

Overview & Scrutiny

Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission

All Members of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission are requested to attend the meeting of the Commission to be held as follows

Wednesday, 30th September, 2020

7.00 pm

Until further notice, all Council meetings will be held remotely. To access the meeting please click in the link https://youtu.be/c2Fn_n5zdz4

Contact:

Tracey Anderson

☎ 0208 356 3312

✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Tim Shields

Chief Executive, London Borough of Hackney

**Members: Cllr Sharon Patrick (Chair), Cllr Sade Etti (Vice-Chair),
Cllr Anthony McMahon, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Ian Rathbone,
Cllr Penny Wrout and Cllr Anna Lynch**

Agenda

ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

- 1 Apologies for Absence
- 2 Urgent Items / Order of Business
- 3 Declarations of Interest
- 4 Update on Thames Water Main Burst N4 (Pages 1 - 4)
- 5 Update on the Impact of Covid 19 on Hackney's Housing Service (Pages 5 - 12)
- 6 Executive Response to LiH Scrutiny Review - Council and partnership response to escalation in serious violence review (Pages 13 - 32)
- 7 Update on Thames Water Donation for Lea Bridge Distribution / Use of Funds (Pages 33 - 34)
- 8 Minutes of the Previous Meeting (Pages 35 - 56)

- 9 Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission- 2020/2021 Work Programme (Pages 57 - 72)
- 10 Any Other Business

To access the meeting please click in the link https://youtu.be/c2Fn_n5zdz4

Access and Information

Getting to the Town Hall

For a map of how to find the Town Hall, please visit the council's website <http://www.hackney.gov.uk/contact-us.htm> or contact the Overview and Scrutiny Officer using the details provided on the front cover of this agenda.

Accessibility

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall.

Induction loop facilities are available in the Assembly Halls and the Council Chamber. Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

Further Information about the Commission

If you would like any more information about the Scrutiny Commission, including the membership details, meeting dates and previous reviews, please visit the website or use this QR Code (accessible via phone or tablet 'app')

<http://www.hackney.gov.uk/individual-scrutiny-commissions-living-in-hackney.htm>



Public Involvement and Recording

Scrutiny meetings are held in public, rather than being public meetings. This means that whilst residents and press are welcome to attend, they can only ask questions at the discretion of the Chair. For further information relating to public access to information, please see Part 4 of the council's constitution, available at <http://www.hackney.gov.uk/l-gm-constitution.htm> or by contacting Governance Services (020 8356 3503)

Rights of Press and Public to Report on Meetings

Where a meeting of the Council and its committees are open to the public, the press and public are welcome to report on meetings of the Council and its committees, through any audio, visual or written methods and may use digital

and social media providing they do not disturb the conduct of the meeting and providing that the person reporting or providing the commentary is present at the meeting.

Those wishing to film, photograph or audio record a meeting are asked to notify the Council's Monitoring Officer by noon on the day of the meeting, if possible, or any time prior to the start of the meeting or notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

The Monitoring Officer, or the Chair of the meeting, may designate a set area from which all recording must take place at a meeting.

The Council will endeavour to provide reasonable space and seating to view, hear and record the meeting. If those intending to record a meeting require any other reasonable facilities, notice should be given to the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting and will only be provided if practicable to do so.

The Chair shall have discretion to regulate the behaviour of all those present recording a meeting in the interests of the efficient conduct of the meeting. Anyone acting in a disruptive manner may be required by the Chair to cease recording or may be excluded from the meeting. Disruptive behaviour may include: moving from any designated recording area; causing excessive noise; intrusive lighting; interrupting the meeting; or filming members of the public who have asked not to be filmed.

All those visually recording a meeting are requested to only focus on recording councillors, officers and the public who are directly involved in the conduct of the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will ask any members of the public present if they have objections to being visually recorded. Those visually recording a meeting are asked to respect the wishes of those who do not wish to be filmed or photographed. Failure by someone recording a meeting to respect the wishes of those who do not wish to be filmed and photographed may result in the Chair instructing them to cease recording or in their exclusion from the meeting.

If a meeting passes a motion to exclude the press and public then in order to consider confidential or exempt information, all recording must cease and all recording equipment must be removed from the meeting room. The press and public are not permitted to use any means which might enable them to see or hear the proceedings whilst they are excluded from a meeting and confidential or exempt information is under consideration.

Providing oral commentary during a meeting is not permitted.



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission 30th September 2020 Item 4 – Update on Thames Water Mains Burst N4 | Item No 4 |
|--|---------------------|

Outline

The Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission is receiving an update on the Thames Water Mains Burst in N4.

The discussion will cover:

An update from Thames Water on their progress of repair works, a status update on residents returning to their homes (home owners, private tenants, council tenants, registered social landlords and leaseholder) and an outline of your investment plans, timescales and the improvements you expect to achieve from this investment plan.

An update from Ofwat on the progress of performance for Thames Water, accessibility of this information locally and investment in improvements by Thames Water.

Reports in the agenda:

There are no formal reports in the agenda.

- Thames Water will be doing a presentation at the meeting. On page 3 is an outline of the areas the presentation will cover.
- Ofwat will be providing a verbal update at the meeting.

Attending for this item will be:

Thames Water

- **Steve Spencer** – Operations Director
- **Tim McMahon** – Head of Water Asset Management

Ofwat

- **Carl Pheasey** - Director Strategy & Policy, Ofwat

Action

Members are asked to consider the presentations and ask questions.

This page is intentionally left blank



Hackney Scrutiny Commission – 30th September, 2020

Thames Water Representatives

Steve Spencer – Operations Director

Tim McMahon – Head of Water Asset Management

Presentation (approx. 20 mins)

Our presentation will cover the following areas:

- A brief overview of the water network in Hackney to provide a reminder of the situation in the borough
- Based on issues raised following Queen's Drive and at this committee, the improvements we have made to our incident response and customer support
- The latest situation with residents who moved into alternative accommodation last October*
- An example of our improved response to incidents elsewhere in London with our new learnings in place
- A wider overview of our investment plans over the next five years across our region following discussions with Ofwat
- The latest on our £7m trunk replacement project on Seven Sisters Road and Queen's Drive due to start in October
- Further investment across Hackney to boost network resilience taking place or due to be carried out
- Next steps

*Please note, we cannot talk about individual cases

This page is intentionally left blank



| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission 30th September 2020 Item 5 –Update on the Impact of Covid 19 on Hackney’s Housing Service | Item No 5 |
|---|---------------------|

Outline

This item provides an update on the impact of Covid 19 on Hackney’s Housing Service in relation challenges and opportunities; business as usual activities; repairs; financial position; support to residents and customer service.

Reports in the Agenda

- Presentation on pages 7-12 of the agenda.

Attending for this item will be:

London Borough of Hackney

David Padfield, Interim Director, Housing Services

Action

Members are asked to consider the presentation and ask questions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Impact of Covid 19 On Housing Service

Page 7

David Padfield

Working for better homes

The logo for Hackney, featuring a stylized house shape formed by two parallel lines. The top line is dark teal and the bottom line is light teal. The word "Hackney" is written in a bold, black, sans-serif font, with a small circular icon containing a white arrow pointing to the right, positioned to the left of the text.

→ Hackney

Overview of Housing during lockdown



| Paused | Continued |
|------------------------------|--|
| Non urgent repairs | Emergency repairs |
| Capital Programme | Mechanical & Electrical inspections |
| Face-to-face meetings | Telephony |
| Arrears Work | Health & Safety inspections |
| Section 20 notices | Lettings |
| Tenancy Audit | ASB work |
| Playgrounds/ MUGAs | Grounds Maintenance |



Lockdown Achievements



| | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| Emergency Repairs | > 6,000 |
| Humanitarian assistance | > 13,000 deliveries |
| Calls to Vulnerable | > 6,000 |
| Lets Talk | > 500 residents helped |



Now...

Page 10

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Repairs | BAU |
| Gas Certificates | 98% |
| Capital Programme | BAU |
| Housing Offices | Closed |
| Community Halls | Closed |
| Playgrounds / MUGAs | Open |
| Rent Arrears | >£7m |



HRA savings requirement



| £'000 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2020/21 | 2021/22 | 2022/23 |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Total savings needed | 4,000 | 2,500 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Additional pressures | | | 1,500 | 1,000 | 500 |
| Replenish reserves | | | | 500 | 1,000 |
| Updated Savings | 4,000 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |



Challenges & Opportunities

- Working From Home - Office Footprint
- Paperless Systems
- Better ICT
- Targeted Face-to-Face Offer





| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <p>Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission</p> <p>30th September 2020</p> <p>Item 6 – Executive Response to LiH Scrutiny Review - Council and partnership response to escalation in serious violence review</p> | <p>Item No</p> <p>6</p> |
|---|--------------------------------|

Outline

The Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission conducted a scrutiny review exploring a number of aspects relevant to an escalation in levels of serious violence. A spike in such crimes and a series of murders in 2018 was one driver for our review. We visited and worked very closely with the Integrated Gangs Unit (IGU) on this review.

In December the Commission published its report of our review on the work of the Community Safety partners in Hackney in tackling the spike in serious violence and in particular in violence related to gang activity.

The discussion will cover:

The Commission’s review of the Executive’s response to the recommendations made by LiH.

Reports in the agenda:

- Cabinet response to the recommendations in the serious violence scrutiny review.

Attending for this item will be:

London Borough of Hackney

- **Cllr Caroline Selman**, Cabinet Member for Community Safety, policy and the voluntary sector
- **Maurice Mason**, Community Safety Partnership Manager.

Action

Members are asked to review the Cabinet response and agreed update action.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Response to the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission Investigation into Council and partnership response to escalation in serious violence

CABINET MEETING DATE

24 February 2020

CLASSIFICATION

Open

WARD(S) AFFECTED

All Wards

CABINET MEMBER

Cllr Caroline Selman
Cabinet member for Community Safety, Policy and the Voluntary Sector

KEY DECISION

No

GROUP DIRECTOR

Ajman Ali
Acting Group Director, Neighbourhoods & Housing

1. Cabinet member introduction

- 1.1 I welcome the work of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission, and their review recommendations aimed at supporting the ongoing work to reduce serious violence in our borough whilst supporting people in Hackney to feel safer.
- 1.2 I also acknowledge and support the feedback provided by the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission in recognising the excellent contribution of the Integrated Gangs Unit in making Hackney safer and look forward to supporting the implementation of the findings.
- 1.3 The Hackney IGU is a well established co- located team, bringing together experience and expertise from a wide range of stakeholders to reduce gang related violence in Hackney. The IGU has adopted a public health approach to reduce serious violence through the implementation of interventions aimed at preventing and diverting those at risk of gang exploitation whilst effectively reducing the recidivism associated with those affiliated to gangs in Hackney.
- 1.4 It is worth highlighting that the IGU is not a "stand alone" team but is one that strives to act as an integrated service to better coordinate supporting activities across the wider community safety partners including engagement with those communities affected by gang violence.
- 1.5 I am pleased to report that many of the recommendations contained within the Living in Hackney report are already being implemented including the recruitment of a mental health professional within the IGU to provide support to young adults who may be at risk of gang exploitation.
- 1.6 The scrutiny recommendations will be incorporated into a development plan for adoption and implementation to optimise the effectiveness of the IGU and wider partnership.
- 1.7 It should be noted that recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 from the review relate to the Council's Scrutiny Commissions receiving updates on or carrying out investigations of various aspects; responses to these recommendations have therefore been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs. These are appended to this report for noting.
- 1.8 Finally, I would like to thank the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission for their oversight and resilience in undertaking a comprehensive series of meetings, with a wide range of stakeholders, to inform their recommendations which will no doubt play a significant part in developing our approach to reducing serious violence in the future.

