encourage council leaderships to allocate sufficient resources to enable it to happen. Councils should also take note of the issues discussed elsewhere in this report regarding raising the profile and prominence of the scrutiny process, and in so doing encourage more members of the public to participate in local scrutiny. Consideration also need to be given to the role of digital engagement, and we believe that local authorities should commit time and resources to effective digital engagement strategies. The LGA should also consider how it can best share examples of best practice of digital engagement to the wider sector. (Paragraph 82)

Scrubtising public services provided by external bodies

19. Scrutiny committees must be able to monitor and scrutinise the services provided to residents. This includes services provided by public bodies and those provided by
commercial organisations. Committees should be able to access information and require attendance at meetings from service providers and we call on DCLG to take steps to ensure this happens. We support the CfPS proposal that committees must be able to ‘follow the council pound’ and have the power to oversee all taxpayer-funded services. (Paragraph 90)

20. In light of our concerns regarding public oversight of LEPs, we call on the Government to make clear how these organisations are to have democratic, and publicly visible, oversight. We recommend that upper tier councils, and combined authorities where appropriate, should be able to monitor the performance and effectiveness of LEPs through their scrutiny committees. In line with other public bodies, scrutiny committees should be able to require LEPs to provide information and attend committee meetings as required. (Paragraph 96)

Scrubtiny in combined authorities

21. We are concerned that effective scrutiny of the Metro Mayors will be hindered by under-resourcing, and call on the Government to commit more funding for this purpose. When agreeing further devolution deals and creating executive mayors, the Government must make clear that scrutiny is a fundamental part of any deal and that it must be adequately resourced and supported. (Paragraph 104)
Annex: summary of discussions at an informal workshop with councillors and officers

As part of the inquiry, the Committee hosted a workshop in October 2017 attended by over 45 council officers and councillors from across the country. Split into four groups, attendees discussed their experiences of overview and scrutiny, with each group considering three questions. The following provides an edited summary of the discussions held and is not intended to be verbatim minutes. Comments are not attributed to individuals or organisations, but seek to reflect the variety of statements made and opinions expressed. This summary and its content does not necessarily reflect the views of the Committee, or all of the attendees present at the workshop.

Q1) Do local authority scrutiny committees operate with political independence and in a non-partisan way

Officers:

- Scrutiny is only non-partisan on the surface: most of the discussion and debate takes place in group meetings, which officers and the public cannot see
- Scrutiny chairs often don’t want to challenge their Leaders, so do more external scrutiny or pick ‘safe’ topics that are less controversial
- The ways that committee chairs are appointed means that chairs more likely to ‘keep quiet’, use the role as a way to prepare for a Cabinet position, or see it as a consolation prize for not being in the Cabinet
- Personalities of chairs and the ability to work well with executive colleagues is key
- Officers in combined roles struggle to adequately support scrutiny: the roles of scrutiny officer and committee clerk are fundamentally different with different skill sets needed
- Clerking a committee changes how officers are treated, with the value placed on their expertise and guidance lessened so they are treated as little more than admin assistants
- Task and finish groups are less partisan and work effectively cross-party. However, witness sessions are usually held in private with only the reporting of findings being in public. External scrutiny is also less partisan, and so can achieve much more while enthusing councillors
- Third party organisations can sometimes be reluctant to be scrutinised by lay persons. It takes significant time to build positive relationships
- There should be debate at Full Council for topic selection for scrutiny committees
- Committees need more power to force changes on executives
• There is too much executive control over what is scrutinised

• In some local authorities, cabinet members and the Leader attend health scrutiny meetings when the NHS is being scrutinised and sometimes lead the questioning of witnesses

• Appointment of members to scrutiny committees is in the hand of controlling political groups, so there will never be full independence

Councillors:

• Focussing on the impact we want, like improved health and wellbeing, gets rid of the party-political aspect because we’ve agreed on what we want to achieve

• The better the quality of the opposition, the better the contribution it makes. Currently, we have a very weak opposition and I don't think they understand the difference between scrutiny and opposition

• One problem is engagement of one's own backbenchers to participate in scrutiny. It’s often the poor relation, and shouldn't be

• Is aiming for political independence realistic and necessary? If you have people from both sides on committee, as long as they challenge effectively, that’s all that matters

• I want to know about value for money, so I ask awkward questions. Politics comes into it when members score points to get votes. It suits my nature to be challenging and ask probing questions. But you need knowledge of subject to do this. A lot of colleagues don’t have this

• The role of the Leader is key: they have to believe in good governance. Scrutiny's success depends on the attitude of the Leader, who needs to recognise that good scrutiny reflects on the reputation of council. Too many Leaders seek to block scrutiny

• Scrutiny is improved in authorities where scrutiny reports go to Full Council and not the executive

• Officers have to be supportive of scrutiny. It’s not just about the Leader

• Some chairs can be fiercely independent regardless of which party has control. An effective chair of a scrutiny committee need to be apolitical and work collaboratively across party lines. A lot depends on the group of individuals on the committee

• A lack of political independence is often more pronounced in small shire district councils where there is often too much domination by strong leaders and executives

• There is a problem with committees lacking teeth - the executive will often not listen regardless of what scrutiny committees say
• Joint scrutiny often works well, sometimes with different chairs. Working groups also increase political independence

• Decisions on who will chair a committee is often whipped vote, and there is considerable remuneration which binds chairs’ approach

• The executive has control over scrutiny funding and budgets which is a big problem

Q2) Do officers and members working on scrutiny have sufficient resources, expertise and knowledge to deliver effective scrutiny?

Officers:

• Limited access to expertise is a bigger issue than resources: committees struggle to access expert advisors and find it hard to build relationships

• Scrutiny support is often combined with wider a corporate policy role, meaning officers often spend relatively little of their time actually working on scrutiny

• There is a tension in trying to scrutinise people with whom you might later seek to work with or for

• The reduced resources allocated to scrutiny has led to a corresponding reduction in scrutiny committees: local authorities cannot have committees that mirror each portfolio like in Parliament, leading to committees with extremely large remits

• Districts need to work better with upper tier authorities: on their own, districts are limited in what they can influence

• Scrutiny has fewer resources, but increasingly wide remits: it’s not possible to do everything justice

• Health scrutiny has a huge workload so committees often struggle to do much more that the statutory requirements

• Scrutiny has become much leaner, but this is not necessarily a bad thing: it is more focussed now so that it achieves more impact and demands greater attention

• Accessing outside experts is easier in London as they are always relatively nearby

• Questioning skills for members are key, and remain the biggest training need

• Getting input from external experts such as academics is possible at the start of an inquiry, but sustaining this engagement throughout an inquiry is difficult

• There should be a separate budget for scrutiny, commissioning research and recommending options

• In authorities that are reducing staff numbers for budgetary reasons, more resources for scrutiny is often unrealistic
• In many councils, there are enough resources, but they aren’t allocated appropriately: there needs to be a top-down reallocation of resources, with more priority given to the scrutiny team

• There is often a lot of resistance to scrutiny at the senior officer level. Many actively seek to keep scrutiny to a minimum, as they don’t want to be challenged in what they’re doing

• Information requested from senior officers is often sanitised or of limited usefulness. Officers need to realise they work for all councillors, not just the executive

Councillors:

• I’m not impressed by the quality of members. They need more training—it’s only then they have the knowledge to ask probing questions

• We have people on our Committee with no expertise

• The way round the resource problem is to get members to do more work themselves.

