

London Borough of Hackney
Scrutiny Panel
Municipal Year 2017/18
Date of Meeting Monday, 11th December, 2017

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Chair | Councillor Ben Hayhurst |
| Councillors in Attendance | Cllr Margaret Gordon, Cllr Christopher Kennedy, Cllr Ann Munn, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr James Peters and Cllr Anna-Joy Rickard |
| Apologies: | Cllr Mete Coban |
| Co-optees | |
| Officers In Attendance | Jarlath O'Connell (Overview & Scrutiny Officer), Ian Williams (Group Director of Finance and Resources) and Bruce Devile (Head of Governance & Business Intelligence) |
| Other People in Attendance | Mayor Philip Glanville (Mayor), Councillor Rebecca Rennison (Cabinet Member for Finance and Housing Needs) and Councillor Nick Sharman |
| Members of the Public | |
| Officer Contact: | Tracey Anderson  0208 3563312  tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk |

Councillor Ben Hayhurst in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 An apology was received from Cllr Coban.
- 1.2 Cllr Rickard stated that she would have to leave the meeting early.

2 Urgent Items / Order of Business

- 2.1 There were no urgent items.
- 2.2 It was agreed that item 7 would be taken first.

3 Declaration of Interest

- 3.1 Cllr Gordon stated that she was currently an employee of the Government Legal Department and therefore she would absent herself from the third part of item 5 (the Mayor's Question Time), as it involved a discussion on the implications of the government amending the debt cap for local authorities.

4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- 4.1 Members gave consideration to the minutes of the meeting held on 23 October 2017.
- 4.2 In relation to the Matters Arising, the Chair reported that the Action 1 had been completed, that Action 2 had led to a meeting on the Special Educational Needs funding issue which had just taken place. Action 3 related to a request for a Member training session on finance and this had now been scheduled for 17 January at 2.00 pm, he added.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| RESOLVED: | That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 October 2017 be agreed as a correct record and the matters arising be noted. |
|------------------|--|

5 Cabinet Question Time - Mayor Glanville

- 5.1 Guest for this item:
- Mayor Philip Glanville
- 5.2 The Chair welcomed the Mayor and stated that the three areas they had invited the Mayor to answer questions on were:
- (a) One Year On – achievements, priorities and learning
 - (b) Hackney Council's communications – update on improvements and future plans
 - (c) Housing and welfare reform – implications if the debt cap was lifted
- 5.3 The Mayor stated that in relation to what he was most proud of during the year he would single out:
- (i) The Kings Crescent Estate Generation project
 - (ii) Having listened to young people in the *Hackney A Place for Everyone* consultation, the re-focusing the Council's Employment and Skills offer
 - (iii) Enjoying a higher level of engagement with the public and residents

On the first he stated that Kings Crescent was the first project to complete with 273 new homes having been provided. It also represented a useful testing of the financial model they were using. It also involved retro fitting homes and working with existing residents. It also demonstrated a new and effective marketing strategy whereby the developer Higgins and Hackney Sales had achieved 89% shared ownership sales, with the vast majority going to those

who lived or worked in the borough. Only 3% of the homes had been sold to investors.

On the second he stated that they had listened to young people in the *Hackney A Place for Everyone* consultation and had re-focused the Employment and Skills offer. There were now 100 young people in the paid work experience programme, they had relaunched the employment service and 84 out of the 100 apprenticeships on offer had been filled.

On the third he stated that he was enjoying his increased engagement with the public and was proud of introducing the public Mayor's Question Time sessions, Mayor's press conferences and overall, being more available to residents.