1.9 I commend this report to Cabinet

2. Recommendation

2.1. The Cabinet is asked to approve the content of this response.

Executive Response to the Scrutiny Recommendations

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 1 – Development of Outcome measures for the Integrated Gangs Unit</u></p> <p>We ask that the next update to the Commission on the Community Safety Partnership Plan includes detail on the revised outcome measures for the IGU, the reasoning for them, and progress against these at that point.</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>Provisional IGU measures have been agreed covering the outcomes and outputs of the component parts of the IGU. The indicators then form part of the quarterly report to the Gangs and Serious Violence Board (GSVB) for oversight and scrutiny.</p> <p>The IGU is to be reviewed independently commencing on 1st February 2020. Outcome measures for the IGU will form part of the terms of reference for this review with the findings feeding into the GSVB for sign off and implementation.</p> <p>We will be happy to provide the Commission with an update on this review - including the detail requested - at the appropriate point.</p> |
| <p><u>Recommendation 2 – Improved information management of ‘non-live’ cases</u></p> <p>Full information did not appear to be at hand on what we would define as ‘non-live’ cases’ – those individuals which the IGU had previously worked with but no longer did so.</p> <p>Further to our questions, we heard that the issues would be addressed, including via a review of the referral process which would enable the IGU to provide a greater insight into the sources of referrals, and the results delivered following these. We ask that an update on this work is provided.</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>Following the Living in Hackney scrutiny process the IGU has implemented a referral process incorporating both internal and external partners.</p> <p>This process is predicated on identifying those at risk of gang exploitation and ensuring that the risk is assessed and a proportionate response provided.</p> <p>Once an initial assessment has been undertaken the case is referred to either the Extra Familial Risk Panel or through the existing Gang Panel meeting. All cases whether “ non-live” or “live” are tracked for progress and involve a wide range of statutory or voluntary sector</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>organisations to safeguard the individual(s).</p> <p>The efficacy of the referral process is to form part of the IGU review commencing on 1/4/2020</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><u>Recommendation 3 – Greater transparency on the approach of the IGU, the cohort it works with, and how partners can support the work to achieve better outcomes</u></p> <p>We suggest that a starting point for this would be the creation of a dedicated page for the Integrated Gangs Unit, on the Council's website. This appears to be a gap currently, compared with some other boroughs with Integrated Gangs Units – for example Westminster and Islington.</p> <p>We feel this should provide details on its work and approaches, non-identifying information on the broad profile of the cohort, any common challenges faced, and the roles which other services and partners can play in helping to address these.</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>Agreed. This recommendation has been incorporated into the IGU Gangs Action Plan to monitor progress.</p> <p>An initial meeting has been arranged with LBH Communications representative and the IGU to scope a terms of reference and to agree timescales for this piece of work.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 4 – Greater representation of Children and Families Services in the IGU</u></p> <p>Children aged under 18 make up a significant and increasing share of the IGU cohort. We have heard about the practical benefits of a co-located model, with a range of services based in the same office.</p> <p>We feel that fuller involvement of Children and Families inside the IGU could enable more effective utilisation of the preventative resources in both areas. We saw the positive impacts achieved from part of the (Children and</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>The Children and Families Service (CFS) is a significant contributor to the work of the IGU. For example the Youth Offending Team (YOT) has a supervisor and six officers co-located within the IGU.</p> <p>In addition CFS attend all IGU related intelligence, tasking and Panel meetings with the Head of YOT jointly chairing the Gangs Panel meeting, and there is joint attendance from the IGU and CFS at the Extra Familial Risk Panel where those at risk of gang exploitation are allocated to appropriate agencies for safeguarding interventions.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Families') Youth Justice service being colocated in the unit.</p> <p>We heard about successful join up between the IGU and Children and Families generally; for example in the Contextual Safeguarding Project. However, we feel there is room for a greater co-location of services inside the IGU.</p> <p>We ask that the potential for this is explored by the Executive Members with responsibility for Community Safety and the Children and Families Service.</p> | <p>At a strategic level there is CFS representation at the Gangs and Serious Violence Board and the Community Safety Partnership Statutory Officers Group. A contextual safeguarding representative also attends the IGU Gangs Panel and Intelligence Meeting together with the monthly Partnership Tasking Meeting ensuring that a consistent and joint up approach is evident.</p> <p>With regards to the Commission's specific recommendation, the Council is currently reviewing their Early Help services; this recommendation will be considered as part of the review and consideration will be given to whether there is any scope for further improving how all children who are at risk from gang exploitation and their families are enabled to access an early help offer, including parenting support, that effectively meets their needs.</p> <p>Children & Family Services are also currently carrying out a review of services for vulnerable adolescents as part of their plan to embed contextual safeguarding approaches. This review will be undertaken with a view to ensuring that our responses to all young people that may be at risk of extra-familial harm and exploitation (including those at risk from exploitation in a gang context) receive a coordinated response to their needs. We will consider what the links between any remodelled services for adolescents and the IGU should look like.</p> <p>The Home Office funded Trusted Relationships team within Young Hackney delivers detached outreach services throughout the week (Monday to Friday) with embedded Clinical Provision. The team already works in collaboration with the IGU and partners, but the potential to continue the service beyond the life of the grant and extend the current offer will also be considered as part of the Early Help Review.</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>In terms of immediate actions to respond to this recommendation and also to inform the Early Help Review, the Children and Families Service will be reviewing representation from the Service at key panels, including the weekly Gangs Panel, the Partnership Tasking Panel and the Alternative Provision Panel.</p> <p>The Children and Families Service will review the support offer/services available at times of higher incidences of crime (Friday evenings and Saturday), reflecting initial feedback from the Young Futures Commission.</p> <p>The Children and Families Service will also look at providing trauma-informed practice training within the IGU which would be delivered by the in-house Clinical Service.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Recommendation 5 – For the IGU to report back on mental health services referral pathway for young adults in the IGU cohort</u></p> <p>With no dedicated mental health resource currently based within the IGU, we see the need for assurance around the referral pathways in place setting out the scenarios in which the IGU will seek mental health support for young adults in its cohort, and the routes that it will take to doing so. This assurance should be provided in the form of a formal referral pathway being shared with us.</p> <p>The East London NHS Foundation Trust (ELFT) provides community and inpatient mental health services to children, young people and adults in Hackney. We feel that the referral pathway should be developed in partnership with ELFT, and that regular reviews should be carried out to monitor its effectiveness in brokering</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>The IGU has recently made a successful funding application to the Violence Reduction Unit to recruit a mental health professional to work within the IGU to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide a service to a number of appropriate cases with a particular focus on the 18 to 25 age group where mental health has been identified. ● Identify appropriate mental health pathways supporting indictable through the process. ● To provide advice and guidance to existing IGU professionals to better identify and respond to mental health concerns. <p>This post is currently proceeding through the recruitment process with the funding being available to 31st March, 2021.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the VRU funded role will be undertaken in six months with the intention of utilising the review to negotiate with the East London</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>mental health support for those within the cohort.</p> | <p>Foundation Trust (ELFT) to mainstream the resource in 2021/22.</p> <p>A formal referral pathway will be developed with ELFT and shared with the Commission.</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 6 – ELFT as partner in IGU</u></p> <p>In the longer term, we feel there should be a mental health specialism inside the IGU¹.</p> <p>We have seen the benefits of a co-located, IGU model. We have also heard about the prevalence of mental health issues among those in the cohort, both among those aged up to 19 and those above this.</p> <p>We ask that the Council seeks to explore with ELFT the feasibility of their becoming a partner agency of the IGU, and for them to provide a dedicated mental health specialist resource.</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>This recommendation is intrinsically linked to 5 above.</p> <p>Contact will be made with (ELFT) with the intention of gaining their expertise and support to design the post profile for the IGU mental health professional (funded by VRU to 31/3/21).</p> <p>As a key partner ELFT will be involved in identifying options around how this role will be mainstreamed at the conclusion of the VRU funding allocation.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 7 – For the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission to explore mental health provision for 19-25s compared to young people aged under 18</u></p> <p>We feel that an item at the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission might explore the differences in mental health provision for those aged up to 18, and those aged 19 to 25.</p> <p>We suggest that to give best focus to the item, that it might explore typical mental health provision and arrangements for 15 to 18s compared to 19 to 25s. This is due to Hackney's</p> | <p>Recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 of the review are directed at Scrutiny Commissions in the first instance.</p> <p>Responses to these have been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs and appear in Appendix 1.</p> |
|--|---|

