

London Borough of Hackney  
Scrutiny Panel  
Municipal Year 2017/18  
Date of Meeting Monday, 17th July, 2017

Minutes of the proceedings of  
the Scrutiny Panel held at  
Hackney Town Hall, Mare  
Street, London E8 1EA

---

<b>Chair</b>	<b>Councillor Ben Hayhurst</b>
<b>Councillors in Attendance</b>	<b>Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Margaret Gordon, Cllr Ann Munn, Cllr Sharon Patrick and Cllr James Peters</b>
<b>Apologies:</b>	<b>Cllr Christopher Kennedy and Cllr Anna-Joy Rickard</b>
<b>Officers In Attendance</b>	<b>Tim Shields (Chief Executive), Andy Wells (Civil Protection Service Manager) and Ian Williams (Group Director of Finance and Resources)</b>
<b>Other People in Attendance</b>	<b>Mayor Philip Glanville (Mayor) and Councillor Nick Sharman</b>
<b>Members of the Public</b>	
<b>Officer Contact:</b>	<b> 0208 3563312  tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk</b>

---

## **1 Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

1.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Officer opened the meeting and requested nominations for the position of Chair of Scrutiny Panel. Councillor Munn nominated Councillor Hayhurst and this was seconded by Councillor Peters. Cllr Hayhurst was duly elected as Chair of the Scrutiny Panel.

### Councillor Hayhurst in the Chair

1.2 The main political opposition party had indicated that it did not want to take up the position of Vice Chair as per constitution. It was agreed that this would be discussed in under Urgent Items at the end of the agenda.

## **2 Apologies for Absence**

2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Anna-Joy Rickard and Councillor Christopher Kennedy.

2.2 Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Mete Coban.

### **3 Urgent Items / Order of Business**

3.1 The main opposition had not taken up the Vice Chair role as per constitution. It was suggested that opposition involvement in Scrutiny should be encouraged.

Agreed: To explore ways to encourage opposition involvement in the Scrutiny Panel

### **4 Declaration of Interest**

4.1 Cllr Peters informed he was a Governor of a special school in Hackney which supported children with severe special educational needs (SEN). Although this was not considered a prejudicial interest, the declaration was made because they would be discussing the SEND budget under agenda item 6.

4.2 Cllr Hayhurst declared that he was a member of the Council of Governors at the Homerton Hospital in relation to the prospective discussion on integrated healthcare commissioning under agenda item 5.

### **5 Cabinet Question Time Mayor Glanville**

5.1 The purpose of this item was to question the Mayor of Hackney about his key areas of responsibility, the delivery of services, and performance and decision-making within the Council. It had been agreed that the Mayor would attend Scrutiny Panel twice per annum to respond to questions from the panel.

5.2 The Mayor was invited to update on 5 topics which had been identified by the Scrutiny Panel in advance of the meeting and to respond to member questions thereafter. The five topics were:

- a) The establishment of a Housing Company and its future plans;
- b) An update on Integrated Commissioning including the rollout of youth commissioning;
- c) Civil resilience and emergency planning;
- d) The new central government, policy direction and implications for Hackney;
- e) Britannia Leisure Centre.

#### The Housing Company

5.3 The Panel noted that the purpose of the establishment of a Housing Company would be to improve the supply and delivery of private rented properties in Hackney. The policy framework for the Housing Company was still in development and a final proposal for its establishment was expected at Cabinet in the autumn (2017).

5.4 The council had a strong track record of housing development, which in part was due to a large and experienced housing development team. There were approximately 700 homes currently being developed on site by the Council, all of which are being financed through the headroom (debt cap) in the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). The housing development team is experienced in building out a range of housing options which include homes for social rent and shared ownership, both of which are

cross-subsidised by the sale of private sector homes. This is undertaken on a portfolio basis on multiple sites across the borough.