• It is incumbent on members who chair committees and task and finish groups to take on knowledge and expertise and motivate other members to do so too

• The clerks don’t prepare papers, someone from the relevant department (e.g. health and social care) does it

• We have found that scrutiny officers have taken on the role of being nothing more than glorified diary clerks. We need to motivate them to become more involved in the background and research. If you rely on reports from individual departments, they are too optimistic

• The key is understanding which questions to ask

• It’s about the officers understanding the key role of scrutiny and not seeing it as a nuisance

• Commercial confidentiality is a big issue which impedes scrutiny committees

• Investment in member development is insufficient, but also hampered by large turnover of committee members

• Individual committees often have too wide a remit to cover individual issues sufficiently

• There is a growing trend to merge scrutiny function with corporate policy team. This negatively impacts on scrutiny because of conflicts of interest among officers

• Too many scrutiny committees remain talking shops. There should be more emphasis on measuring how effective scrutiny is in influencing policy and decisions

• Scrutiny staff must be completely separated from the executive
• There has been a trend towards fewer members on scrutiny committees in recent years. This has negatively affected good scrutiny

• To give scrutiny more agency scrutiny reviews should be regularly produced which go to the full council for consideration

• More focus of scrutiny committees should be placed on upstream policy formation

Q3) If you could make a single change, what would you change about the way scrutiny in your authority operates?

Officers:

• The whole process should be more independent of departmental officers: chairs are reluctant to challenge or disagree with senior officers

• Having opposition chairs would get much better engagement and input from other members

• More members need to actually read their committee papers—however some officers make the papers intentionally long to dissuade members from doing so

• There is a capacity issue for ‘double-hatted’ councillors, and those who work in outside employment

• With meetings being held in the evenings, discussions can go on quite late: with many of the best councillors having demanding day jobs, it’s unrealistic to expect high performance

• Scrutiny committees should share expected questions with witnesses before meetings to ensure all information is available in advance: it shouldn’t be a closed-book exam as some officers can deflect questions by promising to look into an issue and write back later

• Scrutiny in general needs a higher profile, including the role of statutory scrutiny officer: people across the council should know who it is with their status being far closer to that of the monitoring officer

• Scrutiny has become too broad and complex over the years: it is not achievable to do everything asked of it. There needs to be a clear remit for scrutiny with up to date guidance from Government

• Scrutiny will only succeed if the Leader and Chief Executive think it is important—strong scrutiny chairs and strong scrutiny managers are required when they do not

• Ensuring legislation is enforced regarding undue interference from the Leader and cabinet

• Resident-led commissions help to improve scrutiny. Broadening the scrutiny process out to involve the public and prominent campaign groups, inviting them onto task groups, or to serve as chairs of commissions
• There should be an independent secretariat for scrutiny committees with separate
  ring-fenced budget, independent of the council, to create greater organisational
  autonomy
• Councils should be able to compel witnesses to attend from publicly funded
  bodies, such as housing associations
• Legislation relating to scrutiny powers should be simplified, putting them all
  into one place
• Removing conflicts of interests where scrutiny committees are supported by
  officers responsible for the policies that are being scrutinised

Councillors:
• Better selection of candidates to be councillors, as well as improving their calibre
  through training
• We need full time councillors: the part time nature of the role means variable
  quality
• It should be constitutionally established that scrutiny is on a level with cabinet
• Greater public involvement: if you want to be effective, what really changes a
  Leader’s mind is people and residents, and if you don’t get them to meetings, you
  won’t make changes
• Statutory Scrutiny Officers are too low down the food chain to influence people.
  This statutory post has to be a similar level and have access to the corporate
  management level
• We’ve also got to make use of modern technology. It’s about getting the message
  out through facebook and twitter
• One of the changes is taking meetings out in the community
• Political groups need to treat each other with fairness and respect
• Completely disconnect all aspects of scrutiny (formation, governance, resources)
  from the executive
• Increase connection with residents and public through co-opted members. More
  witnesses and public evidence sessions
• Clearer feedback loops to quantify scrutiny influence
• Council leadership should be assessed on how they take into account work of
  scrutiny committees, for example through annual report on scrutiny considered
  by full Council or annual evidence sessions with cabinet members
• Allocate chairs on the basis of political proportionality
• All scrutiny work should be considered by Full Council, rather than the cabinet
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Introduction

In September 2017, the Communities and Local Government Select Committee relaunched the inquiry into the effectiveness of local authority overview and scrutiny committees that had been started by its predecessor earlier that year. The Select Committee published its report on 15 December 2017: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmcomloc/369/36902.htm.

The Government will be looking at further ways to extend and improve transparency and is grateful both to the Committee for its consideration of the effectiveness of overview and scrutiny committees and to all those organisations and individuals who provided oral and written evidence.

Scrutiny can play a vital role in ensuring local accountability on a wide range of local issues. It is one of the key checks and balances in the system and the Government is committed to ensuring councils are aware of its importance, understand the benefits effective scrutiny can bring and have access to best practice to inform their thinking.

The Government firmly believes that every council is best-placed to decide which scrutiny arrangements suit its individual circumstances, and so is committed to ensuring that they have the flexibility they need to put those arrangements in place.

The Government is pleased the Select Committee acknowledges overview and scrutiny is functioning effectively in many local authorities and that committees are playing a key role in helping executives develop and review policy. The Government accepts, however, that in some councils scrutiny is not functioning as well as might be expected.

The Select Committee has made a number of recommendations, most, but not all, of which are for the Government to consider. The response in the following pages addresses only those recommendations aimed at the Government.

Recommendation 1: Proposed revisions to Government guidance on scrutiny committees (Page 7)

a) That overview and scrutiny committees should report to an authority’s Full Council meeting rather than to the executive, mirroring the relationship between Select Committees and Parliament.

b) That scrutiny committees and the executive must be distinct and that executive councillors should not participate in scrutiny other than as witnesses, even if external partners are being scrutinised.

c) That councillors working on scrutiny committees should have access to financial and performance data held by an authority, and that this access should not be restricted for reasons of commercial sensitivity.
d) That scrutiny committees should be supported by officers that are able to operate with independence and offer impartial advice to committees. There should be a greater parity of esteem between scrutiny and the executive, and committees should have the same access to the expertise and time of senior officers and the chief executive as their cabinet counterparts.

e) That members of the public and service users have a fundamental role in the scrutiny process and that their participation should be encouraged and facilitated by councils.