¹ If enacted, one of our recommendations would see greater involvement of the Children and Families Service within the IGU which we would hope would include the Clinical Service offering specialist psychological support to children aged up to 19 and their families.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Community Safety Partnership's Strategic Assessment findings around the peak (starting) age ranges for involvement in gang flagged crimes and knife flagged crimes.</p> | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 8 – Applying learning from pilot delivery of mental health provision in community settings, to the IGU</u></p> <p>Mental ill health is a common issue among both children and adults being worked with by the IGU. A significant share of the cohort is made up of black boys and young men. Evidence shows that tailored approaches can provide more effective pathways to mental health care for this community group, in cases where it is needed. This is due to cultural and structural barriers which can make traditional routes less accessible.</p> <p>We note the pilot led by the East London NHS Foundation Trust which delivered support in community settings. This was found to better enable young black men with mental health needs, to engage, compared to traditional primary care routes.</p> <p>We ask for an assessment – led by the Executive Members with responsibility for Health, Community Safety, and the Improving Outcomes for Young Black Men Programme – to be carried out exploring whether and how learning from this pilot can be applied within the IGU.</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>A mental health group exists as part of the Improving Outcomes for Young Black Men Programme that is chaired by Amy Wilkinson, Programme Director for Children Families and Maternity Services Workstream of Integrated Commissioning and Alice Deacon, Assistant Head of Service for Young Hackney.</p> <p>The approach taken by ELFT will inform the work to be undertaken by the IGU Mental Health professional. Links to the YBM initiative are already well established through a variety of forums .</p> <p>Progress towards the adoption of the ELFT pilot will be monitored at the GSVB with an estimated deadline for implementation of the IGU approach being 1 March 2020.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 9 – For any future pre-apprenticeship programmes to include the IGU cohort in any ring-fencing arrangement</u></p> <p>We ask that any future pre-apprenticeship programmes by the</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>The IGU is undertaking work to scope the likely demand for apprenticeship positions from the IGU cohort and those young people at risk of gang exploitation. This scoping work will also include analysis of the extent to which a pre-</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Council include the IGU cohort within any ring-fencing arrangement, and also that the IGU and the Hackney Works Service explore how the IGU cohort can be best supported to accessing these opportunities.</p> | <p>apprenticeship programme, along the lines of existing traineeship programme developed by the Council, would be required in order to ensure these young people are ready and likely to succeed on an apprenticeship.</p> <p>Once the scoping work has been completed, recommendations will be made to the Gangs and Serious Violence Board (GSVB) outlining the delivery options.</p> <p>The proposed options analysis will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ringfencing apprenticeship posts for this cohort ● integrating this cohort within the existing apprenticeship programme ● developing a bespoke pre-apprenticeship programme for this cohort, to provide a stepping stone to an apprenticeship, work placement and/or job. <p>The options paper will be produced by 1 April 2020.</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 10 – For the Skills, Economy and Growth Commission to explore employment and skills support for ex-offenders</u></p> <p>We note the well-known difficulties ex-offenders face in securing work – both those within the IGU cohort and ex-offenders more broadly. We recommend that the Skills, Economy and Growth Commission explores how the Council and its partners (including the private sector) are working to provide employment and skills support to this group generally, and the feasibility of a dedicated support offer by the Hackney Works Service.</p> | <p>Recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 of the review are directed at Scrutiny Commissions in the first instance.</p> <p>Responses to these have been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs and appear in Appendix 1.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 11 – For the IGU to consult the community on a possible name change</u></p> | <p>Response</p> <p>From consultation with key individual community networks together with gang</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>On a local level we ask the Council considers changing the name of the Integrated Gangs Unit, in consultation with the community. We feel that a name change could give some assurance to those suffering stigmatisation from the careless way in which the term gang is sometimes used.</p> | <p>professionals it was felt that the IGU is becoming a well known brand within affected communities particularly through the work of the IGU Community Co-ordinations.</p> <p>It is our intention to dedicate an agenda item at the IGU Community Forum to consult with key individual community members concerning this recommendation.</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 12 – To report back on how the findings of mapping exercise are being taken forward</u></p> <p>We welcome the significant work by the Council, partners and the wider community which has enabled the production of the provision mapping resource. We see the challenge now as ensuring continued focus on this area by all partners, and achieving a joined up response to those aspects where improvement / greater focus was needed. For our part, we would suggest that they might be translated into a mutually agreed action plan.</p> <p>We ask that the Council – further to discussions with its partners – reports back to the Commission on how these challenges can be best met.</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>The Mapping Exercise which was shared with the Commission in November 2018 was used to inform the development of an action plan. Oversight of this action plan sits with the Community Resilience Partnership which is part of the Community Safety Partnership, and brings statutory partners together with a broader range of voluntary and community sector organisations. Their role is to discuss the broader risks and issues related to community safety that require partnership action, cross-cutting themes and community engagement.</p> <p>The priorities in the action plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Developing our network - improving how we engage and collaborate with the ● Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS). ● Engaging and involving parents/carers and communities. ● Improving confidence and trust in Policing. ● Engaging Young people. ● Reducing school exclusions. ● Improving outcomes for young black men. ● Reducing harm. <p>We have also undertaken a piece of work to improve and make our community more systematic in the aftermath of a serious violence incident.</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Some of the issues which were identified through the mapping related to service improvement. These have been fed back to the relevant services and have informed wider service development. In some cases there will be the opportunity to align this improvement with the outcomes from the Young Futures Commission as well.</p> <p>Many of the issues that were identified call for a greater cross cutting whole systems approach to tackling serious violence; we have been developing this approach and will be taking it forward in 2020.</p> <p>We are happy to report back to the Commission during the next municipal year.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 13 – Ongoing engagement between Chief Executive and Inspirational Leaders</u></p> <p>Inspirational leaders of the YBM Programme made a number of points around barriers to opportunities and positive outcomes. We welcomed the response of the Council’s Chief Executive to these points.</p> <p>This included a commitment to continued engagement from the Council with Inspirational Leaders.</p> <p>One of the specific barriers mentioned was a lack of facilities and spaces to develop businesses within. On this point, the Chief Executive spoke on the Council seeking to provide more workspaces through utilisation of unused spaces. He felt that shares of these might be made available for</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>The leadership and governance of the YBM programme has been reviewed to enable youth leadership over the direction and vision for the programme. In the new structure, oversight of the programme will ultimately be via this community panel. Council officers will be expected to engage and to be accountable for the impact of delivery to this new panel.</p> <p>The Chief Executive is happy to meet with the youth leaders to discuss the new governance for the programme as part of its implementation. It would be helpful to discuss their ideas for how to make the governance as impactful as possible.</p> <p>However, we would also suggest that the engagement with senior officers goes well beyond this, so that there is an emphasis on the systems change and</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>young people wanting to start-up businesses.</p> <p>Another barrier mentioned was a lack of advice and guidance for those interested in setting up businesses. In response the Chief Executive said that he would reflect on how the Landing Pad which the Council was seeking to provide for new businesses to the borough (to better enable access to business planning, financial and other advice) could be made available more widely.</p> <p>We ask that the Chief Executive meets Inspirational Leaders to explore how these aspects and any others can be taken forward.</p> | <p>systems leadership within the organisation, rather than relying on the idea that for actions to take place the Chief Executive has to be involved. This would mean that a regular cycle of meetings will be held with leads on delivery of programme work (e.g. Directors or Heads of Service). The youth leaders will be split into project teams and will engage with specific senior officers based on the theme outlined (in this case Serious Youth Violence).</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Recommendation 14 – For the Council to continue to make the case for a reversal of local Police Officer reductions</u></p> <p>We call for the Mayor of London to continue to make the case for a fair settlement for the MPS, and for the Council to lobby towards ensuring that any more realistic London wide funding is translated into a greater local police presence in Hackney.</p> | <p>Response</p> <p>This will continue to be a political priority informed by the Community Safety Cabinet lead.</p> <p>On 19 October 2019 the government announced that funding will be made available in 2020/21 for an extra 6,000 Police Officers nationally.</p> <p>Although the exact numbers of new recruits within Hackney for this period has not been confirmed it is proposed that any local increase will be dedicated to proactive street based activities, including the reduction in gang related violence.</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 15 – For the Police and Monitoring Groups to provide annual updates to Living in Hackney Scrutiny on stop and search activity, and the engagement between them</u></p> | <p>Recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 of the review are directed at Scrutiny Commissions in the first instance.</p> <p>Responses to these have been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs and appear in Appendix 1.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Living in Hackney Scrutiny will seek to re-establish annual updates on stop and search activity, the engagement between the police and monitoring groups, and the outcomes of this. We hope that this can help better ensure on-going engagement.</p> <p>In reflection of our findings from the discussion with the police and monitoring groups, we will include consideration of the points below, within the next item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of body worn camera dip sampling exercises (we heard that these had started only recently) • Engagement of the community in training • Section 60 communications and consultation (both monitoring groups reported that the engagement of the police prior to enacting Section 60 notices fell immediately after the move to the BCU model, and the BCU themselves acknowledged they were working on addressing this issue) | |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 16 – For Community Safety Partnership to provide annual updates to Living in Hackney on its Trust and Confidence Action Plan</u></p> <p>The Commission will seek annual updates against the Action Plan regarding Trust and Confidence, from the Community Safety Partnership.</p> <p>In line with our review findings in this area, as part of the first item we will seek updates on:</p> | <p>Recommendations 7, 10, 15 and 16 of the review are directed at Scrutiny Commissions in the first instance.</p> <p>Responses to these have been provided by the relevant Scrutiny Commission Chairs and appear in Appendix 1.</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">● The status and activities of the BCU-wide Confidence and Satisfaction Board● The BCU's engagement with the Young People's Independent Advisory Group● The BCU's work to maintain active engagement with the community and to improve communication of engagement events● Any action by the BCU to facilitate greater engagement between the community and central MPS units. | |
|---|--|

Cabinet Response to the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission Investigation into Council and partnership response to escalation in serious violence

Appendix 1 - Responses to recommendations for Scrutiny Commissions

Implementation of four of the recommendations from the review would rely in the first instance on Scrutiny Commissions seeking to incorporate particular items into their work programmes.

This considered, responses to each of these recommendations have been provided by the Chairs of the relevant Scrutiny Commission, and are included in this appendix for Cabinet to note.

It is important to note that implementation would also rely on engagement and facilitation by the Council and external partners. The Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission will monitor this engagement and facilitation as appropriate.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><u>Recommendation 7 – For the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission to explore mental health provision for 19-25s compared to young people aged under 18</u></p> <p>We feel that an item at the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission might explore the differences in mental health provision for those aged up to 18, and those aged 19 to 25.</p> <p>We suggest that to give best focus to the item, that it might explore typical mental health provision and arrangements for 15 to 18s compared to 19 to 25s. This is due to Hackney’s Community Safety Partnership’s Strategic Assessment findings around the peak (starting) age ranges for involvement in gang flagged crimes and knife flagged crimes.</p> | <p>Response (Cllr Ben Hayhurst, Chair, Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission):</p> <p>I am supportive of the value of scrutiny comparing and contrasting the extent and nature of the mental health services available for young people at different times during their adolescence. I will consult Members and the support officer for the Commission on the most appropriate format for any item or review into this area, and on how this can be incorporated into our forward planning.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Recommendation 10 – For the Skills, Economy and Growth Commission to explore employment and skills support for ex-offenders</u></p> <p>We note the well-known difficulties ex-offenders face in securing work – both those within the IGU cohort and ex-</p> | <p>Response (Cllr Mete Coban, Chair, Skills, Economy and Growth Commission):</p> <p>I am supportive of scrutiny exploring the important topic of skills and employment support for ex offenders. I agree that this should include consideration of the support given to ex offenders in the</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>offenders more broadly. We recommend that the Skills, Economy and Growth Commission explores how the Council and its partners (including the private sector) are working to provide employment and skills support to this group generally, and the feasibility of a dedicated support offer by the Hackney Works Service.</p> | <p>borough by the Council and its Hackney Works Service specifically, and by our partners. I will consult with Members and the support officer for the Commission on the most appropriate format for any item or review into this area, and on how this can be incorporated into our forward planning.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Recommendation 15 – For the Police and Monitoring Groups to provide annual updates to Living in Hackney Scrutiny on stop and search activity, and the engagement between them</u></p> <p>Living in Hackney Scrutiny will seek to re-establish annual updates on stop and search activity, the engagement between the police and monitoring groups, and the outcomes of this. We hope that this can help better ensure on-going engagement.</p> <p>In reflection of our findings from the discussion with the police and monitoring groups, we will include consideration of the points below, within the next item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Extent of body worn camera dip sampling exercises (we heard that these had started only recently) ● Engagement of the community in training ● Section 60 communications and consultation (both monitoring groups reported that the engagement of the police prior to enacting Section 60 notices fell immediately after the move to the BCU model, and the BCU themselves acknowledged they were working on addressing this issue) | <p>Response (Cllr Sharon Patrick, Chair, Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission):</p> <p>The Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission will liaise with the Police and the Stop and Search Monitoring Groups in order to seek to receive annual updates around stop and search activity, the work of the monitoring groups, and on the extent of engagement between these stakeholders.</p> <p>The first of these annual updates is planned for the Commission’s meeting in March 2020. This will give specific consideration to the points flagged in the recommendation.</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Recommendation 16 – For Community Safety Partnership to provide annual updates to Living in Hackney on its Trust and Confidence Action Plan</u></p> <p>The Commission will seek annual updates against the Action Plan regarding Trust and Confidence, from the Community Safety Partnership.</p> <p>In line with our review findings in this area, as part of the first item we will seek updates on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The status and activities of the BCU-wide Confidence and Satisfaction Board ● The BCU’s engagement with the Young People’s Independent Advisory Group ● The BCU’s work to maintain active engagement with the community and to improve communication of engagement events ● Any action by the BCU to facilitate greater engagement between the community and central MPS units. | <p>Response (Cllr Sharon Patrick, Chair, Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission):</p> <p>During its review the Commission heard that an action plan on trust and confidence this was being developed within the new Community Safety Partnership Plan.</p> <p>We will liaise with the Co-Chairs of the Community Safety Partnership to seek annual updates against this action plan.</p> <p>The first of these annual updates is planned for the Commission’s meeting in March 2020. This will give specific consideration within the item to the points flagged in the recommendation.</p> |
|--|---|