- 5.5 The council also has an ambition to increase the supply of homes in the private rented sector at London Living Rent.<sup>1</sup> The Council is not able to provide such homes directly however, as it is not be able to issue an Assured Shorthold Tenancy or any other private rented product under the 1985 Housing Act. It will therefore be necessary to establish a Housing Company in order to issue such private sector tenancies.
- 5.6 The sole purpose of the Housing Company will be as vehicle for delivery of private rental homes. A range of sub-market rents (e.g. London Living Rent) will be offered through the Housing Company, which in part will be cross-subsidised by offering a number of properties at market rent. The financial modelling that underpins this strategy is important as this will determine the number of private rented homes which can be let at sub-market rents.
- 5.7 To support the delivery of the private rented homes, the Housing Company will have access to wide range of finance options. The Housing Company could borrow money from the Council to support development, or take loans from the Public Loans Work Board (PLWB) or a number of other public and private finance options. The Housing Company will be able to buy land from the Council or buy units directly from the open market. The Panel noted that the intention was to keep the delivery model simple and to focus on the delivery of London Living Rent homes.

**(i) The Panel sought to confirm establishment of the Housing Company would be to obtain finance to support the supply of homes for private rent, and therefore sought clarification on (a) if there would be any borrowing limits for the Housing Company (b) if the Council will be required to underwrite the debts of the Housing Company.**

The Panel noted that the primary purpose for establishing the Housing Company was not finance, but the ability to issue private sector tenancies. Due to legal constraints of the 1985 Housing Act, the Council had been prohibited from taking up offers to work with private developers who were interested to move their portfolio into a private rented offer. As a consequence there have been missed opportunities for the council to develop its London Living Rent offer or increase other areas of housing support (temporary rented accommodation).

The Housing Company would have many borrowing and finance options, but this was not the primary purpose for its establishment. The Housing Company would not be a separate entity to the Council, but would be closely aligned to the Council and this would be reflected in the governance arrangements. The Council would also underwrite the borrowing of the Housing Company.

**(ii) The Panel were keen to understand the outcome of the public consultation in the housing strategy, and what implications this might have for the establishment of the Housing Company?**

There were approximately 150 responses to the Housing Strategy consultation from residents and other community stakeholders. The analysis and outcome of the

---

<sup>1</sup> London Living Rent is a new type of affordable housing for middle-income Londoners. These homes will have lower rents, so cash you save on rent can go towards a deposit for your own home.

**Monday, 17th July, 2017**

consultation was still being finalised and this would be presented to members and residents shortly.

No specific consultation on the establishment of the Housing Company was anticipated at this time as there was an electoral mandate to deliver 500 London Living Rent homes only vehicle through which to achieve this ambition was the establishment of Housing Company.

It would be made clear that the Housing Company was not privatisation and that the Council would not relinquish its assets. The Housing Company was a vehicle for the delivery of private sector tenancies, and therefore just another arm in the councils overall housing delivery plan that sat alongside objectives to increase supply of homes for social rent, shared ownership or private sale.

**(iii) Cllr Sharman noted that Audit Committee and Scrutiny have shared oversight for a number of council functions and should develop a shared approach to developing corporate assurance, particularly in relation to risk, value for money and resilience of future planning. Cllr Sharman enquired how best can the Council equip itself to manage the financial and other corporate risks it faces in respect of its housing and wider regeneration projects and ambitions?**

The Mayor suggested that the risks of establishing a Housing Company would be offset against the Council's ability to develop a new private rented offer to local people and that this would also give the Council greater flexibility in how it manages its local housing stock.

The Panel noted that the Council had a number of developments which were dependent on finance from private sales and as a consequence there was a sales risk if there was a future downturn in the housing market. The sales risk could be managed better if such properties could be taken-over and managed for private rent within the Housing Company, rather than the Council forced to sell units at below expected level. Similarly, improved provision within the private rented sector through the Housing Company could also reduce some of the financial risks associated with other housing responsibilities (e.g. provision of temporary accommodation).

Unlike other councils, Hackney has a large and experienced housing development team which had been successful in overseeing a number of housing and mixed use schemes. In this context, the Council does not have the management risk of other authorities in supporting housing and regeneration ambitions.

Critically however, the formation of the Housing Company will allow the development a much wider range of private rented housing and tenure options to meet the varied housing needs of local people. The Panel noted it could be argued that to do nothing and not extend the housing options available, would represent a greater risk to the Council.