Government Response:

The Government acknowledges that the current guidance was issued in 2006 and is happy to ensure it is updated. New guidance will be published later this year.

a) The Government notes the evidence supplied to the Committee. Updated guidance will recommend that scrutiny committees report to the Full Council.

b) The Government accepts the need to limit the executive’s involvement in the scrutiny meetings. Updated guidance will make clear that members of the executive should not participate in scrutiny other than as witnesses.

c) Scrutiny committees already have powers to access documents and updated guidance will stress that councils should judge each request to access sensitive documents on its merits and not refuse as a matter of course. We will also have discussions with the sector to get a better understanding of the issues some scrutiny committees appear to have in accessing information and whether there are any steps the Government could take to alleviate this.

d) Updated guidance will make clear that support officers should be able to operate independently and provide impartial advice. It will also stress the need for councils to recognise and value the scrutiny function and the ways in which it can increase a council’s effectiveness. However, the Government believes that each council should decide for itself how to resource scrutiny committees, including how much access to senior officers is appropriate to enable them to function effectively.

e) The Government fully believes that local authorities should take account of the views of the public and service users in order to shape and improve their services. Scrutiny is a vital part of this, and scrutiny committees should actively encourage public participation. Updated guidance will make this clear.

Recommendation 2: That DCLG works with the Local Government Association and Centre for Public Scrutiny to identify willing councils to take part in a pilot scheme where the impact of elected chairs on scrutiny’s effectiveness can be monitored and its merits considered (Paragraph 35).

Government Response:

The Government will give further consideration to this recommendation.
The Government fully accepts that the chair of a scrutiny committee can have a great impact on its effectiveness. As the then Minister told the Select Committee at the oral evidence session on 6 November 2017, a chair needs to have the requisite skills, knowledge and acumen to take on the functions and achieve the outcomes that the scrutiny committee needs to achieve.

The Government also accepts that, in some instances, the election, rather than the appointment, of a chair might help ensure that the right individual is ultimately selected, but feels that this is a decision for every council to make for itself - we note that the Select Committee is "wary of proposing that [election] is imposed upon authorities by Government".

A local authority is already free to elect a chair if it wishes, and the updated guidance will recommend that every council bears this in mind when deciding on a method for selecting a chair.

The Government is happy to explore with the sector how best to establish the impact of elected chairs on scrutiny committees’ effectiveness, but is not yet convinced that running pilot schemes is the best way to achieve this. The Government will therefore discuss this recommendation with the sector, including the Local Government Association and Centre for Public Scrutiny, and write to the Select Committee on this matter when we publish updated guidance.

Recommendation 3: Councils should be required to publish a summary of resources allocated to scrutiny, using expenditure on executive support as a comparator (Paragraph 62)

Government Response:

The Government does not accept this recommendation.

Many councils do not have dedicated scrutiny support staff - officers work on issues and engage with committees as part of the flow of business - so this would make quantifying the support that scrutiny committees receive very difficult. In the Government's view, the quality of the support is the more important issue.

The Government firmly believes that each individual authority is best-placed to decide for itself how to support scrutiny most effectively.

Recommendation 4: That the Government extend the requirement of a Statutory Scrutiny Officer to all councils and specify that the post-holder should have a seniority and profile of equivalence to the council's corporate management team. To give greater prominence to the role, Statutory Scrutiny Officers should also be required to make regular reports to Full Council on the state of scrutiny, explicitly identifying any areas of weakness that require improvement and the work carried out by the Statutory Scrutiny Officer to rectify them (Paragraph 65).

Government Response:

The Government does not accept this recommendation.

As the then Minister outlined during the oral evidence he gave to the Select Committee, decisions about the allocation of resources for the scrutiny function are best made at a local level. Each council is best-placed to know which arrangements will suit its own individual circumstances. It is not a case of one size fits all.
The key requirement for effective scrutiny is that the culture of the council is right. Where councils recognise the benefits effective scrutiny can bring, and put in place suitable arrangements, it is working well. Local authorities with a strong culture of scrutiny may invite regular reports to full council on the state of scrutiny in the council and this idea will be reflected in the updated guidance.

**Recommendation 5:** The Department to put monitoring systems in place and consider whether the support to committees needs to be reviewed and refreshed. We invite the Department to write to us in a year’s time detailing its assessment of the value for money of its investment in the Local Government Association and on the wider effectiveness of local authority scrutiny committees (Paragraph 76).

**Government Response:**

The Government does not accept this recommendation. Local authorities are independent bodies and it is for them to ensure that their scrutiny arrangements are effective.

The Government firmly believes that every council should be able to access the training it needs to carry out its functions effectively, and recognises that Government itself has a role to play in making this happen. That is why we provide funding to the Local Government Association for sector-led improvement work. It should be noted that this funding is to support local authorities on a wide range of improvement work. It is not purely to assist with overview and scrutiny.

The funding is determined annually and for 2017/18 is £21 million. The package of work that is funded from the grant is set out in a jointly agreed Memorandum of Understanding between the Department and the Local Government Association, which is refreshed annually to ensure that it remains relevant to the sector’s needs.

The Government is, of course, very keen to ensure that this funding provides value for money and that local authorities feel that the training on offer serves their needs. To this end, the Department has quarterly performance monitoring and review meetings with the Local Government Association, which are chaired by the Director-General for Local Government and Public Services.

The Government notes that not all the councillors who provided evidence to the Select Committee felt that the scrutiny training provided was as effective as they would have liked, and that the Local Government Association wrote to the Committee on 20 December 2017 to provide more information on the feedback it received on its support work.

The Government will ensure that the 2018/19 Memorandum of Understanding with the Local Government Association clearly sets out our expectation that they remain responsive to feedback they receive to ensure all training, including scrutiny training, remains relevant and effective.

**Recommendation 6:** Scrutiny committees must be able to monitor and scrutinise the services provided to residents. This includes services provided by public bodies and those provided by commercial organisations. Committees should be able to access information and require attendance at meetings from service providers and we call on DCLG to take steps to ensure this happens (Paragraph 90).

**Government Response:**

...
Updated guidance will remind councils of the requirements set out in regulations that allow scrutiny members to access exempt or confidential documents in certain circumstances. As mentioned in response to the Select Committee’s recommendation on guidance, the Department will also have discussions with the sector to get a better understanding of the issues some scrutiny committees appear to have in accessing information and whether there are any steps the Government could take to alleviate this.

In terms of service providers’ attendance at meetings, when councils are tendering contracts with external bodies they should carefully consider including requirements to ensure they are as open and transparent as appropriate. Ultimately, however, it is up to each council to decide how best to hold to account those who run its services.

**Recommendation 7: The Government to make clear how LEPs are to have democratic, and publicly visible, oversight. We recommend that upper tier councils, and combined authorities where appropriate, should be able to monitor the performance and effectiveness of LEPs through their scrutiny committees. In line with other public bodies, scrutiny committees should be able to require LEPs to provide information and attend committee meetings as required (Paragraph 96).**

**Government Response:**

The Government agrees on the importance of clear and transparent oversight of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). The Industrial Strategy made clear the continuing important role of LEPs in delivering local economic growth.