This page is intentionally left blank



| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| <p>Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission</p> <p>30th September 2020</p> <p>Item 7 – Update on Thames Water Donation for Lea Bridge Distribution / Use of Funds</p> | <p>Item No</p> <p>7</p> |
|--|--------------------------------|

Outline

In response to the letter sent by the Chair of the LiH Scrutiny Commission to Thames Water - relaying the concerns raised by a Commission Member around what was described as continuing issues following the mains burst and resulting flooding in Lea Bridge in October 2018 - the Council received a £10,000 donation specifically in recognition of the impact caused by the 2018 mains burst and flood in the Lea Bridge Ward, and that it is intended as a goodwill donation for the community affected by this specific incident over and above any compensation owed to individual claimants.

The Commission asked the ward councillors to make recommendations and suggest ideas for spend to benefit the local community. Following some consultation with residents the ward councillors recommended giving £5k to Hackney Foodbank and £5k to a local playgroup in the Ward.

In relation to the governance for the funding. LBH Officers are recommending the following:

1. The donations are unrestricted, i.e. the Trustees and management of the organisations can decide what the best use of the funds is.
2. The Grants Team write to both organisations with a letter of agreement. The agreement letter will advised them about the Thames Water gift and that a proportion of the funds are being passed on to them. The Grants Team will contact them in six months (if that is what is agreed) to ask for the short update detailing how they used the funds, to be shared with Cllrs and the public through appropriate channels such as ward forums/scrutiny commission/press releases.

The Hackney Council Grants Team will administer this process on behalf of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission and the Lea Bridge Ward Councillors.

The discussion will cover:

The Commission to approve the allocation of funds (taking into consideration the recommendation by the local ward councillors from Lea Bridge Ward) and to agree the governance process or any restrictions on the donations e.g. for a specific use.

Attending for this item will be:

London Borough of Hackney

- **Cllr Ian Rathbone**, Ward Councillor for Lea Bridge

Action

The Commission is asked to approve the allocation of the funds and the governance process for the distribution and use of funds.



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission 30th September 2020 Item 8 – Minutes of the Previous Meeting | Item No 8 |
|--|---------------------|

Outline

The draft minutes of the meeting of the 15th July 2020 are enclosed.

Matter arising from 15th July 2020 meeting:

Action

Page 48 point 4.12 bullet point xxiii

The Head of Neighbourhoods, East Region from Peabody to check and confirm if back office staff were furloughed during lockdown.

Response

A verbal update at the meeting from the Chair.

Action

Page 56 point 7.6

The Chair to set up round table meeting date for Commission and the Borough Commander.

Response

The meeting has been set up for 1st October 2020. Members of the Commission have been sent a meeting invite.

Action

The Commission are asked to review and agree the minutes, and to note the responses to actions arising from previous meetings.

This page is intentionally left blank

London Borough of Hackney
Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission
Municipal Year 2020/21
Wednesday, 15th July, 2020

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

Chair: Councillor Sharon Patrick

Councillors in Attendance: Cllr Sade Etti (Vice-Chair), Cllr Anthony McMahon, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Penny Wrout and Cllr Anna Lynch

Apologies:

Officers In Attendance: James Goddard (Director, Regeneration), Donna Bryce (Head of Resident Safety, Housing Services) and David Padfield (Interim Director, Housing Services)

Other People in Attendance: John Cockerham (Director of Customer Service Operations, Guinness Partnership), Helderda Costa, Ruth Davison (Chief Executive), Councillor Clayeon McKenzie (Cabinet Member for Housing Services), Steve Webster (Chair, Hackney Residents Liaison Group), Jess Mullins (External Affairs Manager (London)), Zoe Pratten (Head of Housing, North London), Stefanie Turton (Head of Housing (London)), Vatel Ntankeu (Head of Neighbourhoods, East Region) and Alistair Smyth (Head of External Affairs, Guinness Partnership)

Members of the Public:

Officer Contact: Tracey Anderson
☎ 0208 356 3312
✉ tracey.anderson@hackney.gov.uk

Councillor Sharon Patrick in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies for absence from Cllr Moema, Mayoral Adviser for Private renting and housing affordability; Cllr Rennison, Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Finance and Housing Needs.
- 1.2 Officer apologies for absence from Matthew Parsonage, from Clarion Housing Group; Victoria Whittle, from Clarion Housing Group and Claire Raindrop from Peabody.

2 Urgent Items / Order of Business

2.1 There are no urgent items or changes to the order of business.

3 Declarations of Interest

3.1 The Commission Members made the following declarations of Interest:

3.1.1 Cllr Lynch is a shared ownership leaseholder of Hackney Council.

3.1.2 Cllr Patrick is a leaseholder of Hackney Council.

3.1.3 Cllr Rathbone informed his wife is a tenant of Peabody Housing Association.

3.1.4 Cllr McMahon is a leaseholder and Chair of a Tenant Management Organisation in the borough.

4 Exploring the work of Housing Associations in Hackney Scrutiny Review - Evidence Session

4 The Chair welcomed to the meeting James Goddard, Interim Director Regeneration from London Borough of Hackney.

4.1 The Chair welcomed to the meeting the following officers from Housing Associations and the National Housing Federation:

- Vatel Ntankeu, Head of Neighbourhoods, East Region from Peabody
- Ruth Davison, Chief Executive of Islington and Shoreditch Housing Association (ISHA)
- Alistair Smyth, Head of External Affairs from Guinness Trust and John Cockerham, Director of Operations for Maintenance from Guinness Trust
- Stefanie Turton, Head of Housing from Sanctuary Housing Association
- Zoe Pratten, Head of Housing, North London from Clarion Housing Group
- Jess Mullins, External Affairs Manager (London) from National Housing Federation.

4.2 The Chair explained this was the last evidence session for the scrutiny review exploring the partnership working of housing associations in Hackney. A selection of housing associations agreed to participate in this discussion.

4.3 The Chair outlined this item will cover 3 areas of discussion.

- 1) Improving community investment by housing associations, approaches to supporting their residents to succeed, and partnership with the Council to improve social and economic wellbeing.
- 2) Improving recycling on estates across the borough and the request of Registered Social Landlords (RSLs).
- 3) The strengths of formal partnership arrangements.

- 4.4 The meeting commenced with a discussion about the strengths of formal partnership arrangements with an opening presentation from the Interim Director Regeneration from Hackney Council.
- 4.4.1 The Director explained this was a verbal update setting out the vision, thinking and work to date by the council in relation to developing partnership arrangements for Hackney council with Registered Providers (RPs) operating in the borough.
- 4.4.2 Hackney has been exploring how to formally set up their partnership arrangements and wants to co-design this with the RPs in the borough.
- 4.4.3 The council anticipates that this will have 3 levels of operation. The first being more formal covering things like nominations agreements, governance and forums. Semi contractual and contractual type activities and how grants are used etc.
- 4.4.4 The second level will be semi informal e.g. covering areas like a sales protocol that RPs can access to help work in partnership in this arena.
- 4.4.5 The lower level will be where the partnership working operates.
- 4.4.6 The Director pointed out Hackney does have a housing forum called the Better Homes Partnerships. There are 2 structures. One covering management and the other covering development. The partnerships meet quarterly so there are a total of 8 meetings a year. The meetings have themed discussions like smoking cessation and they are chaired by the housing associations. The council facilitates the discussions.
- 4.5 The Head of Neighbourhoods from Peabody outlined the following main points.
- 4.5.1 He works across 10 different boroughs therefore he agreed formal partnership working can be difficult when there is no structure. The officer pointed out it works better with a formal structure.
- 4.5.2 Although Peabody attend Hackney's Better Homes Partnership the officer acknowledge there was a gap.
- 4.5.3 The officer cited the develop work of a compact agreement by Waltham Forest Borough. Highlighting they engaged with residents and partners to develop the compact. The engagement reflected the work stream and was a good structure. The partners have clarity about the objectives they are working towards at the beginning of the year.
- 4.5.4 The officer pointed out the advantage of having a structure means no duplication among partner's work, particularly for areas like community investment. In the officers view from working with other boroughs he has observed that resources are better pooled together for the benefit of residents overall.
- 4.6 The Chief Executive from ISHA outlined the following main points.
- 4.6.1 To commence the Chief Executive asked Hackney to clearly define what they want to achieve through formal partnership working.