- 5.4 In terms of lessons learned, the Mayor stated that he had learned that one cannot do it all and that events would always intervene and upset any plans made. He added that in the aftermath of Grenfell Tower tragedy there was a collective loss of trust by the public in their councils. In Hackney however they had proceeded with 1800 fire risk assessments and the data on these was now accessible online. Valuable lessons had been learnt here on how the Council uses data to increase transparency. He added that the events around the recent murder on Cassland Rd, or the moped acid attacks had illustrated how there was a need to keep residents groups closely informed and expectations were high here. The Council was seen as a trusted source to hold the ring in situations like this and this status needed to be maintained.
- 5.5 In terms of priorities, the Mayor stated that he wished to highlight three areas. There was a need for more resources to fund crime and anti-social behaviour, the housing regeneration programme while having got off to a good start would require ongoing political leadership and there would be a need for a concerted focus on influencing government policy around the budget. There would need to be extensive lobbying on infrastructure spend, welfare reform, Brexit and on education funding.
- 5.6 The Chair of Audit Committee stated that he welcomed the building of trust which had taken place over the past year and he asked what more could the Council's revised Scrutiny function do over the coming year.
- 5.7 The Mayor replied that while the revised structure for Scrutiny might have had an uneasy start, it was clear that Scrutiny did not shy away from controversial issues and this needed to be commended. He highlighted the work done on unregistered educational settings, the future of work, Thames Water's response to the flooding and the roll out of the Sustainability and Transformation Plan, as examples of good work. He commented that whether residents were sufficiently aware of this was another issue, but his view was that the new system needed some steady state running for now. He added that Scrutiny was seen as front and centre and it would be valuable now to look at how the communications and engagement functions dovetailed with scrutiny. The work on 'Unregistered settings' demonstrated how value can be added by scrutiny working closely with other sections of the Council. There were good foundations in place in which to build and perhaps there was room for some Place Based leadership led by Scrutiny. There was a need for more communications activities on scrutiny e.g. press releases. He added that Ward

- Forums needed further thought also as they have been left rather under resourced.
- 5.8 A Member stated that while the successes of the Regeneration work must be welcomed there continued to be problems with Housing Repairs and in some wards these had deteriorated.
- 5.9 The Mayor replied that there was an important distinction to be drawn between 'Major Works' and 'Repairs', the latter done by Direct Labour Organisations (DLOs). The DLOs were good on repairs but there had been problems with the more complex Major Works. The way in which the contracting was carried out has created some challenging issues and perhaps there was a need to look at fewer jobs going out to DLOs. There were differences between the 2010 and 2013 rounds of procurement which had led to problems.
- 5.10 A Member asked about the recent announcement about devolution of powers and whether the future lay in more powers coming to boroughs.
- 5.11 The Mayor replied that they were actually finalising the Executive Response to the Governance & Resources Scrutiny Commission's review on 'Devolution'. London now had some high level devolution and the major issue on health devolution was around NHS estates and it would be interesting to see if this might bear fruit. He added that we had also seen the introduction of the Single Accountable Officer for the STP which had been very controversial. He noted that in Hackney the Council and the NHS were working together very well and seemed to be getting on with the job, unlike in other boroughs.
- 5.12 On the devolution of skills and employment programmes, the Mayor wondered whether the proposed Working Health Programme driven by Central London Forward would be better than what we already had and he expressed the hope that the programme doesn't get caught up in the national skills debate or that we would be presented with false choices on this. It would need close attention and he was pleased that the Chief Executive was a strong advocate for Hackney in his role in leading the Central London Forward skills programme.
- 5.13 The Chair moved the Mayor on to the second theme of this session on Communications.
- 5.14 The Mayor stated that he continued to feel strongly that Hackney Today was an incredibly effective tool with a great demographic reach and that it was worth defending. On issues such as communicating on the roll out of changes to childcare or on campaigning around welfare reform, it had been very useful but it wasn't the only tool. The Council had worked hard to engage the local press and they had also expanded the reach of its social media (twitter, facebook, Instagram). The Council's twitter following was the largest for a London council. They had also worked on e-newsletters for the Hackney Business Network and had used e-newsletters very effectively to reach TRAs with targeted information. A new website called 'Love Hackney' would soon replace 'Destination Hackney' and this would be broader and chime with the developing culture strategy for the borough. He added that there was a suite of communication tools which needed to be used.