The MHCLG Non-Executive Director Review (published in October 2017), looked at a range of governance issues for LEPs. The Review made a series of recommendations that we have accepted in full and are now implementing. As part of this we have published guidance for LEPs on a range of issues including publication of agenda and papers for LEP Board meetings. This will make the proceedings of LEPs more transparent for local people.

The National Assurance Framework for LEPs states that democratic accountability for the decisions made by the LEP is provided through local authority leader membership of LEP Boards. In places where not all local authorities are represented directly on the LEP board it is important that their representatives have been given a mandate through arrangements which enable collective engagement with all local authority leaders. Many LEPs already go much further in allowing democratic scrutiny of their decision making.

The MHCLG Non-Executive Director Review into LEP governance and transparency explored the extent to which scrutiny was embedded into LEP decision making. The review acknowledged that each LEP had their own arrangements to reflect: legal structure, the complexity and needs of the locality and local requirements to ensure value for money; engagement; and democratic accountability. The Review concluded that it was not appropriate to be prescriptive on the specific arrangements that all LEPs needed to adopt due to the variation in LEP operating models.

The Government committed in the Industrial Strategy White Paper to reviewing the roles and responsibilities of LEPs and to bringing forward reforms to leadership, governance, accountability, financial reporting and geographical boundaries. Working with LEPs, the Government committed to set out a more clearly defined set of activities and objectives in early 2018. MHCLG will write to the Select Committee following the conclusion of this Ministerial review into LEPs to provide an update.
Recommendation 8: We are concerned that effective scrutiny of the Metro Mayors will be hindered by under-resourcing, and call on the Government to commit more funding for this purpose. When agreeing further devolution deals and creating executive mayors, the Government must make clear that scrutiny is a fundamental part of any deal and that it must be adequately resourced and supported. (Paragraph 104)

**Government Response:**

The Government accepts this recommendation.

At the Budget it was announced that the government will make available to mayoral combined authorities with elected mayors a £12 million fund for 2018-19 and 2019-20, to boost the new mayors’ capacity and resources. Combined Authorities could use some of this resource to ensure that scrutiny and accountability arrangements within the CAs are effectively resourced and supported.

Further to this, the recent Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees, Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017, developed with assistance from the Centre for Public Scrutiny and the National Audit Office, provides for the rules of operation for local overview and scrutiny and audit committees to robustly hold combined authorities and mayors to account. The order ensures that there are strong scrutiny arrangements in place consistently across every combined authority area and sets out clear requirements, strengthened appropriately to match the new powers and budgets being devolved, for the arrangement of overview and scrutiny and audit committees in all combined authorities.

Combined authorities are subject to existing relevant legislation applying to local authorities, including the strong finance and audit requirements around ensuring value for money and sustainability. Local democratic accountability, including through the scrutiny of directly-elected mayors, is a crucial and fundamental aspect of devolution.
1. **Decision required**

   This report makes the following recommendations to the decision-maker:

1.1 Note the options for changes to the charging policy in Greenwich for Adult social care services.

1.2 Advise on the preferred options for changes to the charging policy.

1.3 Agree to take forward a consultation process with borough citizens, with a focus on those who are current or future users of adult social care services, with regard proposed changes to the Adult Social Care Charging Policy.

2. **Purpose of Report**

2.1 The purpose of the report is to brief members on the areas of social care charging under the Care Act (2014) where the Council has headroom to increase income and to demonstrate how Greenwich benchmarks against other local authorities with regard to our charging policy. This is the first of a series of reports that will consider potential changes to adult social care that will improve the delivery of services and management of costs.

2.2 The report sets out the rationale and options for changing the current charging arrangements for service users of Adult Social Care in Greenwich. The options set out in the paper have been designed to remove current inequalities that have built up over the years and ensure Greenwich has similar charging levels to comparator Local Authorities.
2.3 Advances in medical care mean that people are living longer and people with disabilities and complex care needs are able to be supported at home for longer. If accepted and implemented, the recommendations in this report would lead to a significant increase in chargeable income received by the borough to help ensure that the growth in demand for social care is sustainable.

2.4 A consultation with borough citizens would be required before implementation.

3. **Introduction and Background**

3.1 The Care Act (2014) enables Councils to charge people, following a financial assessment, for the social care services they receive. Under the current charging policy, Greenwich Council charges less than the Care Act permits for some social care services, and disregards some benefits or savings when calculating the charge. In Autumn 2018, HAS officers undertook a benchmarking exercise with other London boroughs and found that in some cases, Greenwich Council charges less than other boroughs for comparable services.

3.2 The proposals that have been developed below attempt to deliver on two principal objectives:
   a) To close inequalities in our current charging approach for users of different service types
   b) To position Greenwich alongside other comparable London local Authorities in respect of the levels and types of charges that are levied. Section Five sets out in detail the proposals and the rationale for making the recommended changes.

3.3 The proposals in this report to change the charging policy would address current inequities in the way social care charges are applied and will provide substantial additional income.

3.4 The changes proposed would require a formal consultation process with borough citizens. Members should be aware that where other boroughs have proposed some of the changes suggested below, this has been met with opposition and challenge from organisations representing people with lifelong disabilities.
4 **Available Options**

4.1 Each area of change to the Charging Policy for Adult Social Care is outlined below, with at least two potential options. Information is also provided on benchmarking with other Councils, the number of people affected and the maximum additional income to be yielded. In the options below, the officer-recommended option is always Option B, and these are highlighted in bold.

4.2 **Homecare charges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homecare Charging</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Homecare is charged at a subsidised rate of £13.35 ph. The actual hourly cost from July 19 is £17.50 for preferred providers, £15.00 others. LAs can charge based on the actual costs of care - applied according to assessed ability to pay.</td>
<td>256 affected. The other 629 people have already reached their maximum charge.</td>
<td>Hackney, Lewisham &amp; Croydon charge on actual cost of care, Lambeth, Merton, Enfield and Camden say they “slightly subsidise” their homecare charges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Continue at current rates</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>More generous subsidy than most Councils. It is not equitable as services such as Direct Payments are charged on the actual cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Charge a flat rate of the lowest actual cost (from July 2019 this will be £15 per hour)</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>This option provides equity for all fee payers, and will not create a financial penalty for people using the agencies that pay London Living wage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Charge the full cost of care (£17.50/£15 per hour)</td>
<td>£340,000</td>
<td>This option is transparent. People still pay only what they...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1 We currently impose a chargeable rate for homecare that is lower than the hourly rate charged by providers. A proposal to base the charge on the actual rate (or a flat £15 which is the minimum) being charged to the Council would require 256 people currently receiving homecare to pay more.