- 4.6.2 The officer pointed out if Hackney's vision was to build a fairer, safer and more sustainable borough for residents this aligns with ISHA's vision. ISHA could help to support the delivery of that vision.
- 4.6.3 ISHA help to deliver this vision by building and helping others to build through alliance.
- 4.6.4 ISHA is a London living wage employer and insist their contractors are too. ISHA is serious about environmental sustainability too.
- 4.6.5 ISHA would like to partner with Hackney for them to understand how they build. They build social rented homes not affordable rent homes.
- 4.6.6 The fairer aspect of their vision aligns with Hackney's inclusive economy. This is covered in more detail in the written information provided in the agenda.
- 4.6.7 In regards to safety ISHA are of the view this is key for local authorities and housing associations to work together. Particularly around building fire safety. ISHA commented that the building safety fund announced would provide full refund for remedial action to building works. However this does not apply to social sector housing only the private sector. ISHA urged all local authorities and housing associations in London to come together and lobby about this.
- 4.6.8 In reference to sustainability, the drive to zero carbon and EPPC homes gives more money to residents and delivers the inclusive/fairer agenda.
- 4.6.9 In regards to partnership working ISHA was chairing the development forum - part of the Better Homes Partnership - until the retirement of their officer. The officer commented the partnership would benefit from more consistent attendance both from housing associations and the local authority and good strong discussion on issues that affect them all.
- 4.6.10 The officer pointed out ISHA have not been involved in the management forum of the Better Homes Partnership but they would like to be.
- 4.6.11 ISHA would welcome a stronger partnership approach between housing associations and the council going forward.
- 4.7 The Head of External Affairs from Guinness Trust outlined the following main points.
 - 4.7.1 As a national organisation they are involved in a number of partnerships nationally.
 - 4.7.2 Locally the organisation is working well operationally with Hackney Council and would welcome closer working and support the co-production principles and ideas.
 - 4.7.3 Guinness Trust is working with another London borough on a more strategic partnership which has recently been implemented. They welcomed a more strategic focused partnership.
 - 4.7.4 Local colleagues have attended the better homes partnership meetings in the past and found them useful.

- 4.7.5 Guinness Trust agrees with ISHA that regular attendance and a clear plan and agreements for priorities is key for residents.
- 4.7.6 The officer pointed out the pandemic and last 4 months has highlighted the importance of their role with residents and the community.
- 4.7.7 Guinness Trust supported the development of a structured partnership and was happy to be involved.
- 4.8 The Head of Housing from Sanctuary Housing Association outlined the following main points.
 - 4.8.1 Agreed with the comments made by other colleagues in the meeting.
 - 4.8.2 The officer highlighted the properties they manage in Hackney are real communities.
 - 4.8.3 They have a lot of partnership working on the estates to work with the local community.
 - 4.8.4 The current partnerships has been operational and transactional. Sanctuary would be keen to have a more strategic partnership.
 - 4.8.5 Moving forward resources will be stretched for everyone and therefore partnership arranges can ensure that resources are best placed to help communities.
 - 4.8.6 Part of the motivation for Sanctuary Housing implementing the Head of Housing post for London was to improve the quality of partnership working in London boroughs.
 - 4.8.7 Sanctuary Housing would welcome being part of the co-production process and reiterated the same comments as previous speakers.
- 4.9 The Head of Housing, North London from Clarion Housing Group outlined the following main points.
 - 4.9.1 The officer explained she had just taken over the housing management for Hackney in November 2019.
 - 4.9.2 The housing association manages approximately 2000 properties in hackney.
 - 4.9.3 The officer works across 7 boroughs and 17 estates across North London boroughs.
 - 4.9.4 Agreed with fellow colleagues about attendance at the Better Homes Partnership. Pointing out she had not attended because she was unaware of these meetings. The officer suggested there was some form of mechanism to inform new personnel.
 - 4.9.5 The officer pointed out colleagues within her organisation had spoken positively about the arrangements they have in place with Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest boroughs. There is a forum for the executive to talk about various issues and sub meetings for specific issue like public realm. Colleagues had

commented they found it helpful to join up all housing associations to find solutions to common problems they all faced. This was important because resources are stretched. It would make sure residents get access to the right support and financial assistance.

- 4.9.6 In reference to recycling Clarion have found significant increases in bulk consumption on estates and fly tipping. They would welcome closer working with Hackney to resolve or find solutions. Particularly for fly tipping and recycling alongside better enforcement across the borough. In Clarion's view these were 2 areas that would benefit from formal arrangements.
- 4.9.7 Clarion would support looking the development of formal arrangements and would welcome being involved in the co-production of the arrangements.
- 4.10 The External Affairs Manager (London) from National Housing Federation outlined the following main points.
- 4.10.1 The national housing federation is the trade body for housing associations.
- 4.10.2 The National Housing Federation believes there is value in local partnership working. They encourage and create opportunities for their members to work with local authorities.
- 4.10.3 The value of partnership working runs through the federation and is part of their business strategy.
- 4.10.4 Their Members acknowledge partnership working is central to the sector to deliver on its ambition.
- 4.10.5 They recognise working together is the best way to tackle some of the shared challenges they all face.
- 4.10.6 Their written submission focused on 3 broad areas of key partnership working. But there are different models and structures to explore, that can be adopted depending on formality and scope. Key to this is the aims of the partnership.
- 4.10.7 Their written submission identified some of the common characteristics for good partnership working. It is important to have shared and agreed vision, values and objectives to build trust and for it to be led by senior leaders. In all these areas they have noted the benefit for everyone working together to achieve the areas outlined in written submission.
- 4.10.8 A good partnership values compromise, flexibility and good communication. Ensuring the partnership is well resources from the outset.
- 4.10.9 There can be barriers to partnerships working such as a lack of trust between parties and reluctance to share the credits of success. Also disagreements over issues. In addition there are also barriers like the lack of time and resources being invested up front in the partnership.
- 4.10.10 The officer made reference to case studies in the written submission.
- 4.11 The positive comments to the idea of formal partnership structures from housing partners was welcomed by the Commission.

4.12 **Questions, Discussion and Comments**

- (i) **Members asked if the Better Homes Partnership had powers or was it an information sharing structure. Asking if the partnership groups could make changes following resident views or requests?**

The Interim Director Regeneration from LBH informed Members it was a mixture. They have powers in relation to areas like nomination agreements, domestic violence and governance. There are also some areas of work where they do not have controls/powers but this work is achieved through relationships and protocols. The Director pointed out there are no formal arrangements in place for redress / chasing if things go wrong. For example the current nominations agreement is run by East London but it is out of date by 10 years. In Hackney they have no formal forum to review this and make changes for agreement with their local RPs.

Having a partnership / signed document by chief executives will help them to work well together through a set of partnership standards.

The officer advised the new arrangements could be trailed and reviewed after 12 months to consider how it's working.

- (ii) **Members asked about the steps taken or positive achievements since the last scrutiny evidence session.**

In response the officer confirmed he has had contact with all RPs that were present at the meeting. There has been more interest and uptake of their grant. There has been more interest and uptake around nominations agreements and disrepair cases. There is still progress to be made but this has slowed due to Covid-19, as all organisations moved to emergency services. This is important because they were making good progress following the scrutiny meeting, but it is estimated the pandemic has put this work back by 4 months. In the next 6 months there is a lot of catching up to do.

- (iii) **Members asked Peabody to confirm if they would be willing to participate in the development of a formal partnership structure in Hackney.**

In response the officer from Peabody confirmed they would.

- (iv) **The Chair suggested the Commission monitors the progress of the partnership structure. The Chair asked if the interim Director Regeneration could return with a brief update in September 2020 and then a full update in December 2020.**

In response the Interim Director of Regeneration from LBH agreed with the points made by the partners and confirmed the council has been in discussion with other London boroughs about their arrangements. The officer reiterated the development of this partnership would be achieved through co-production. The Director pointed out there are 56 known register providers in the borough and the Council's aim is to capture the views of all the RPs for the development process.

The Director informed the partnership would cover development as well as housing management.

The Director pointed out there are different forms of partnership like compacts and federations. During the development process they will be looking at the different structures to consider what would work best for Hackney.

The Co-Chair of Hackney's Resident Liaison Group (RLG) commented the RLG is part of Hackney's housing structure to encourage residents' voice in the development of policy and service improvements. The Co-Chair pointed out there is a lot of expertise in managing fly tipping and waste and encouraged all partners to come together. The Co-Chair also pleaded for registered providers to speak to residents to get their views and ideas as they develop their work.

The Chair suggested the RLG and housing association other residents groups could come together to discuss.

- (v) The Head of Housing from Clarion asked if Hackney had a strategy for recycling. The officer pointed out there was the potential to do more for example with food waste. The officer asked for more information and the contact details of who to speak to at the council.**

In response the Chair of the Commission confirmed Hackney Council did have a recycling strategy and that this was recently agreed by Cabinet. A key ambition was to increase recycling rates.

The Interim Director Regeneration from LBH informed he would make contact after the meeting.

The officer pointed out this was as example of what the partnership could cover.

- (vi) Members commented that Hackney's housing estates have food waste recycling. Members urged RPs to look into having this as it is a good time to expand. Members pointed out Hackney Council has been developing some strategies and following investment these have been trailed e.g. new collection facilities and times, literature to residents to boost recycling rates etc. Members suggested this was a good opportunity for LBH to share the benefits of their trail work, so Partners could see what can be achieved with investment.**
- (vii) Members referred to the report on page 109 in the agenda and highlighted there was no mention of working with Tenant Resident Association (TRAs) to help communicate with residents about recycling. Members pointed out TRAs are a good way to get information out to residents.**
- (viii) Members asked if the housing associations present were willing to implement recycling on their estates in Hackney.**
- (ix) Members asked Hackney Council to confirm if recycling on estates had increased and urged all parties to work with TRAs.**
- (x) Members made reference to Guinness Trust moving services online and asked how they were capturing residents that were digitally excluded. Members pointed out Hackney had a big digital divide.**

(xi) Members also asked the housing associations worked with other each other in partnership or on projects.

In response the Director of Operations for Maintenance from Guinness Trust confirmed the written information in the agenda advises that their core services have moved online. This has given them capacity to deal with more enquires over the phone and more residents across the country.

They also work with other agencies like DWP to help solve residents' issues and sign post them to other agencies.

This gives capacity to do more for more people. The officer pointed out they do have local teams on the ground who work directly with residents. These officers liaise with colleagues in the organisation to get the right support / information if they are not able to access digital channels. They still do visits and urgent surgeries for residents with access issues to digital channels.

Guinness Trust confirmed they do work with other housing associations for formal joint ventures like building homes and they have less formal arrangements that cover specific issues in specific areas like fly tipping campaigns etc. They have lots of experience of working with local authorities too.

The Interim Director Regeneration confirmed Hackney has good collection rates for recycling. The Council is not in a position to do more to involve residents to improve rates. Do things like have green champions to provide better information and change behaviours. Having a formal partnership would help to bring RPs together for work areas like recycling.

A key aims is to then turn the rhetoric into action plans. The Director confirmed he could provide an update in December 2020.

In response to Members questions ISHA confirmed they have formal arrangements with North River Alliance. This partnership was established 15 years ago and works with 11 housing associations for development. This partnership has built 3500 homes in the last 15 years. In Hackney they have a formal arrangements with the North London Muslim Housing Association and they build on their behalf.

(xii) Members referred to ISHA's recycling targets (21% by March 2021). Members asked about their progress to achieving this target, how they intent to meet the target and if Covid-19 had impacted achievement of this target.