Monday, 11th December, 2017

- 5.15 The Mayor stated that it was regrettable that the Secretary of State was on the one hand criticising councils for being too remote from their residents (in the aftermath of Grenfell) while at the same time going after Hackney Today. He stated that Waltham Forest Council had also been issued with directions about its council newspaper. He stated that the directions issues by DCLG had not been carried out properly and this had been pointed out to them. They also continued to make representations on the issue and there would be a paper coming to Cabinet in January on whether the Council would proceed with legal action against the government. He concluded that he did not feel that the Secretary of State had answered their questions on the issue of Reach and the Council had always been careful in applying the guidance on not being political in Hackney Today.
- 5.16 Members stated that the feedback they had received from residents on estates about Hackney Today had been very positive with the listings information and information on activities for children being a lifeline for young parents. They also asked if in future it might have a half page 'Feedback' page.
- 5.17 The Mayor replied that he too had received a number of unsolicited compliments from residents about it and that he was pleased that, overall, a very nuanced view was coming back from residents about this campaign. Hackney Gazette he stated appeared to have had a resurgent interest in campaigning, which was welcome. He stated that there was enough space in Hackney for the three current publications and they were mutually exclusive. He stated that since the Hackney Homes newsletter information had been absorbed into Hackney Today there had been an uplift in readership from tenants. They hadn't increased the print run in line with the increase in population and so it did not reach everyone. He added that at the end of this process they will be looking to re-design the publication.
- 5.18 A Member stated that the previous Mayor had stated that if the law was changed and councils could proceed with publishing statutory notices online only there would be no requirement for Hackney Today and he asked if this position still holds.
- 5.19 The Mayor replied that the frequency of the publication was guided by the need to publish the statutory notices in a physical format. If not they would have gone monthly. If Hackney Today is closed the Council would have to launch a procurement exercise to engage an existing local newspaper to publish the statutory notices and other information and this would greatly distort the current local newspaper market as the value of such a contract would be c. £100k. Currently only the Gazette would be in a position to tender. The current circulation of the Gazette was vastly smaller than that of Hackney Today. He explained that in other parts of the country where only 1 local newspaper existed in a borough a scenario like this would mean that such a newspaper could then charge what they liked. He also added that closing Hackney Today and moving the statutory notices to a local newspaper was only part of the picture. The Council would still have to run the expense of other communications initiatives e.g. a letter to all tenants and leaseholders alone costs £30k each time. The Council would still bear the cost of other communications initiatives for which Hackney Today was currently being used.

Monday, 11th December, 2017

- 5.20 The Chair asked the Mayor to move on the third area of focus for the session which was the implications for the borough if the local authority Housing Revenue Account debt cap was lifted, as was being discussed.
- 5.21 The Mayor stated that this was being presented as a sort of freedom and the rhetoric was correct in that the supply of council housing had consistently gone down since the cap had been imposed and Housing Associations had never been able to pick up the slack. To solve the housing crisis there needed to be a joint effort between Housing Associations, Local Government and private developers and a £1bn injection from lifting the cap would not be sufficient. He added that this was not the type of freedom that councils had in mind. It was good that DCLG was making progress with these arguments with the Treasury but Hackney was itself developing a pragmatic and ambitious bid of its own.
- 5.22 The Mayor explained that the current debt ratio in councils was 7% whereas in the private sector this could be 20-40%. If councils were allowed to move to a debt ratio of 15% in Hackney this would currently bring in a borrowing capacity of £230m. Careful modelling had been done and this combined with the savings from Housing Benefit they could build 2000 homes and deliver savings of £1bn over 30 years. He stated that the government's current answer to the crisis, the 'Help to Buy' scheme had been a failure. What Hackney was asking for was not grant funding but the ability to borrow against its assets in a prudent way. As it was, it was not clear how the offer of £1bn borrowing capacity nation wide would deliver for Hackney. They had had one meeting with officials thus far and more work on the rationale and evidence base was required.
- 5.23 A Member commented that it appeared the government was loosening national debt targets, which might help, but asked if the predicted market turmoil arising from Brexit might increase the Council's borrowing costs.
- 5.24 The Mayor replied that the Treasury was naturally cautious and wanted to bring down the national debt and traditionally did not see HRA borrowing as national infrastructure. The Hackney Model was built on cross subsidy with the aim of being cost neutral. The more developed the proposals they could present to ministers the more likelihood of some success. It was scandalous how much of tax payers money was being spent on Housing Benefit which mostly went to private landlords. This spending dwarfed the social sector. In relation to the impact of Brexit the Mayor stated that there would obviously be prudential tests and in the borough there has been a vast increase in land values. Cllr Rennison added that the Brexit effect was leading to increases in cost of bricks and in costs right through the supply chain as well as problems in securing qualified builders as so many were EU migrants whose status was now in question.
- 5.25 The Group Director of Finance and Resources added that the revision of the Council's Prudential Framework was out for consultation. He commented that DCLG was worried that local authorities might borrow to purchase assets outside their borders.
- 5.26 Members asked what modelling had been done on the impact on the council of the Homelessness Reduction Act commenting on the existing good track record of initiatives such as 'No First Night Out' and the Greenhouse centre.