4.3 DLA/PIP/Attendance allowance (higher rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DLA/PIP /AA Higher rate.</strong> Currently the higher element of these benefits (£28.30 per week) is disregarded when assessing a person’s ability to pay charges. Government guidance allows us to consider the whole benefit as income. Reducing /ending the disregard may increase maximum charges.</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Camden Hackney, Lambeth &amp; Lewisham no disregard and Ealing is moving to this position. Barking &amp; Dagenham take £10 &amp; Redbridge £5 into account. (While no other boroughs disregard these benefits completely, some boroughs have other methodologies such as a low maximum charge to protect the income of disabled residents.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Continue to disregard DLA/PIP and AA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>This disregard is more generous than many other boroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Take 50% of DLA, PIP, AA per week into account</td>
<td>£230,000</td>
<td>Less impactful; allows people to keep some of their benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Take full higher rate into account</td>
<td>£430,000</td>
<td>Risk of impacting income of most severely disabled people, particularly if we do this &amp; abolish flat rate for DRE as well. Likely to meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Currently the higher element of these benefits (£28.30) is disregarded when people are financially assessed for ability to pay charges. Ending this disregard, which the Council is able to do under the Care Act would affect 308 people and may increase maximum charges, yielding up to £430,000 of additional annual income. Please note under charging regulations the mobility component of DLA and PIP must continue to be disregarded.

**4.4 Introduce charging for “client support”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce charges for “client support”. Under existing charging policy, we don’t charge for community support commissioned on client's behalf. E.g. one to one support to access a day centre</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>No other borough appears to have such a policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Continue to exempt client support from charges</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Would continue to be at odds with most other councils that do charge for client support. This could be considered inequitable as other community support services are charged for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Remove the exemption, and charge for all services delivered</td>
<td>£90,000</td>
<td>This would only affect those who could afford to pay more and would remove the inequity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the existing charging regime, the Council does not charge for some client support provided in respect of eligible needs in the community that are commissioned by the Council. Introducing a charge would affect 70 people and the estimated annual yield would be £90,000.
4.5 Tariff Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tariff Income &amp; capital limit</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Almost all LAs apply the £1 per £250 tariff and charge the full cost if the person has over £23,250. Examples include Redbridge, Kent, Lewisham, Lambeth, Islington, and Bromley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Continue maintain old tariff for 11 individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small number of individuals would continue to benefit from old tariff arrangements. This could be considered inequitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Bring all service users onto the same tariff</td>
<td>£5,000 likely to reduce in future.</td>
<td>This would only effect 11 people current on old tariff/not full charges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 People with savings of over £23,250 pay the full cost of their care; the Care Act enables Councils to charge a tariff on savings held between £14,250 and £23,250. Currently people in Greenwich whose services started pre-2014 pay £1 per £500, while those whose services started more recently pay £1 per £250. The Care Act sets the chargeable rate as the latter and our proposal is to move to a tariff income charged at £1 per £250 between the upper and lower threshold. This would only affect 11 people and yield around £5,000 in the first year but would be a more transparent charging policy and removed an area of inequity.

4.6 Cap on weekly costs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cap on weekly costs.</td>
<td>Fewer than 5 (Likely to increase over time)</td>
<td>Redbridge £600, Newham £200, Lewisham &amp; Lambeth no maximum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Continue to have a cap on care costs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Minimal impact currently May need review following social care green paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Abolish the cap on care costs</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>This measure only affects the most wealthy service users; however, the additional income will remain small.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1 We impose a maximum charge for care services in the home of £546.00. While few people would pay more currently if the maximum charge were raised, the cost of homecare is rising, and those who are assessed as being able to afford more, could be charged more if they use services to a greater value. This would affect very few people in the first year; however, this will change with increases in care costs and fewer exemptions. The yield would be under £10,000 per year. As this would affect only a few people, it will be necessary to ensure the impact is understood and mitigated/ staggered if required.
### 4.7 Arrangement fees for full cost payers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrangement fee for full cost payers</strong> (self-funders who ask RBG to put package together) Under Care Act we can charge a fee for arranging and administering care packages based on the actual cost of this.</td>
<td>Approx. 200 people could pay weekly admin fee and up to 100 would pay an arrangement fee, depending on demand.</td>
<td>Camden £300 arrangement fee + £15 per month admin charge, Enfield £250 arrangement fee, Redbridge £150 arrangement fee, Southwark, Hackney, &amp; Lewisham £0. Solihull £220 arrangement fee plus £4.14 per week admin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Continue not to charge for arrangement and admin for full fee payers.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>There is a roughly even split between those that do and don’t charge. Those self-funders who ask for Council support to arrange and manage their care currently benefit from a range of services for no charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Impose a new one off arrangement charge and weekly administration fee for all packages arranged for full cost payers based on the actual costs to the Council.</td>
<td>Up to £250k. Further work required to develop a fee structure.</td>
<td>This only affects full cost payers who choose to use the Council to set up their care services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7.1 Under the Care Act (2014) Councils are able to charge an arrangement fee to anyone who is a full cost payer, following financial assessment, if we arrange his or her care services. Currently, we provide this service for just under 200 full cost payers. We propose to make a charge that would recover the
actual cost to the council, which would yield up to £250,000. We may need to review our approach following the social care Green Paper, which is expected to address the issue of capping lifetime care costs.

4.8 Reduce or abolish Disability Related Expenditure (DRE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce/ Abolish Disability Related Expenditure flat rate</strong></td>
<td>763 on basic £15.30</td>
<td>Hackney rate £14.33. Islington £0, Lewisham £5.90, Lambeth £25 (under review), Ealing Westminster &amp; K&amp;C have sliding scales between £5 and £20 based on level of disability benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Continue to set DRE at £15.30 pw</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>More generous offer than some other councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Reduce DRE flat rate to £10 per week</strong></td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>Likely to be opposition from disabled people, particularly if we withdraw the disregard for higher rate DLA/PIP/AA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Abolish DRE flat rate and assess all clients’ expenses</td>
<td>£470,000 (This figure represents no one making a fresh claim for their DRE)</td>
<td>Abolishing the flat rate would require assessment of all 763 clients for disability related expenditure with operational costs- plus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.1 Disability Related Expenditure is an exemption from charges based on the additional expenditure that someone incurs due to their disability (for example paying for shopping to be delivered, taking a taxi instead of public transport, paying for window cleaning, gardening etc.).

4.8.2 Many Councils, including Greenwich, have a flat rate, above which people must provide receipts proving the additional expenditure. Greenwich currently has a flat rate of £15.30 per week. If the flat rate is abolished, people will pay a higher maximum charge or have to show evidence for any exemption related to Disability Related Expenditure.

4.8.3 Whilst option C of abolishing the flat rate altogether might in theory yield substantially more income per year the nominal figure shown against option C is unlikely to be achieved, as people affected are likely to request Disability Related Expenditure assessments and potentially claiming greater exemptions than they had. In these circumstances if option C is selected then there is likely to be a substantial cost in officer’s time (circa £60k) to complete the required assessments. This would place significant operational burden and cost on the Council, and it could also provoke the greatest opposition from disabled citizens.