In response ISHA confirmed work on recycling has slowed during lockdown. During Covid-19 they have focused on vulnerability welfare and shielding.

In reference to digital exclusion ISHA found there were older people who could order online but were lonely. Therefore their weekly calls helped those residents. The organisation is looking at the good elements to keep from lockdown, like good communication with residents.

In relation to recycling they did a big piece of work 2 years ago and that achieved shift gold - a housing sustainability award for all elements of their business practices. But in their hostels they do not have good recycling provision and they are working with residents to improve this.

Having a partnership that joins up those areas of work on recycling would be welcomed. ISHA confirmed they have not worked closely with Hackney in relation to their recycling strategy.

The officer was unable to confirm at the meeting the progress against the target but highlighted they are working with residents.

(xiii) The Chair asked the other housing association to comment in their recycling and their work with residents to encourage recycling.

In response the Head of Neighbourhoods, East Region from Peabody advised in Hackney they were part of an initiative where local residents could bring their white goods for repair to sell or to recycle.

The officer agreed that partnership can be formal and informal and in his experience this can be reactive to resolve issues. Formalising the relationship should lead to better outcomes and impacts for residents due to pooling resources.

(xiv) Members asked what worked well and what has not during Covid-19 and what lessons have been learnt to take forward.

In response the Interim Director Regeneration from LBH advised the council has been in contact with approximately 16/17 registered providers to talk about services, repairs, food, digital exclusion and to check the challenges. The initial themes at the start related to PPE, getting operatives to buildings, and ensuring people who need to shield could shield.

These themes have transitioned to questions like "how to manage this long term and being virtual". With formal partnership working they can build on the relationships built up during Covid and before to consider how they can face the challenges of the next 6 months together.

In response the Head of Neighbourhoods, East Region from Peabody advised one of the areas that has been challenging is domestic violence. Particularly being able to identify DV. The real challenge has been the loss of visiting contact. They decided to give known victims a weekly call for welfare checks. They also keep an eye on requests and queries coming in, to look for usual trends such as a high number of door key requests. Minimising contact during this period has impacted on identifying other issues too. There needs to be reflection to consider how they can find other ways to identify vulnerabilities.

The Co-Chair of the Resident Liaison Group (RLG) commented as a local resident group they have been actively involved and have offered support to residents shielding on the estate. They have been working with the Council's volunteers to get food, prescriptions etc. out. They have also helped to ensure issue are referred to the council for escalating.

In response to the question the officers from Guinness Trust confirmed they have been doing welfare calls.

Guinness Trust recognised a large proportion were being helped by the wider community, however they also discovered a new group that was on the margins e.g. board line poverty. They have come to light from the impact of furlough, the pandemic and redundancies. The pandemic has propelled a new group of residents to the fore. They were unknown previously. The officers suggested the new partnership could look at this group.

The Guinness Trust highlighted that a particular problem going forward was isolation and they need to understand how they can maintain the support. Residents have welcomed the proactive contact. They need to consider how to keep that going in the future to help older people in this category. The trust is working in partnership with the Royal College of Arts to see how they can improve the experience for older people. The Trust offered to share the findings once produced. They are now developing a new service for this group.

- (xv) The Chair commented the council was looking at what needs to be changed in relations to support services post Covid-19. They are aware there may be people seeking support and help that previously did not use services. Members pointed out services need to be prepared.**
- (xvi) The Chair suggested people needing help may go to mutual aid groups or their landlords. The Chair suggested the two work together as people may go to one or the other and it would be better if they pooled resources and worked together.**

In response to Members questions the Chief Executive from ISHA advised they have an active scrutiny panel looking at the organisation's response during Covid. The HA would share once complete.

ISHA also found a spike in ASB complaints for things like my neighbour is playing the piano loudly. This was due to people living cheek by jowl (side by side).

As an organisation they took the view it was important to ensure homes were safe. ISHA carried out all compliance work during lockdown and only had one gas safety certificate expire for approximately 2 weeks during this period. ISHA also carried out voids and emergency repairs during the restricted period too.

- (xvii) Members asked about customer services for housing associations. Members pointed out they have noticed that residents have been unable to get in contact with housing associations customer service teams during Covid. Residents had received out of office emails stating they were on furlough. Members directed the question about customer service contact and response during Covid to Clarion and Peabody.**
- (xviii) Members also commented they were made aware of an older resident in Sanctuary sheltered accommodation that had no contact from the housing association and this was 2 month into the pandemic.**

- (xix) **Members referred to food poverty and local authorities' carrying out food distribution during the pandemic; noting that this was due to come to an end shortly. Members asked how organisation were preparing for this; given the expectation there will be further economic impacts like redundancies. Members pointed out many people are being forced into food banks etc. What are RPs doing to be able to signpost appropriately?**
- (xx) **Members commended the housing association that reported giving donations to food banks in Hackney.**
- (xxi) **Members asked the housing associations if required, would they be willing to increase the recycling capacity to support the council to reach its targets.**
- (xxii) **Members referred to shared ownership and affordable housing tenants and pointed out they could be vulnerable too and have young families. Members encouraged the housing associations to provide sign posting for these groups too.**

In response to Members questions, the Head of Housing, North London from Clarion Housing Group confirmed they were committed to recycling. However operational limitations such as space to hold extra bin stores may restrict them doing more. There could be operational challenges with space and fitting new bins on site. For example they might need to remove a car parking space to do this.

- (xxiii) **Members pointed out the council is giving up car parking spaces for cycle racks, recycling and park lets. Highlighting that car park spaces could be used for other purposes now. Commenting generally more could be done to improve recycling on estates. Members suggested the partnership could carry out work to advance this policy across the borough. The Member pointed out he was in talks with Sanctuary Housing about exploring solar power on roofs. Members commented solar power and working with the Council's energy company are areas of work for the partnership agenda.**

In response to Members questions about customer service the Head of Neighbourhoods, East Region from Peabody suggested he speaks directly to the Councillor about the specific cases after the meeting. The officer pointed out initially at the start of the pandemic staff experienced challenges with the telephone system when they transitioned to working from home. However to his knowledge this was resolved within 2 weeks.

In relation to front line staff being on furlough. To his knowledge only back office staff were on furlough not front line staff. However the officer will check this and report back to Members.

| | |
|---------------|---|
| ACTION | The Head of Neighbourhoods, East Region from Peabody to check and confirm if back office staff were furloughed during lockdown. |
|---------------|---|

(xxiv) The Chair thanked all the housing association officers for their attendance and participation in the scrutiny review.

5 Update on Housing Services' Fire Safety Works

- 5.1 The Chair welcomed to the meeting from London Borough of Hackney: Cllr Clayeon McKenzie, Cabinet Member for Housing Services; David Padfield, Director of Housing and Donna Bryce, Head of Resident Safety.
- 5.2 Also in attendance was the Resident Liaison Group. Representatives for the RLG was Co-Chairs: Steve Webster and Helder Da Costa.
- 5.3 This item was to discuss the Council's work in relation to the fire safety and improvements work that are being carrying out following the Grenfell tragedy.
- 5.4 The Commission invited the Resident Liaison Group (RLG) to participate in this discussion to provide the views and experiences of residents in relation to the fire safety improvement works on their estate(s) and or completed fire safety improvements that had taken place.
- 5.5 The Chair highlighted the written reports in the agenda were on pages 113-132.
- 5.6 The discussion items commenced with a short introductory update from the Cabinet Member for Housing from London Borough of Hackney (LBH).
 - 5.6.1 The Council's housing services continue to make progress and take a proactive approach to fire safety.
 - 5.6.2 Fire safety is an integral part of how they work on residential housing stock.
 - 5.6.3 The fire safety costs uncompleted work is expensive and without government funding support.
 - 5.6.4 The Council is trying to ensure the fire safety work is part of the asset management programme to make best use of resources and limit the impact on residents. Any outstanding actions will be included in major works and they have ensured there are mitigating risks in place.
 - 5.6.5 The Council has focused on resident inclusion for the fire safety works on their estates.
 - 5.6.6 The Council is keeping abreast with legislation and taking a proactive approach to the recommendations in the Hackett Review.
 - 5.6.7 The Fire Safety Governance Board gives Members assurance of senior management oversight for the fire safety works programme and business as usual.
 - 5.6.8 The Council's Executive continues to lobby government to ensure councils have adequate funding to implement any new changes in legislation.

- 5.7 The Head of Resident Safety from LBH highlighted the following key points from their written submission.
- 5.7.1 The Council's key area of fire safety work over the last 3 years has been external wall installations (EWIs).
- 5.7.2 In Hackney they did not find any cladding but did find EWI that was not to standard. The Council has been doing proactive work on various estates in the borough.
- 5.7.3 For EWI fire safety work they have issued certificates to residents to help with selling their properties.
- 5.7.4 The Council is hoping to use the government building fund to help with leaseholders charges for EWI.
- 5.7.5 Done extensive survey on blocks and there is no more blocks with EWI concerns.
- 5.7.6 Major works taken place at Fellows Court following fire inspection and fire safety works. They brought all works together and this has been completed.
- 5.7.7 The Council has been fitting dry and wet risers across the borough. Phase one had 63 (154 blocks) and phase 2 had 63 blocks. Post inspections found 4 more blocks. Missed blocks will be added to list and done by end of September and full maintenance programme in place.
- 5.7.8 Fire safety is considered at all points of the works they do across teams.
- 5.7.9 Carried out new fire risk assessments to standards and have in-house fire risk assessors that are members of the Fire Engineers Register.
- 5.7.10 Where they have taken the decision to do no works they are part of the asset management programme e.g. fire door programme.
- 5.7.11 The council is working through the actions coming out of phase 2 following type 3 assessments.
- 5.7.12 For phase 1 they did works for communal areas. For phase 2 they looked at 10% of properties for more in-depth assessments.
- 5.7.13 If issues are found they do a type 4 which is a more intrusive survey within a property. If critical action they call fire safety team to get works done immediately and take mitigating action. Categories of high are within a month and the mediums they are working through.
- 5.7.14 Recently trained resident safety team.
- 5.7.15 Door replacement programme was impacted by Covid. However Covid did not affect the work on fire risk assessments in communal areas.
- 5.7.16 As a result of Covid the council was able to get in contact with residents and put in place personal escape plans for vulnerable residents who may need assistance to leave their property in an emergency. The council is not

providing personal details to the London Fire Brigade (LFB) but with personal plans in place the council can provide the LFB with more details about flats and can direct support to resident who need extra support.