**(iv) What can be learnt from other authorities who have set up similar Housing Companies?**

The Council has undertaken desk-top work and has assessed the approach taken in Enfield, Kensington and Chelsea and Thurrock. The Council is not seeking to establish Joint Vehicle (JV) with a private investor partner, as unlike many other

**Monday, 17th July, 2017**

authorities it has both the management experience and the capital finance to support its development ambitions for land in its possession. What the Council does not have however, is the ability to offer private sector tenancies, hence the need for the establishment of the Housing Company.

Other authorities had been required to enter JV arrangements to bring in additional finance, as such authorities did not have the borrowing capacity within its HRA to support large scale housing development.

**(v) The Panel sought to ascertain the timeline for the development of the Housing Company and when units would be developed on site.**

The Panel understood that there the policy for the establishment for the Housing Company was being finalised with a commitment to develop 500 homes for private rent. The aim would be to transfer that commitment to 500 homes to the next party manifesto, with the anticipation that the Housing Company will be on site and delivering homes by 2020.

If the Housing Company could acquire properties in this period, it might be possible that units at the London Living Rent could be available at the same time. Further policy work will be needed to shape the London Living Rent to meet the needs of Hackney residents, and this may be an area where further public consultation may be beneficial.

Integrated Commissioning

- 5.8 It was noted that the Chair of the Health in Hackney Panel had written to the City and Hackney Clinical Commissioning Group to highlight concerns about plans for the introduction of a Single Accountable Officer for East London. The Council and the CCG has agreed an integrated commissioning process which involves joint commissioning and a pooled budget. NHS England had identified a number of governance issues which the CCG and the Council. These have been addressed and they were awaiting clearance from NHSE to proceed with the fully pooled budget. .
- 5.9 In the interim, integrated commissioning arrangements continued to be developed and workstreams aligned. This has resulted in the establishment of an overarching Integrated Commissioning Board together with a number of supporting work streams (e.g. Planned Care, Unplanned Care, Prevention; and Children and Young People). The Council and partners were of the view that this would be an effective model to deliver integrated care and support for local people.
- 5.10 It was acknowledged that there would be challenges around the formation of the Sustainability and Transformation Plan for North East London (NEL STP) which has now been renamed the East London Health and Care Partnership. The preferred approach of the Council was to work in partnership with colleagues across east London, though not sign up to any formalised plan or agreement which may inhibit the ambitions of the Council.
- 5.11 In the development of the STP there would be critical points ahead, such as the establishment of a Single Accountable Officer across the 7 CCGs in the area. The Panel noted that the Council would be reluctant to be incorporated into a larger accountable healthcare body which may result in the possible dilution of the independence of the local CCG and a lack of public accountability.

- 5.12 The Mayor noted that he did not have specific details on Children and Young People commissioning workstream to hand, as this was still in development.

Civil resilience

- 5.13 The Panel noted that there were two aspects to Civil Resilience. The political and community management side involved the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Safety and Enforcement who would liaise with other members of the Council. The Panel also noted that there are corporate arrangements both within the Council and across all London Local Authorities which establish a command structure to deal with major emergencies and incidents and to help manage the interface with emergency services (e.g. police, fire, ambulance).
- 5.14 A response to a major incident in London would require 'Gold Command' response which would include top-level representation from London local authorities and 'blue light' services and this body would make pan-London emergency response decisions. Each local authority is on-call for Gold Command on rotation and would lead emergency planning if an incident occurred. This process is replicated at the local level, with all senior managers on gold alert in rotation to handle local emergencies and critical incidents.
- 5.15 The local Gold response was recently used to manage a gas leak. In this instance, the on-call senior manager would coordinate relevant council departments and ensure that there is an appropriate and effective response to the identified incident. Depending on the nature of the incident, the response could be scaled up accordingly, including to request additional support from other local authorities (Gold Command).
- 5.16 The Panel noted that Hackney has been asked to support the response to the Grenfell Tower fire and the Camden evacuation, in which the Chief Executive and Group Director for Children, Adults and Community Health had been involved and undertaken extensive and valuable work.
- 5.17 **(i) The Panel sought to clarify what provision there would be locally for people that might need to be re-housed in a civic emergency?**

It should be acknowledged that any local authority would find it difficult to find the quantum of local housing to fully meet the needs of all those involved in critical incident on the scale of the fire at Grenfell Tower.