4.8.4 With all the risks and likely consequences of removing DRE altogether the recommendation is to move to a flat rate of £10, with the lower yield of approximately £170,000 per year.
### 4.9 Charge everyone for Telecare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charge everyone for Telecare Service. The weekly community alarm charge of (£5.80 per week) is not currently applied to people on Housing Benefit, however this is based on Supporting People guidance that no longer applies.</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Lewisham £5.81 (£5.95 from 1/4/19), Hertfordshire £3.25, Bromley £5.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A*</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Continue to not charge people on Housing Benefit</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Most other councils do levy a charge for Telecare users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Charge everyone a flat rate of £5.80 per week (1200 people are already paying this)</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>Equity in the service currently some people pay and others do not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9.1 This change would mean that charges for community alarms and other Telecare services are applied to everyone taking this option. The exemption for those on housing benefit was applied under Supporting People however this guidance is no longer in force and most Councils apply a flat rate. Those people using social care services will have this expense exempted from their charges as Disability Related Expenditure (see 4.8).

### 4.10 Charge for all care & support provided Sheltered Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care &amp; Support in Sheltered Housing Currently tenants pay some care charges but the Scheme manager support charge is exempted for</td>
<td>Up to 713 people although some will be nil cost and</td>
<td>This was not included in our original benchmarking exercise. Benchmarking will be undertaken before a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEM NO: 12
those receiving Housing Benefit. Under the Care Act, this support is chargeable subject to an assessment of ability to pay. 137 are currently paying their assessed maximum charge.

Under the Care Act, this support is chargeable subject to an assessment of ability to pay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Continue not to charge people in Sheltered Accommodation for the scheme manager support if they receive Housing Benefit</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Charge for all care and support provided to Sheltered Housing tenants based on their assessed ability to pay.</td>
<td>£210,000</td>
<td>Equity with other care and support services. Only those who are able to afford it will pay extra.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10.1 Under the existing charging regime, the Council does not charge for some client support provided in sheltered housing in respect of eligible needs. Introducing a charge would affect up to 713 people and the estimated annual yield would be £210,000.

4.11 Charges for care and support in Supported Living Accommodation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Of Change</th>
<th>Number of people affected</th>
<th>Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care &amp; Support in Supported Living Accommodation</td>
<td>88 expected out of total 175 clients</td>
<td>Bromley has no exemption. Exemptions for people in Supported Living or scheme manager support do not feature in any other known policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Max extra income P/A*</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ITEM NO: 12
A. Continue not to charge people in supported living for all their care services. | NA | Benchmarking shows that Greenwich would be unusual not to charge people in Supported Living.

| B. Financially assess Supported Living clients and charge them for all care and support services, based on their assessed ability to pay. | £80,000 estimated | Equity with other care and support services, however 12 months is required for full implementation |

4.11.1 Of the 175 HAS clients in supported living, around half will be nil cost, but having a policy to financially assess those that are not in receipt of funded aftercare under S117 of the Mental Health Act (2007) would achieve equity with other citizens receiving social care. We project that we will be able to charge 88 of the 175 supported living tenants for their personal care, which would ultimately yield up to £80,000 per annum.

4.12 Rate increases for non-care services
We propose to make above-inflation uplifts in charges where rates are lower than the actual cost for non-care services. The main areas are:

| 4.13 Deferred Payment Arrangements (DPA) | are legislated under the Care Act and are agreed when a full cost payer enters residential care, and their funds are tied up in a property. A DPA is an agreement for us to disregard this asset in their financial assessments for as long as they live; it is effectively a loan. In addition to an initial cost and interest, Councils can recoup administration costs each year. We propose to increase our charge from £120 per year to £169.14 per year to reflect the actual cost to the council, yielding an additional £2 – 4,000 per year depending on take up. |

| 4.14 Community meals: The charge for Community meals would be increased from £3.60 to £4.30 per meal, to reflect the actual cost to the Council. This would affect around 48 people (the number using the service over the past 12 weeks) and yield an additional income of up to £22,000 per year. |

5. Preferred Options

5.1 From the section above each proposal sets out the do nothing position as option one with the recommended option being option B, highlighted in bold. For some proposals a third option (c) is described for consideration with the comments setting out any risks or inequalities there might be in adopting...
these options. The table below sets out the annualised additional income that could be expected if the recommended options were to be accepted.

5.2 It is proposed that a hardship policy is created which will allow the Council to review assessments and reduce charges where there is a genuine case of hardship and a serious risk to their health and safety if the person withdraws from services. Independent senior management approval, that is from outside the department, would be required for any reduction of charges, to ensure appropriate oversight of the policy.

5.3 There are some considerations that will likely affect the level of additional income that is possible to achieve, as set out below:

➢ The amounts below represent a full year effect and so will be impacted by the date on which any change is implemented.
➢ There is a harder to quantify impact of the likelihood that some people will be affected by more than one proposal, and may reach their maximum contribution level without making the forecast additional contributions.
➢ Imposing or increasing a charge may lead to reduced demand for a service. In some cases, this will reduce the forecast income, but also lead to reduced service costs as people decline services. In these cases it will be important to ensure thorough professional assessment and risk mitigation processes.
➢ The implementation of some of the proposals may have some additional operational costs. A business case will be produced in these circumstances to ensure that there is a proportionality of investment compared to yield.

5.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended options Summary Table</th>
<th>Annualised Additional income (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Homes support chargeable rate</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Taking into account PIP, DLA and Attendance Allowance for charging.</td>
<td>£230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Charging for client support</td>
<td>£90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tariff income</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cap on Weekly Care costs</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Arrangement fee for full cost payers</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Disability Related expenditure</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Telecare Charging</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Charging For Care &amp; Support Sheltered Housing</td>
<td>£210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Charging for Care &amp; Support supported</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM NO: 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>living</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Admin fee rise</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Meal charges</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,740,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensitivity Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for reduction in take up (PED=10%)</td>
<td>(£174,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance for exceeding maximum charge cap (5%)</td>
<td>(£78,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forecast based on variables as above</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,487,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Reasons for Recommendations**

6.1 The changes recommended would increase income and help to sustain the provision of social care to meet the challenge of growing demand in the face of wider financial pressures. The financial context for adult social care is challenging.

6.2 Officers have identified inequalities in the way we currently apply charges to people receiving social care. These have been highlighted in the tables above.

6.3 Benchmarking our charges against other London boroughs indicates that Greenwich is out of step with comparable local authorities in respect of the levels and types of charges that are currently applied.