Monday, 11th December, 2017

- 5.27 The Mayor stated that he had recently given evidence to the House of Common's Public Accounts Committee on housing matters including on the costs of implementing the Homelessness Reduction Act to local authorities. He stated that in Hackney it was estimated at £400k alone to deal with the advice aspects. He stated that the changes did not represent any significant cultural shift for Hackney. It was less about the need to have lots of additional single unit accommodation because of the law change but rather that there was to be a greater focus on prevention. It would mean that a greater level of advice would need to be offered. Cllr Rennison added that they had estimated £1.6m but would only receive £500k to deal with this. She added that they were very pleased with the Greenhouse Service and were looking to expand it.
- 5.28 The Chair of Audit Committee stated that this session had again proved very fruitful and it was a pity that no public were present and that it didn't have a higher profile.
- 5.29 The Chair replied that he would take on board these comments, which had also been made at previous meetings, and at the next meeting of the Panel they had scheduled a discussion on how the new model of Scrutiny was working and they would take up the issue of raising the profile of the Cabinet Question Time Session with the Mayor, then.
- 5.30 The Mayor commented that while there is scope for Scrutiny to raise the profile of the session, this session was designed specifically for Scrutiny Members alone and there was of course now the separate public Mayor's Question Time Sessions also.

| | |
|----------------|--|
| ACTION: | That the next meeting include a discussion of how the profile of the Mayor's Question Time Session at Scrutiny Panel could be raised. |
|----------------|--|

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| RESOLVED: | That the discussion be noted. |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|

6 Quarterly Finance Update

- 6.1 Guests in attendance for this item were:
- Ian Williams, Group Director Finance and Resources (IW)
 - Cllr Rebecca Rennison, Cabinet Member for Finance
- 6.2 Members gave consideration to briefing paper on 'Quarterly Financial Update'.
- 6.3 IW took members through the paper and drew their attention to Appendix 1 the note on the Chancellor's Autumn Budget 2017. It was noted that pilots for local retention of full National Non Domestic Rates had been agreed. Unlike the rest of the country, London as a whole had to agree a single pilot. The doubling of the council tax for empty properties would also not generate the level of income anticipated by commentators and the other main item of interest was that the roll out of Universal Credit in Hackney had been postponed to October 2018. This was welcome. He commented that of the £325m paid out in Housing Benefit in Hackney only £68m relates to council housing stock.

Monday, 11th December, 2017

- There was a discussion on the issues around the unit cost per private property receiving payment.
- 6.4 Moving on to Hackney's own budget position, IW stated that they were awaiting the announcement of the figure for the GLA Precept for the coming year. The Mayor of London was proposing to increase the Met Police Precept by 1.99%. In the recent past this had been frozen. They were currently on a four year financial deal on the RSG and other central government grants were on different cycles. He expected the final figures to be in line with their financial planning assumptions.
 - 6.5 The Chair asked how the Council was modelling the risks to Adult Social Care arising from the NHS's plans, currently out to consultation, to change the Payment System within the NEL STP footprint.
 - 6.6 IW replied that in Hackney the Integrated Commissioning Board was well advanced on these issues compared to our neighbouring boroughs. There were a number of cost shifting issues that needed to be addressed. In Learning Disabilities, for example, he had found that the Council was paying costs which should have been taken up by the NHS and he was working closely with the Financial Director of the CCG on these.
 - 6.7 In terms of ongoing budget pressures the cost of funding concession fares had increased very significantly over the past few years. There was also little movement thus far on the Local Government Pay Award which would have budget implications. Outer London boroughs for example were reluctant to pay the London Living Wage, he added.
 - 6.8 A Member asked what could be done about the cost pressures relating to supporting those with No Recourse to Public Funds.
 - 6.9 IW replied that the Council had a statutory duty to support this group where children were involved. The Council had set up a Multi Disciplinary Team to deal with these vulnerable families but it was a complex area.
 - 6.10 Members asked about the percentage of rent arrears and National Non Domestic Rates collections being below target.
 - 6.11 IW explained that for a period earlier this year the new rate and guidance had not been set because of the intervening general election. Because ratepayers were waiting for the national budget changes to be implemented there was an increase in net collectible debt primarily as a result of the revaluation. This matter has now been resolved and NNDR collection rates were back on target and outperforming last year.
 - 6.12 The Chair asked whether the Council had been able to model the impact of the localisation and the changes to Council Tax Benefit.
 - 6.13 IW replied that historically Hackney has had very high rent collection rates so the impacts from the Council Tax Reduction Scheme had not been severe. The localisation of and changes to Council Tax Reduction Scheme has meant that these collection rates have fallen. The impact across London hadn't materialised as expected however probably because not many are actually in

Monday, 11th December, 2017

receipt of full the Council Tax Benefit. Overall about 200,000 bills were issued covering 114,000 properties. A key task was to get more residents to move to Direct Debit payments. Currently only 55,000 were paying by this method. This represented an improvement from a few years ago when the level was just 30,000.