It was noted that there had been dialogue on a pan-London level with large hotel chains to help secure large volume housing options for people involved in critical incidents in the future. At present it is very difficult to engage and make bookings with such hotel groups but it was hoped that new systems could be developed to enable speedy block booking of hotel accommodation if required.

The Panel discussed whether it was necessary to re-home people out of borough or out of London in such crises.

The establishment of the emergency response centre would be central to handling resident's needs immediately in the aftermath of a critical incident such as Grenfell Tower. Accommodation and other provisions at the emergency centre would reflect this, though people would be moved to more suitable and sustainable housing options as the emergency response develops.

**(ii) The Panel enquired how the Council became involved in supporting other authorities in their emergency and critical incident response?**

There is an agreement across London authorities to provide mutual support to help manage and respond to critical incidents (London Gold). Any authority can activate this London wide response to help them manage such critical incidents.

**(iii) The Panel invited the Chief Executive to provide an analysis of the lessons learnt from Hackney's support for both incidents at Kensington and Chelsea and in Camden.**

The panel noted that the Council does manage critical incidents on a regular basis in Hackney, and whilst these may not be on the scale of Grenfell, they often required a coordinated response from across the Council which involving numerous departments and services.

An emergency response guide had been developed in response to the London terrorist attacks in 2007 and this has been updated as lessons have been learnt from responses to other critical incidents.

In total 13 Chief Executives were involved in supporting the Grenfell Fire response, which again underlines the collective response of local authorities to this critical incident. Requests for support from Kensington and Chelsea were however still ongoing, and where Hackney is able, it will support such requests. The Gold Command would only be stood down once the response has moved to a recovery phase.

A Panel noted that a core group of 7 Chief Executives would be formed in the autumn which would have enhanced security clearance and would be able to come together quickly to help manage incidents of this nature more effectively in the future. Hackney had been invited to participate in this core group.

**(iv) The Commission enquired how the emergency response is financed, particularly when this draws on the staff of a wide range of local authorities?**

Most people supporting the emergency response would be doing this voluntarily and would need to balance this alongside existing work commitments. In this context, it is difficult to sustain this level of emergency response as these impedes leadership and service provision elsewhere across the capital.

General Election

- 5.18 The Panel noted that **if** the austerity agenda eased, it was unlikely that this would result in any material difference locally in the short-term. In this context, the Council was in the first year of a 3-year funding settlement, and would therefore need to continue to find savings already identified.
- 5.19 If there was any loosening of the public purse, it was most likely to be within the education or health budgets. Indeed, this was exemplified in today's (17<sup>th</sup> July 2017) announcement from the Education Secretary in which an additional £1.3 billion would be provided to schools. It should be noted however, that this was not new money, but

**Monday, 17th July, 2017**

would be funded from the rest of the DfE budget and possibly require cuts to other education programmes such as Free Schools, Further Education or Early Years.

- 5.20 The Queens Speech had identified that there would be legislation coming forward on Domestic Violence. Whilst interventions to support those experiencing domestic abuse was welcomed, it should be acknowledged that the government's own welfare reform agenda had placed considerable restraint on the Council and other welfare agencies in supporting such needs. The Panel noted that a housing solution was often critical to solving a domestic violence situation, though given the pressures within housing services, this would continue to be challenge for local authorities.
- 5.21 The Panel noted that there had been widespread debate on the 1% pay cap among public sector employees. Whilst it is recognised that public sector pay has been eroded over recent years and removal of the cap would be welcomed, the failure of central government to fully resource any pay increase would necessitate local authorities to find savings in other service areas.
- 5.22 It was clear that Brexit would dominate the national agenda and that domestic policy would take a backstage for this coming parliament.

#### Britannia Development

- 5.23 The Panel noted however, that this development proposal had been widely discussed in various local policy making and decision making forums including Cabinet and through specific development consultations.