7. **Consultation**

7.1 The Council will consult on all of the proposed changes to the charging policy. Officers from HAS are working with the Council’s communications team to plan an effective and accessible consultation process. We would enable citizens to engage in the consultation by a variety of means including meetings, postal and online questionnaire and dedicated email and telephone line. There is a recognition that some of those effected may find it hard to engage with a local authority consultation so every effort will be made to mitigate this risk. We will engage with local advocacy services and VCS groups that work with older and disabled people.

7.2 It is planned that the consultation will start in April 2019 and run for 13 weeks, to ensure that we capture the widest possible range of views.

7.3 Several other London Councils have recently conducted consultations on their charging policy and there are very good examples of effective and clear
communication on this issue. Feedback from some consultation processes is that citizens can struggle to understand the complex area of social care charging. Mitigation for this would include production of the consultation document in easy read format, engagement with advocacy and advice services in the borough and other community services such as libraries and community centres.

8. **Cross-Cutting Issues and Implications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Sign-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal</strong> including Human Rights Act</td>
<td>Section 14 Care Act 2014 gives councils the power to charge adults for meeting their assessed eligible care and support needs. In so doing councils must have regard to the relevant regulations issued under the Act as well as the Statutory Guidance. The Care and Support (Charging and Assessment of Resources) Regulations 2014 issued under the Care Act set out the duty under section 17 of the Care Act to carry out a financial assessment if a council’s policy is to charge for care and support. The regulations set out the rules for the treatment and calculation of income and capital within a financial assessment. The charging rules require that after charging a person must be left with the minimum income to cover daily living costs. In addition where a person receives benefits to meet their disability needs that do not meet the eligibility criteria for local authority care and support, the charging arrangements should ensure that they keep enough money to cover the cost of meeting these disability related costs.</td>
<td>Ingrid Brown, Assistant Head of Legal Services, 11.03.2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cost that they incur in meeting assessed needs. They also cannot recover any administration fee relating to arranging care and support except where a person has assets above the capital limit.

The proposals in this report are consistent with the provisions of the regulations and Statutory Guidance. They will impact on some of the most vulnerable adults within the Greenwich area including adults with communication difficulties and other sensory impairment. The proposals must therefore be subject to a period of meaningful consultation and the proposals set out at paragraphs 7.1- 7.3 provide for this.

| Finance and other resources including procurement implications | The report proposes a number of fees and charges that are either new or variations from current levels. Section 6.3 outlines the position in respect of benchmarking against peer authorities. Increased income is one element of the Transformation Programme and will assist with bringing down the net overspend within the service.

The table in section 5.4 summarises the possible financial effects of implementing the recommended options on a full year basis. Modest allowances have been provided to show the sensitivity that price elasticity of demand (i.e. the change in demand as a result in a change of price only) could have and also where a client as a result of multiple charge interactions reaches their cost cap.

When considering preferred options, members are asked to consider the effect that any change may have upon the intended recipient. Changes to the fee structure for this client group will be |

Damon Cook, Asst Director Finance & Deputy s151 Officer 12.03.19
subject to consultation. This process will enable the figures in this report to be refined to gain greater confidence of the overall financial effects upon the service (including any operational costs arising) and a further report produced to agree final charges and forecast effects.

**Equalities**

Decision-makers are reminded of the requirement under the Public Sector Equality Duty (s149 of the Equality Act 2010) to have due regard to (i) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act, (ii) advance equality of opportunity between people from different groups, and (iii) foster good relations between people from different groups. The decisions recommended through this paper could directly impact on end users. The impact has been analysed and there is a certain amount of variation between groups of people, although the recommendations also serve to remove current inequities. The result of this analysis is available in the equality impact assessment attached at Appendix 1.

Rachel Karn, Assistant Director Commissioning and Business Support 11.02.19

**Health and wellbeing**

Social care services are provided on the basis of eligibility and need, in line with the Care Act (2014). Services are intended to support people with health and care needs to have a good quality of life and be as independent as possible.

Simon Pearce Director of Health and Adult Social Care 11.02.19

9  **Report Appendices**

9.1 Appendix 1 Equality Impact Assessment
Appendix 1 – Full EIA Assessment

**Detail of Assessment**

- The Care Act (2014) enables Councils to charge people, following a financial assessment, for the social care services they receive. The Act creates a single, consistent route to establishing an entitlement to public care and support for all adults with needs for care and support.

- Under the current charging policy, Greenwich Council charges less than the Care Act permits for some social care services, and disregards some benefits or savings when calculating the charge.

- In Autumn 2018, HAS officers undertook a benchmarking exercise with other London boroughs and found that in some cases, Greenwich Council charges less than other boroughs for comparable services.

- There are proposals detailed in the LIM paper to make changes to the charging policy to Position Greenwich alongside other comparable London Local Authorities in respect of the levels and types of charges that are levied.

- The purpose of this EIA assessment is to identify and mitigate against existing or potential inequalities that would arise from the revising of Greenwich’s Charging Policy.

- The 2011 Census estimated that there were around 255,000 people living in Greenwich. It is predicted that by 2025 the population of Greenwich will increase to 312,000 and to 360,000 by 2035.

- The population 65+ in Greenwich is expected to rise from 26,000 in 2011 (10% of the borough’s pop) to 35,500 in 2025 (11% of the borough’s population) and to 48,000 in 2035 (13% of the borough’s population).

**What is its purpose?**

This EIA is in response to proposed changes to Greenwich’s current Charging arrangements. This EIA covers changes to

1. Home care charges
2. Disability Living Allowance / Personal Independence Payment/Attendance Allowance disregards
3. Charging for “client support”
What are its main objectives (of the new/revised service or policy)?

The main objectives of these proposed changes in charging policy are to:

1. Close inequalities in our current charging approach for users of different service types
2. Position Greenwich alongside other comparable London local Authorities in respect of the levels and types of charges that are levied
3. Raise revenue to enable us to sustain the current level of service to all who need it.

Change to service delivery in order to:

- Have a fair and easy to understand charging policy

Context

- The Care Act (2014) enables Councils to charge people, following a financial assessment, for the social care services they receive. The Act creates a single, consistent route to establishing an entitlement to public care and support for all adults with needs for care and support

- Under the current charging arrangements Greenwich Council charges less than the Care Act permits for some social care services, and disregards some benefits or savings when calculating the charge

- Recommendations have been put to members deliver objectives as detailed above.

Criteria

Is this function designed to meet specific needs of groups with protected characteristics?

The charging policy applies to people with care and support needs, these will by definition will include older adults, adults with disabilities and long term condition.