- 6.14 With reference to point 6.11 of the report, the Chair asked what the best metric was to judge the Council Tax Reduction Scheme.
- 6.15 IW replied that the key to the issue was communicating earlier and more frequently with those who might be in difficulty. There were now more steps in place to deal with the issues and they had learned from the findings of the Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission investigation into 'Debt collection' from a few years ago.
- 6.16 Members asked if they could look at the indicators and long term trends on debt collection.
- 6.17 Cllr Rennison stated that in the New Year the Finance team were scoping a review of how they carry out debt collection and she would be happy to report back on this once it had completed. A Member commented that Lambeth had reported that they had increased collection by stopping using bailiffs. IW replied that they had benchmarked with Lambeth and Lewisham on this and there were a number of perverse consequences from, for example, switching from in-house bailiffs to outsourcing. With the latter, the incentive for the service to pay for itself drove behaviours which might not be positive in the long run. There were a number of nudge options that needed to be tried and the letters used needed to be constantly reviewed, he added. The Chair asked if this could return to the Panel once completed.

| | |
|----------------|---|
| ACTION: | The Group Director of Finance and Resources to provide a briefing to the Panel on the findings of the internal review of Debt Collection once it has been completed. |
|----------------|---|

| | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| RESOLVED: | That the report be noted. |
|------------------|----------------------------------|

7 Complaints and Enquiries Annual Report

- 7.1 Guests for this item were:
- Bruce Devile, Head of Business Analysis and Complaints (BD)
 - Cllr Rebecca Rennison, Cabinet Member for Finance
- 7.2 Members gave consideration to the Annual Report on Complaints and Enquiries.
- 7.3 In introducing the report BD stated that overall complaints were up 13% which was the highest for a number of years. They were answering them within 20 days, which was outside the 15 day target. At the same time the number of escalations was down indicating that they were resolving more complaints, despite taking a bit more time to do so. Complaints were dominated by Housing, Parking, Council Tax Benefit and Housing Needs. The increase in

Monday, 11th December, 2017

volume was being driven by more people using the complaints process itself to further their case e.g. when an appeal might have been turned down. He stated that there had been one formal report to the Council from the Local Government Ombudsman (finding against the Council). This had related to Adult Social Care and had been presented to Full Council. He added that complaints to the Mayor's Office were also slightly up. Complaints relating to the statutory areas of adult social care and children's services were also up. On Quality Assessment there had been a levelling of performance. He and his team were continuing to feed back to on a sample of complaints to Management Teams. They were discontinuing this process where it was seen as not adding value as the focus had to be in ensuring that service areas took ownership of the issues which were arising.

- 7.4 A Member asked if the target for a Member Enquiry response would continue to be 10 working days.
- 7.5 BD replied that he was loathe to move this target to 15 days as speed of response would then slow down. They did consider different targets for different service areas but had decided against it. Cllr Rennison commented that the outliers here generally impacted the overall performance results for the service, so this needed to be looked at carefully.
- 7.6 A Member asked if benchmarking data on Local Government Ombudsman's Reports could be sought from neighbouring boroughs and included in the next annual report.
- 7.7 The Chair of Audit Committee stated that this data was a really important way of assessing how we were doing as a borough and he asked how we were now using this data as a diagnostic tool.
- 7.8 BD replied that he was continually feeding complaints data to the Chief Executive and Heads of Service and in addition they were looking at how complaints data can best feed into Business Intelligence. Members asked if next year's report could also include a couple examples of these processes.

| | |
|----------------|---|
| ACTION: | Head of Business Analysis and Complaints to include: (a) Benchmarking data from neighbouring boroughs on reports from the Local Ombudsman's Service (b) Illustrative examples of how complaints data has been used as a diagnostic tool in Business Analysis in the next annual report to the Panel. |
|----------------|---|

- 7.9 A Member asked how much modelling was ICT doing on how to streamline the complaints and business analysis processes.
- 7.10 BD replied that he worked closely with the Head of ICT on the issue. The current IT system for complaints was 3 to 4 years old and they were talking with ICT about how complaints data can be dropped into the new Business Intelligence software and the focus was on ensuring the system was used for more than merely case management.
- 7.11 A Member asked how they worked with Members who may be unhappy with the system.