#### Audit Committee

- 5.24 Cllr Sharman made a number representations on behalf of the Audit Committee and requested that the Mayor attend the December meeting to respond to questioning on the following:
- (a) The Audit Committee is producing a suite of performance indicators and it would be useful if there could be an agreed process to which the Mayor could respond to any issues that are raised in the assessment of these;
  - (b) There was increasing use of strategic boards across the council to develop service responses, this highlighted the need for improved accountability arrangements;
  - (c) How value for money is achieved for future planning decisions.

The Mayor confirmed that he would be very happy to appear at Audit Committee to address the issues outlined above and to improve political engagement with this body. Alternatively, the Mayor indicated that he would also be happy to attend Scrutiny Panel to discuss the issues raised by the Audit Committee.

The Mayor confirmed that he welcomed the suggestion for such boards to be more open and transparent. The Housing Board is public body and governance is out in the public domain. It was suggested that individual scrutiny commissions could play a further role in increased accountability of such boards.

## **6 Quarterly Finance Update**

- 6.1 The Chair welcomed Ian Williams, Group Director for Finance and Corporate Resources to the Panel. A number of finance reports were submitted to the Panel ahead of the meeting, and these were discussed in turn.

SEND

- 6.2 One of the key points to note from this report was that the same pattern of budget pressures within SEND budgets was experienced across other London boroughs. Other Councils were experiencing similar budget pressures as a result of high demand for services and decline in central government support. Hackney would be surveying other London boroughs through the Society of London Treasurers to identify the scale of this problem.
- 6.3 The Panel noted that the levels of central government resource for SEND had not been upgraded since 2011. This had created additional budget pressures which had to be offset locally.

Action: To provide further details of the targeted and exceptional policy to the Panel and what this involves.

Temporary Accommodation

- 6.4 A number of developments had been made since this item was last presented at the joint session for Children and Young People and Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission in December 2016. Most notably the work that has been undertaken to reduce the time taken to turn around void properties and the conversion of council properties for use as temporary accommodation. The Panel also understood that the Council had also bought a hostel and invested in new leasing arrangements to increase its temporary accommodation offer.
- 6.5 The interventions outlined above were however just temporary solutions and it is unsustainable to maintain such a large number of families in temporary accommodation. There had also been an ongoing shortfall in funding to support people in temporary accommodation which was further adding to budget pressures.

**(i) The Panel sought to clarify whether the total cost of service outlined in the paper (on page 13) was the actual overspend and or projected overspend.**

The base budgets provide for a significant element of the cost of the service and where this isn't fully resourced the council would top up from reserves.

**(ii) The Panel sought to clarify, given the extreme housing pressures in the capital, whether the Council was formulating a policy to offer accommodation outside of London?**

The Council is currently taking a suite of policy documents through to decision which include homelessness strategy, temporary accommodation strategy and a rough sleeper strategy. The housing regulations allow the Council to discharge its duties outside of London, but to date this been used very sparingly as people were very reluctant to take up such offers.

The only way people could be re-housed was if they were homeless. It was suggested that an additional piece of policy work would be needed to identify what support could be provided to people to prevent them becoming homeless and presenting at the council for emergency accommodation. It was suggested that policy options should be explored to identify ways in which newly homeless residents can be supported (e.g. staying with friends or family) or to find other housing solutions, whilst still remaining on the housing register. This has been explored in other boroughs and

the Council will be looking into this further to identify if similar procedures can be adopted here.

Generally speaking, the Mayor questioned whether spending large amounts of council resources to support the housing and resettlement of people in temporary accommodation out of borough is the right choice, as these resources could be spent developing an in borough response. It would also be difficult to replicate the same level of support and required safety nets that are provided for residents within the borough as those housed outside of London.

Whilst it was accepted that some people from Hackney may continue to be rehoused out of London, this would hopefully be a small number.

**(iii) The Panel queried if it would be helpful for Living in Hackney to look at some of the models used elsewhere that incentivise people to find their own housing options rather than present as homeless to the Council?**

The Council was aware of some of the developments in other boroughs in this area and would be looking into these, but it was unlikely that there will be further policy development in this specific area before May 2018. The Mayor would welcome the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission in providing that policy development work leading up to that time.