- 5.7.17 Hoping to launch an app soon and this will enable residents to self-refer.
- 5.7.18 Many of the gas safety certificates held for leaseholders are out of date. Covid has impacted receipt of gas safety certificates from leaseholders. Prior to Covid the council had received gas certificates from 51% of leaseholders.
- 5.7.19 The Council will be writing to leaseholders and will offer the LBH service (DLO) to provide gas safety certificates at a competitive price.
- 5.7.20 The Council will be asking for fixed electrical certificates too from July 2020.
- 5.7.21 The Hackitt and Grenfell reviews have implications for LBH. Mainly low level concerns such as fire action notices. The council is carrying out work on blocks for evacuation action notices.
- 5.7.22 All 10 storey and above blocks will have plans and LFB will have this information. The Council is commencing work for 6-9 storey blocks and they are well into the work programme.
- 5.7.23 Done work on access to street level properties. Been able to do joint working across housing services to do assessment and works in these properties covering asbestos, fire and electrical checks in a programme of works.
- 5.7.24 One of the actions following the Grenfell review was having floor level indicators. The council is getting plates made that will show the LFB how many flats are on the floor and the floor level. On every floor there will be a floor level indicator for residents too. The DLO will be commencing this work.
- 5.7.25 There are significant changes due to come into force in April 2021. A new joint competent authority will be set up comprised of health and safety executive, fire and rescue authority and local authority building control. This authority will oversee every new buildings. All new buildings will need to be licensed before residents can occupy the property. Developers will need to demonstrate fire safety is up to date and building control regulations in place. This will require having the correct documentation for each build. New builds will be included and old buildings will come into the programme when they get refurbished. The regulator will have more authority to stop breeches of fires safety in building controls.
- 5.8 The Co-Chairs from the Resident Liaison Group (RLG) highlighted the following key points from their written submission.
- 5.8.1 The RLG welcomed engagement with the scrutiny commission and the opportunity to bring the voice of residents to the commission.
- 5.8.2 The RLG thanked the Head of Resident Safety for the work of her team and the effective partnership working with the RLG.
- 5.8.3 The RLG pointed out this had inspired confidence in residents that the council is taking their views seriously and they felt listened to.

- 5.8.4 The RLG was pleased to know the council has put in place a requirement for leaseholders to have gas safety checks on their property and requested certificates.
- 5.8.5 The RLG asked for assurance from the Council that there is a robust system in place for leaseholders and freeholders to a) be compliant with safety checks and b) send in certificates as proof.

5.9 Questions, Discussion and Comments

- (i) **The RLG requested to be involved in the monitoring of the statistics and to have the ability to scrutinise the fire safety KPIs to be assured. The RLG pointed out at each meeting they have regular updates from the fire safety team and asked if these could include the monitoring data on gas safety certificates.**

In response the Head of Resident Safety from LBH confirmed they have a database and can present the statistics to the RLG. It was highlighted that the system flags up when new certificates are required. The officer confirmed the fire safety team could bring a report to the RLG.

- (ii) **The RLG highlighted there was confusion in relation to the request for electrical certificates because of mixed messages and asked for clarification. The RLG pointed out at each meeting attended there has been mixed messages to leaseholders and freeholders in relation to these certificates.**
- (iii) **In relation to gas and electrical safety certificates Members asked if leaseholders would be able to spread the cost of these and have it added to their service charge bill to help with affordability.**
- (iv) **Members asked if there was anything the council could do to support residents with the costs. Member commented this might improve the take up of the DLO service for certificates from the council. Commenting many people may not know the cost of these safety checks and certificates.**
- (v) **Members also pointed out that residents may not understand the importance of electrical certificates so it might help if the council provided more information to residents.**
- (vi) **Members referred to fire alarms and commented that when the battery needs replacing often the whole unit has to be replaced. Members asked if this could be changed.**

In response the Head of Resident Safety advised the letters sent out about gas safety checks also included information about electrical checks. Taking into consideration the points raised about the general understanding and costs they could include a leaflet providing an explanation.

The officer explained the electrical check was a mains check and this should be checked every 5 years.

The officer pointed out the letters issued will contain requests for both certificates. These checks are in the leaseholders regulations. The Council has been introducing a more robust system but are giving leaseholders time to adjust. They will be enforcing both more robustly from next year.

In reference to fire alarms the officer confirmed the LFB do fit alarms but they are battery operated. However when the council does fire safety works or a refurbishments of a kitchen and bathroom they will fit an electrical wired fire alarm.

In response to the question about spreading the cost of safety certificates the Director of Housing from LBH informed the Commission this could not be add to the service charge. Legally this was not a service charge. The Director informed the Commission the council would review what options are available to see if they can do anything.

- (vii) Members suggested offering a service to leaseholders e.g. boiler cover for a monthly fee. Members suggested this could be a potential income stream for the council. Members pointed out this could help to give leaseholders benefits they previously had as tenants, assurance and access to more trusted contractors.**
- (viii) Members referred to the fire action work referenced that is expected to be completed by December and asked if it has started and if it will be completed by the deadline stated?**
- (ix) Members referred to page 130 in the agenda (the RLG submission) and asked the Council if this could be investigated as a health and safety concern, noting similar concerns have been raised about estates in their wards.**
- (x) Members also highlighted that it has been mentioned that there is a lack of communication between the leaseholder management team and the asset management team. Members asked if this has been a factor and has it been rectified?**
- (xi) In the chat function Members asked how leaseholders will know when their certificates have expired.**

In response to the questions above the Head of Resident Safety from LBH confirmed the programme is progressing well and yes they will finish street properties by December 2020.

In response to the health and safety concerns raised about balconies the officer agreed with the concerns raised and highlighted this is particularly an issue for private properties.

The Council recently issued guidance to residents about combustible items and have included balconies in the letter. They will send out letters again to residents to remind people about this because it is on their radar but they need access to properties to review. The information being sent to residents also includes reference to enforcement action and notice for removal if found. The

officer highlighted this issue needs education and the council is meeting with LFB to discuss how they can work in partnership to support the council with this issue.

In response to the question about communications between service areas the Director of Housing from LBH advised generally the information flow between the two teams is good. He highlighted one area there has been a historical issue is with final accounts for major works bills. The council is slow at issuing final bills for works. A benefit of lockdown has been the suspension of schemes enabling council staff to clear some of the final accounts backlog. The Director encouraged Members to contact him if there were specific cases.

- (xii) Members asked a question about using technology such as drones to carry out a survey of balconies on estates. Highlighting this would be an efficient way to get a survey done and encouraged the council to explore this possibility. The Members acknowledged there would be challenges in relation to privacy etc. but commented there have been reports of small scale fires that were started due to items on balconies.**

In response the Head of Resident Safety from LBH commented it was also about educating their contractors to report back information to the council if they noticed something when doing works.

The Co-Chair from the RLG agreed with Members observations and highlighted that many TRAs conducted walkabouts and they could inform the council too. The Co-Chair highlighted the council completes regular inspections and if staff carrying out inspections identify issues on balconies they should report it so action could be taken. The Co-Chair also liked the idea of a technological solution to survey and access balconies.

- (xiii) Members asked about the Council's relationship with Tenant Management Organisations (TMOs) and asked if their contractors are compliant and if their works are to the standards that Hackney Council expects?**

In response the Head of Resident Safety from LBH advised the TMOs fire safety and fire risk assessments are carried out by the council. The works are completed by DLO to ensure standard and they do health and safety inspections.

Communications between TMOs and the Council are going well with the council is attending their monthly forums and does joint inspections.

The officer pointed out when the council does health and safety inspections for TMOs they will check the competency of the staff. The council also checks the works are to standard. To date TMOs have engaged well with the council on this.

- (xiv) Members referred to the post Grenfell work that councils are required to carry out and asked about the actions required and the funding they have received to do this work?**

In response the Head of Resident Safety from LBH confirmed they have started looking at the recommendations in terms of building safety. They need a building safety manager and have started to have discussions about this.

The council is also doing engagement with residents. It is important they ensure residents understand the duties on them too. The officer explained there will be requirements for residents to undertake in the new legislation for fire safety and to maintain fire safety.

The council will be doing work on the licensing of new buildings prior to occupancy. Going forward the council will have to look at new design and sign off builds. This has huge implications and changes for planning and regulation of build licensing. Thus is to make sure the people building new buildings are competent.

The officer pointed out all London boroughs have concern about the recommendation to do quarterly checks on all front door closers. There are 33 thousand front door closers in Hackney borough.

In relation to funding there is no funding to complete the works and the council continues to lobby about this. However, there is a building safety fund for organisations with ACM cladding. Hackney did not have any ACMs.

There is a new building safety fund for EWIs but a council can only access this fund if they can demonstrate that doing the works will make them bankrupt.

The officer informed the Members there is another pot of funding that Hackney can apply for. This is in relation to charging leaseholders for EWI work. The Council will be applying for this funding.

The officer pointed out the council has made progress with the works to date but in the next 12 -18 months there will be a lot more work to do.

(xv) The Chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting and advised the scrutiny commission will continue to monitor the fire safety works.

6 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

6.1 Minutes for the previous meeting held on 23rd June 2020 were agreed.

| | |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| RESOLVED | Minutes were approved. |
|-----------------|------------------------|

7 Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission- 2020/2021 Work Programme

7.1 The latest version of the work programme was on pages 157 – 162 in the agenda.

7.2 The Chair advised a full review of the Scrutiny commission's work programme for 2020-21 will take place at the LiH meeting in September 2020.

7.3 The Chair provided the following updated:

1. The September meeting is as outlined in the work programme document.
2. The November meeting will be a follow up meeting with Hackney Metropolitan Police Services in relation to stop and search.
- 7.4 Members raised concern about the timescale for the next discussion with the MPS and proposed they hold a round table discussion before the next formal meeting in November 2020. Member suggested this was held over the summer or early September.
- 7.5 Members highlighted at the next Full Council meeting there will be a Black Lives Matters motion and this covers concerns about the attitude of the police in relation to police activity and community perception.
- 7.6 The Chair agreed to set up a round table discussion with Hackney MPS in advance of the November meeting.

| | |
|---------------|--|
| ACTION | The Chair to set up round table meeting date for Commission and the Borough Commander. |
|---------------|--|

8 Any Other Business

- 8.1 None.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00 - 9.40 pm



| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission 30th September 2020 Item 9 – Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission 2020/21 Work Programme | Item No 9 |
|---|-------------------------|

OUTLINE

The remit of the Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission covers quality of life in local communities. This incorporates neighbourhoods and housing, place, wellbeing, amenities, and the performance of the statutory Crime and Disorder Committee function.

The discussion will cover:

Agreement of the remaining work programme items for 2020/21 and what the substantive review topic for the year should be focused on.

Reports in the agenda:

1. A short paper about the commission's work remit, previous work and suggestions from stakeholders on work programme items or 2020/21
2. The latest version of the work programme for 2020/21.

ACTION

The Commission is asked to finalise and agree the work programme items for 2020/21.

This page is intentionally left blank

Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission

LiH Members when considering items for the LiH Commission work programme please note the following information below.

1. High level remit as per constitution

Quality of life in local communities covering neighbourhoods, place, wellbeing, amenities and the formal crime and disorder partnership function.