The charging policy will ensure a consistent approach to charging service users across all groups. In its current form, there are inconsistencies in how we charge users of different service types.
Outcomes of Assessment
*Identify which, if any of the protected groups will be affected, including likelihood of impact*

Depending on which option is agreed to,

**IMPACT OF EACH PROPOSAL BASED ON OPTION CHOSEN**

### Home Care changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Continue at current homecare charge rates</td>
<td>Leaves inequity between home care charges and direct payments who are paid on actual costs.</td>
<td>Yes-Consider option that enables equity in charges across all service users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Charge flat rate</td>
<td>This option provides equity in Greenwich’s charging policy for all fee payers but 256 people would have to pay more. Of the 256 people, 230 would be over the age of 65 (86%)- this is in line with demographics of everyone using Homecare</td>
<td>No equality issue – in line with service user demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Charge full cost</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DLA/PIP/Attendance Allowance (higher rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1- Continue to disregard DLA/PIP and AA</td>
<td>No equality impact</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2- Take full higher rate into account</td>
<td>Risk of impacting on income of most severely disabled people – there is a higher percentage of ethnic minorities accessing AA/ DLA/PIP when compared to overall borough demographics</td>
<td>Develop new hardship policy. Make information about Disability Related Expenditure more accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3- Take £15 per week into account</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Introduce Charging for client support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1- Continue to exempt client support from charges</td>
<td>No equality impact</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Remove the exemption, and charge for all services delivered</td>
<td>This would impact more on men than women and would be slightly higher than gender split in overall demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tariff Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 - Continue maintain old tariff for 11 individuals</td>
<td>Small number of people would continue to benefit from old tariff</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 - Bring all service users onto the same tariff</td>
<td>Will affect 11 people</td>
<td>At review of financial assessments we will consider the impact on these 11 people and if there appears to be any hardship this will be addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cap on weekly costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 - Continue to have a cap on care costs</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolish the cap on care costs</td>
<td>This is currently limited to less than 5 individuals.</td>
<td>At review of financial assessment will review the impact on any individuals to whom this cap will apply under Disability Related Expenditure rules and the hardship policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Arrangement fees for full cost payers-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 - Continue not to charge for arrangement and admin for full fee payers.</td>
<td>No equality impact</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impose a new one off arrangement charge and weekly administration fee for all packages arranged for full cost payers based on the actual costs to the Council</td>
<td>No equality impact identified. It could be that there may be variations in impact depending on what ethnicity and gender people are that this would need to be monitored as we don’t currently collect this information as this would be a new charge</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reduce or Abolish Disability Related Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 - Continue to set DRE at £15.30 pw.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 - Reduce DRE flat rate to £10 per week</td>
<td>Would impact on 75% of over 65’s, 66% of white population - roughly in line with borough demographics. By definition, disabled people will be most affected. Accessible information about how to claim a disability related expenditure. Expenditure will be made available prior to assessment/review.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 - Abolish DRE flat rate and assess all clients’ expenses</td>
<td>Would impact on 75% of over 65’s, 66% of white population - roughly in line with borough demographics. Disabled people have extra costs. As above</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Charge everyone for Assistive Technology (Previously Telecare)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 - Continue to not charge people on Housing Benefit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge everyone a flat rate of £5.80 per week (1200 people are already paying this)</td>
<td>82% of Assistive Technology users are aged 70+ Currently very few people pay for telecare and there is not enough demographic data to enable us to understand impact of change in policy on populations from equality point of view. Benefit maximisation – they may be to afford or budget to pay for client. Monitor impact on populations and take corrective action. Hardship policy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEM NO: 12 (Appendix A)
Charge for all care and support provided Sheltered Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1- Continue not to charge people in Sheltered Accommodation for the scheme manager support if they receive Housing Benefit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge flat rate</td>
<td>No equality issue but geographical disparity</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge full cost</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charge for Care and Support in Supported Living Accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change proposed</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1- Continue not to charge people in supported living for all their care services.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2- Financially assess Supported Living clients and charge them for all care and support services, based on their assessed ability to pay.</td>
<td>72% of cohort have a learning disability-this is in line with numbers of people in supported living</td>
<td>We would need to ensure there is an easy read guide to charges and letters are in similar format. More support with financial assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What other risks/factors will be taken into account in the decision making?
These might include national/regional/local factors.

none

Mitigating risks
How will any identified risks be mitigated against?

As shown in the table above. In the case of each change proposed and the options available, we have detailed what we will do to mitigate against these risks by changing practice and procedures.

Impact Assessment
Include different outcomes for all the groups identified as being affected. If there are difference, are these justified?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected Characteristic</th>
<th>Potential for negative impact</th>
<th>What reasonable mitigations can you propose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>58% of people who currently require social care are people aged over 65 This cohort of people may be disproportionately affected by the changes proposed by the Charging Policy review</td>
<td>The revised policy will still ensure that people do not pay more than they can afford to pay and will continue to ensure that residents have the guaranteed minimum income stipulated by DWP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability including physical and mental health</td>
<td>Overall, 78% of the total cohort that</td>
<td>The new charging policy will make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>May be affected by the proposed charging policy will have a learning or physical disability. In addition 2% will be affected in all 3 areas.</td>
<td>Clear how appeals can be made and how we will assist those in hardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make information about Disability Related Expenditure more accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a higher percentage of BAME accessing AA/ DLA/PIP when compared to overall borough demographics. In addition 31% of the 173 affected in all 3 areas are from ethnic minorities. This is slightly higher than the overall percentage of BAME in the overall cohort (difference of 6%)</td>
<td>The new charging policy will make clear how appeals can be made and how we will assist those in hardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make information about the exemptions available for additional Disability-related expenditure more accessible including translating this information into other languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>It is not anticipated at this stage that the proposal will disproportionately affect people who undergo gender reassignment. However, we do not collect this data so this is not currently known.</td>
<td>We will consult with transgender service users about whether recording their status will assist in ensuring fairness so we can monitor any impact on people who undergo gender reassignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy and maternity</td>
<td>It is not anticipated at this stage that the proposal will disproportionately affect pregnant women and new mothers.</td>
<td>We will continue to monitor any impact on pregnant women and new mothers. if proposed changes are implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or Belief</td>
<td>It is not anticipated at this stage that the proposal will disproportionately affect religious people or anyone with a specific Religion or belief</td>
<td>We will continue to monitor any impact on Religion or Belief if proposed changes are implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>The gender split between Females and Males is 59/41. Overall changes may affect more females than male. Of the 2% affected by all 3(HC, DRE and DLA/AA/PIP) the Female to Male split is 66/34 which means women will be disproportionately affected by these changes.</td>
<td>We will need to target Males and Females as affected to refresh financial assessment based impact this may have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>It is not anticipated at this stage that the proposal will disproportionately affect sexual orientation. We don’t currently keep data on sexuality as a routine, so determining any unfair impact is difficult.</td>
<td>We will continue to monitor any impact on sexual orientation if changes are implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and Civil Partnership</td>
<td>It is not anticipated at this stage that the proposal will disproportionately affect either people who are single, married or in a civil . We do not keep reportable data about the marital status of service users although we may need to update systems around civil partnership status.</td>
<td>We will continue to monitor any impact on Marriage and Civil Partnership if proposed changes are implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is detailed in the table above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We will monitor discretionary reductions of charges under the hardship policy (mitigations made) and claims for Disability Related Expenditure to ensure we are reaching all parts of the community equally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>