#### Capital Risk

- 6.6 The report on capital risks was presented to the panel. Additional details were provided for two projects as these mixed use development schemes represented significant risks to the authority, these being Nile Street and Britannia Leisure Centre site.
- 6.7 A risk profile has been developed for all development be it specific housing development or wider estate regeneration projects. This model used a number of risks to develop an overall risk profile for each development. The specific risks assessed include; management risk, cash flows risk, sales risk, contract risk and borrowing risk.
- 6.8 It was suggested that further work was needed to help members understand the nature and totality of risks within individual developments and in their totality. Officers offered to provide a workshop for members for this purpose.

**Action:** Group Director Finance and Corporate Resources to set up a member workshop to support assessments of corporate risks associated with housing and regeneration developments.

**(i) The Panel sought to clarify whether in relation to mixed use developments, if there was any risk associated to the projection of declining pupil numbers to these developments. Is the funding for these developments dependent on pupil numbers?**

The fundamental reason why these schemes were conceived was to respond to local projections which indicated an increased demand for school places. In terms of the actual build, there were no expected problems as the income from private on site sales would fund the physical development. In the unlikely event that numbers did not materialise, then some other alternative use may be needed.

**(iii) On the capital risk associated with Britannia development, it is suggested that the Council may need to offset some of the capital investment needed to reduce the amount of capital sales. How much money might be needed and where is this coming from?**

The Council was undertaking a lot of work to ensure that this scheme remains viable. There are 480 homes planned for development on site, of which 80 are affordable. The scheme will require council funding. This will be obtained from a number of sources including Community Infrastructure Levy, overage on other sites and other smaller finances schemes.

- 6.9 The Chair and members of the Panel indicated that this had been a very informative and productive session and thanked the Mayor for attending and responding to questions.

## **7 Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme Review**

- 7.1 Each Chair or Vice Chair of the Commissions highlighted the main components of their respective work programmes in the year ahead.

### Working Hackney

- 7.2 The main review of the Commission would be to assess the skills and training needed to meet the local employment needs over the next 10 years. The Commission would focus on what could be done to upskill local residents to obtain local employment opportunities.

- 7.3 Other one-off items agreed were:

- Integrated schemes to get people back in to work who had been unemployed for a period of time;
- Inequality at work and in work poverty;
- Skills and training at local schools and local jobs (possibly with CYPS);
- Support to small businesses (July 2017).

- 7.4 The Commission noted that many local young people aim to go to University and that many of these institutions were themselves beginning to consider how they could offer apprenticeships. The Commission will look at how the current apprenticeships programme in Hackney could be expanded and explored the cultural barriers that may inhibit uptake of this career pathway.

### Children and Young People

- 7.5 The Commission's in- depth review would focus on CAMHS and the early identification and support for young people in schools. The Chair and Vice Chair had begun to scope this with key stakeholders. A spotlight review would take place in October 2017 and focus on the recruitment and retention of Foster Carers.

- 7.6 Other one-off items that the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission would include:

- School admissions;
- Children's Social Care Annual Report;
- Child Safeguarding Annual Report;
- School attainment;

- Integrated commissioning arrangements.

- 7.7 The panel hoped to work together informally with the Working in Hackney Scrutiny Commission to support a joint scrutiny of how schools are preparing young people for local job opportunities. The Commission also hoped to agree a joint scrutiny process with Living in Hackney in respect of scrutiny of Temporary Accommodation and how this impacts on the attainment of children.
- 7.8 It was noted that the Unregistered Educational Settings report was due to be presented at the September meeting of the CYP Scrutiny Commission.
- 7.9 It was noted the Corporate Parenting Committee had also undertaken work on foster carer recruitment and it may be beneficial to factor this in to the scoping of the planned review by CYP Scrutiny Commission. It was suggested it would be useful to know how other local authorities have approached this issue.