- 7.12 BD stated that a key focus will be on improving the Members Induction Session on the complaints system with the incoming cohort of members in May. On Members Enquiries the important thing was to ensure follow through on a problem rather than how quickly an initial answer was provided. As Members were aware, residents will frequently raise the same problem via multiple channels and the priority must be reducing this tendency and focusing on ensuring the issue is followed through with the service department and that a satisfactory solution is found rather than merely hitting targets for how speedily one part of the system responds. The pressure too often was on getting the answer from the service back rather than seeing the issue through.
- 7.13 The Chair thanked BD and Cllr Rennison for their report and attendance.

| | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| RESOLVED: | That the report be noted. |
|------------------|----------------------------------|

8 Work Programme 2017/18

- 8.1 Members gave consideration to the work programme. It was noted that the next meeting on 7 Feb there would be a focus on the Budget. It was agreed to ask for an update on the financial settlement, an update on the Council Tax modelling and an update on any unusual items in the Budget Briefing paper. IW offered a meeting with Panel Members once the budget proposals were in place.
- 8.2 It was agreed that there be an item on Housing Repairs and that the Cabinet Member, the Group Director of Neighbourhoods, the Director of Housing and the Head of Housing Repairs be invited. The Head of Business Analysis and Complaints was asked to provide an accompanying report on complaints data relating to housing repairs.
- 8.3 It was agreed that there be a discussion on how the revised Scrutiny Function was operating.
- 8.4 Members discussed which upcoming Scrutiny Review reports would go forward to Full Council and in which order. The following was agreed:

January Full Council – CSSI report on ‘Vulnerable Migrants’
February Full Council – Budget setting meeting (no scrutiny item)
July Full Council – CYP report on ‘Unregistered educational settings’
Oct/Nov Full Council – HiH report on ‘Supporting adult carers’ and WiH report on ‘Changing world of work and skills’.

| | |
|----------------|---|
| ACTION: | Head of Scrutiny and Ward Forums to action the work programme items agreed at 8.1-8.4. |
|----------------|---|

- 8.5 The Chair of Audit Committee suggested that the Annual Audit report on Performance should also go to a meeting of Full Council.
- 8.6 The Chair asked the Chair of Audit and the Chairs of the 4 Commissions to provide a brief verbal update on their latest work.

Monday, 11th December, 2017

- 8.7 The Chair of Audit stated that their focus was on the development of Performance Review as well as keeping an eye on Risk.
- 8.8 The Chair of Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission stated that they had recently completed reviews on 'Childcare – 30 hours free entitlement'. In terms of impact of the changes, one provider so far had had to close. They also completed a Scrutiny in a Day review on 'Recruitment and support to Foster Carers'. The challenge here was huge he added. They were also about to publish the report of their review on 'Unregistered educational settings'.
- 8.9 The Chair of Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission stated that they had recently done work on the potential for licensing the Private Rented Sector. They were also looking at homelessness and would be going on site visits to Camden and Lambeth to look at some innovative approaches there. Next month they would have the Probation Service coming to answer questions and in the pas they had refused to appear at public meetings. The Commission would also be looking at how the Council monitors it housing contracts.
- 8.10 The Chair of Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission stated that they were coming to the end of their review on 'Supporting adult carers'. A number of issues had come up including housing and they had been on a range of site visits. The Commission had not been satisfied with the initial Executive Response to its review on 'End of Life Care' and the Cabinet Member had undertaken to take this to Health and Wellbeing Board to produce a more joined up partnership response to the recommendations. She stated that the INEL JHOSC Committee had been very active on scrutinising the STP including declining to endorse the proposal for a Single Accountable Officer for the STP i.e. across the 7 North East London CCGs. The Commission had considered a wide range of single items including 'Infrastructure Planning and Health and Wellbeing Provision' which explored how the Planning Service in drafting the Local Plan 2033 could better include the local CCG and health partners in this work.
- 8.11 The Chair thanked the Members for their updates.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| RESOLVED: | That the updates to the work programme agreed above be noted. |
|------------------|--|

9 Any Other Business

- 9.1 There was none.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.30 pm