#### Living in Hackney

- 7.10 The Commission had started a review to assess fire safety controls in local housing in light of the Grenfell Tower fire. This would include not only fire safety officials, but also housing associations and tower blocks managed by the private sector. The Commission felt that it was important that this is undertaken in public to help bring confidence to local fire safety regulations.
- 7.11 Another line of work would be to assess the local impact of the privatisation of the Probation Service.
- 7.12 In addition, the Commission would look at children in temporary accommodation, which would be undertaken either through a full scrutiny or through the Cabinet Member Q & A process.
- 7.13 Other areas for one off scrutiny would include:
- Public realm;
  - Transport – the provision of cycle lanes;
  - Contract management in the housing department.
- 7.14 Given the recent concern about moped crime and the use of acid in such robberies, this would be added to the work programme of the Commission.

#### Health in Hackney

- 7.15 For its in-depth review the Commission would look at the support for adult carers (i.e. adults caring for adults), which would be confirmed on 20 July.
- 7.16 A number of aspects of mental health were suggested by a number of local stakeholders as a possible area for in-depth review by the Commission. It was decided however, that one-off items on early intervention in Psychosis and the effectiveness of interventions for people with long term, moderate mental health problems
- 7.17 There would be a range of one-off items taken at the Commission including STP plans and development of a Single Accountable Officer. The Commission would also follow up earlier completed work which assessed the maternity unit at the Homerton hospital.

**Monday, 17th July, 2017**

7.18 There would also be regular updates to the Commission on integrated commissioning plans for the borough. The Safeguarding Adults Board would also be attending the Commission to update on its work as would the Local Pharmaceutical Committee on the future of community pharmacy services.

7.19 The Panel requested that correspondence from Health in Hackney Commission to the local CCG concerning possible future East London Commissioning arrangements and the Single Accountable Officer be circulated.

**Action:** Overview and Scrutiny Officer to circulate the letter from Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission to local CCG around future commissioning arrangements be distributed to members of the Scrutiny Panel.

#### Audit Committee

7.20 It was noted that the Audit Committee were taking forward three areas of work in the year ahead, which included the following:

- A high-level performance indicator set for the whole council to help assess the performance of the Council;
- Ways to oversee strategic boards for improved transparency and accountability;
- Value for money in future plans and that there is adequate assurance in respect of future revenues and costs of specific regeneration plans. This would be a council wide assessment.
- Bring additional transparency of capital costs across the Council.

7.21 Many of the issues above fall within the Mayors portfolio, so the Committee would welcome his offer to attend their meeting to discuss these issues.

Action: Overview and Scrutiny Officer to contact Chair of Audit Committee and Mayor's office regarding Mayor Glanville's attendance at the Audit Committee meeting.

## **8 Scrutiny Panel Work Programme 2017/18**

8.1 The Panel discussed the work programme for the Scrutiny Panel for 2017/18. It was noted that a number of items were already scheduled:

- 2 Mayor's Cabinet Member Q & A and December 2017.
- 2 Chief Executive question time session - October 2017 and February 2018
- Quarterly Finance Updates – the Panel can choose particular areas of focus for each update.

8.2 The Panel were keen to have an IT focused session at the next Panel meetings. It was suggested that the panel can raise a number of issues in relation to IT which can be scrutinised at the meeting (e.g. CRM, spend to save). This could involve inviting the new Head of IT to present to the Panel the key IT and digital challenges for the council.

**Agreed:** That the next meeting in October will focus on IT. Members of the Commission will identify 3 topics for Group Director for Finance and Corporate Resources and 3 topics for Chief Executive and Head of IT.

8.3 It was suggested by members that it would be useful to assess how Corporate Procurement systems work across the Council. Members agreed that this would be useful and would complement work undertaken by the Living in Hackney Scrutiny

**Monday, 17th July, 2017**

Commission on contract management. It was suggested that this could be a themed session with the Chief Executive (February 2018).

- 8.4 There was also a suggestion that the Scrutiny Panel should also assess the performance of the Council against its key corporate objectives. In addition, the Panel may also assess the new delegated management structure proposed by the Chief Executive at his next attendance at Scrutiny Panel.
- 8.5 Members of the Panel indicated that the meeting had been productive and positive. It was suggested that further work could be done to promote public engagement and involvement at Scrutiny Panel so that the process of holding key decisions makers to account could be more transparent.
- 8.6 The Chair thanked members and officer for attending. The next meeting would be 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2017.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.10 pm