2. Areas of the Council falling into remit, by Directorate

Neighbourhoods and Housing

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Community Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antisocial Behaviour • Violent Crime • Strategic Analysis • Prevent • Emergency Planning | <p>Public Realm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streets and Streetscene • Environment • Leisure • Parks • Waste and recycling • Regulatory | <p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance, repairs and estate environment • Ongoing improvement (transformation) • Asset Management • Services for tenants and leaseholders • Housing Policy • New housing and estate regeneration • Private rented sector |
|---|--|--|

Finance and Resources

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Benefit • Housing Needs including temporary accommodation | <p>Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fleet management • Energy Unit |
|--|--|

Statutory function of Living in Hackney Commission – Scrutiny of Hackney’s Community Safety Partnership

All local authorities are required to have a crime and disorder scrutiny committee in place, with the power to review and scrutinise decisions made and action taken by the local Community Safety Partnership. Living in Hackney fulfils this function, in addition to holding the areas above in its general remit.

2.1 Hackney’s Community Safety Partnership

The Community Safety Partnership has a wide ranging membership.

A Statutory Officers Group operates within the partnership, made up of representatives from the Council, Police, Health, Fire and Rescue and Probation. The Statutory Officers Group has responsibility for the statutory duties of the wider partnership (which are listed in [Appendix 1](#)).

Duties include the production of a Strategic Assessment; a detailed overview of crime, disorder and community safety in the area, and a three-yearly Partnership Plan (the Community Safety Partnership Plan).

Following a refresh of the Strategic Assessment, the Partnership has produced a new Community Safety Partnership Plan for the period 2019 to 2022.

2.2 Approaches to scrutinising the Community Safety Partnership

Each year the Commission is invited to consider how it will perform its role of reviewing and scrutinising decisions made and action taken by the community safety partnership.

This might be through exploring the contribution of a specific partner(s) to progressing particular elements of the plan and or by taking an objective and asking the various lead partners around progress on this being met.

In previous years relevant items and reviews have included exploring the police's response as lead partner on a rise in moped enabled crime (2017/18), the response of the National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Company for London to a critical inspection report (2017/18), and exploring the Partnership's response to an escalation in serious violence (2018/19) and looking at Stop and Search and Trust and Confidence.

Due to Covid-19 this was delayed and carried out at our LiH meeting in June 2020.

3. Key relevant Council Strategies and Plans

Extracts of a number of policy documents relevant to the Commission's remit are appended to this paper. The sections selected are intended to help best inform discussions on where the Commission's focus might be best placed over the next year. Links to the fuller versions are also given below, when these were available at the time of publication.

3.1 Corporate Plan 2018-22

The Corporate Plan sets out the Council's mission, the way that it will deliver and meet its priorities, objectives and challenges. The full plan is available [here](#).

3.2 The Hackney Community Strategy 2018–2028

The strategy sets out a vision for Hackney in 2028, developed through significant engagement, consultation and analysis. It breaks this down into key five themes, each with a vision for that specific area. For each theme there are sets of actions the Council will do, what it will ask of local stakeholders, and what is required by Government. The full strategy and further information is available [here](#).

3.3 Hackney Housing Strategy 2017-22

The Housing Strategy sets out how the Council and its partners aim to meet the Council's housing-related ambitions. Each year the Council produces an annual report on progress already made against the actions in the strategy, and next steps. The full Housing Strategy and supporting information is available [here](#).

4. Previous work by the Commission

2019/20 - highlights

- **Housing Services support of resident engagement** – explored the work to support the involvement of Council tenants and leaseholders in the

management of their housing and in the improvement in quality of life on estates, and any aspects for improvement.

- **Housing Services support of resident engagement update** - explored the work of Housing Services' Resident Participation Team. This included the history of the function, the activities delivered, the resources in place, recent successes, and areas for potential improvement moving forward.
- **Prevent Programme Update** - The Prevent Programme is an initiative to support and divert vulnerable people away from the radicalisation process and is one of four elements of the government's counter-terrorism strategy.
- **Management of asbestos in Council-managed homes** - explored the Council's approach to managing asbestos in its housing stock. This includes the measures in place to ensure safe and effective removal where this is required due to maintenance and improvement works in our residents' homes and in communal areas.
- **Outcomes of Housing Services' review of Community Halls** - This item was an updated around the outcomes of the Community Halls Review, taking into consideration the points raised the LiH Scrutiny Commission in their letter to the Cabinet Member for Housing .
- **Thames Water Main Burst in the N4 area** – this was a summary of the response by the Council and Thames Water with input from Ofwat (economic regulator of the water sector in England and Wales).
- **Learning from the 2019 Hackney Carnival, and benefits for residents** – explored the learning from the 2019 event, the costs, the benefits of the Carnival and events like it for Hackney residents, and any advantages and disadvantages of delivering the event directly. Members also want to explore the work of the Council and partners to secure a wide range of involvement including by schools and alternative education providers, and residents living on estates.
- **A scrutiny review looking partnership working between Hackney Council and the local Housing Associations.**

2018/19 - highlights

- **Reviewing the response of the Community Safety Partnership to an increase in levels of serious violence** – a review exploring a range of topics including the approach of Hackney's Integrated Gangs Unit, the Police's use of Stop and Search and its work to improve trust and confidence, and the views of leaders from the communities disproportionately affected by the issue.
- **Investigation of contract management by Housing Services** – discussion with Cabinet Member for Housing further to Commission's findings on the performance and management of major housing contracts.
- **Exploring Healthwatch Hackney report on single homelessness and mental health, with a focus on housing conditions** – sites visits to a range of Council run and private hostel provision in the borough, and a discussion item on the Healthwatch Hackney report and the responses of the Housing Needs and Private Sector Housing services
- **Thames Water mains burst in Lea Bridge** – questioning Thames Water on the causes of a burst and major flood in the Lea Bridge Ward and its management of the aftermath.

- **Update on discretionary private rented sector licensing** – update further to go live of additional and selective licensing schemes, including levels of compliance against that forecast and next steps.
- **Fire Safety** – update on the progress made on implementation of Fire Risk Assessment Recommendations.

5. Work programme suggestions received

Proposed Standing items

Cabinet Question Time - relevant Cabinet Members are:

- Cllr Selman (Her remit also covers Skills, Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission)
- Cllr McKenzie
- Cllr Burke (His remit also covers Skills, Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission)
- Cllr Nicholson (His remit also covers Skills, Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission)
- Cllr Rennison
- Cllr Kennedy (His remit also covers Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission)

Community Safety Partnership – this item was taken in June 2020.

5.1 Items to be scheduled in work programme

- Prevent Update
- homelessness/rough sleeper update planned to be scheduled for update
- Lettings Policy (Due late 2020 or early 2021)
- Resident engagement changing how we do resident engagement. (Update should be ready 2021)
- Outcomes of Housing Services' review of Community Halls (Update should be ready 2021).

5.2 Suggestions from Hackney Council officers and Cabinet Member

- Financial inclusion for Council Tenants - supporting for rent, benefits, debt management etc.
- Hate Crime & Prevent Update
- Police Stop & Search Annual Update
- Community Safety Partnership Plan annual update
- trust & confidence
- Licensing for private rental sector.

5.3 Suggestions from the Resident Liaison Group

1. A review of Leasehold Services. There is very little transparency or accountability from this section or forums with leaseholders where updates can be given and questions raised as many of the issues are common to all. There have been some errors of judgement and more recently a serious breach of financial information going out to incorrect addresses. Leaseholders and Freeholders pay for this section and need

to be sure they are getting value for their money which currently is not the case.

2. Asset Strategy procurement and ongoing performance monitoring of major works contractors plus how are residents involved with this.
3. HRA scrutiny of HRA funds contributing to non-HRA services across LBH.
4. Scrutiny of the Housing Management Service.
5. Outcomes of Housing Service's review of Community Halls.
6. Full review - Council's strategy and approach to monitor and measure outcomes of the Council's commitment to being an "Anti-Racist" Council. In the context of the Black Lives Matters protests during 2020 and the Council's commitment to being an anti-racist LA. How will this commitment be monitored and measured, will Service areas be producing KPIs or enhancing KPIs to measure these outcomes?
7. Full review - Improving safeguards to prevent data breaches from Housing Service's - Leasehold Services: Recently there have been two serious data breaches from Housing Service's - Leasehold Services. What are the points of learning for Housing Services from these two breaches. What measures will be put in place to ensure that data breaches do not happen again? Are there implications for other Service areas?
8. Review of the Council's strategy and approach in offering services and support to the most vulnerable residents in the Borough. In view of the extra demands for help and support from the most vulnerable residents and as a result of the Covid19 lockdown. What lessons have all Council Services taken from these unprecedented times? Will the Council be reviewing or developing a new strategy to support the most vulnerable in the Borough?

Membership:

- Cabinet members/non-exec members of partners
- Greater London Authority
- senior leaders from responsible authorities
- chief officers
- service heads/managers
- housing representatives
- voluntary and community sector
- community representatives (including faith groups)
- Learning Trust and further education college representation

Key Statutory Responsibilities to be met:

- a strategy group to be made up of senior representatives from the responsible authorities
- prepare, implement and performance manage an evidence-led annual strategic assessment and three-yearly partnership plan for the reduction of crime and disorder in the area
- consult the community on the levels and patterns of crime, disorder and substance misuse and on matters that need to be prioritised by the partnership
- reduce re-offending
- coordinate domestic violence homicide reviews
- share information among the responsible authorities within the CSP
- have a crime and disorder scrutiny committee with the power to review and scrutinise decisions made and action taken by the community safety partnership
- assess value for money of partnership activities

¹ Sourced from - www.hackney.gov.uk/community-safety-partnership

Overview & Scrutiny

Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission: Work Plan July 2020 – April 2021

Each agenda will include an updated version of this Scrutiny Commission work programme

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and lead officer contact | Description, Comment and Purpose of item |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>23rd June 2020</p> <p>All Council meetings will be held remotely until further notice.</p> <p>Papers deadline: Fri 12th June 2020</p> | Trust and Confidence | Metropolitan Police Service Hackney Borough DCS Marcus Barnett, CE BCU Commander | The Commission's scrutiny review highlighted some indicators suggesting lower than average levels of trust and confidence (meeting held on 31st January 2019). The Commission learned a range of activities were being delivered by the police in this area including the activities being delivered by the newly formed BCU-wide Trust and Confidence Board. This item is an update on that area of work and a look at the impact of Covid - 19. |
| | Stop and Search | Metropolitan Police Service Hackney Borough DCS Marcus Barnett, CE BCU Commander | At the Commission's meeting in January 2019 the Commission heard about the roll out of body worn cameras, and work with the IAGs, the Safer Neighbourhood Board, and programmes in schools to improve understandings on both sides about stop and search. This item is an update on that area of work and a look at the impact of Covid - 19. |
| | Community Safety Partnership Plan 2019-2022 | London Borough of Hackney Tim Shields (Chief Executive) | An update on the progress of the Community Safety Partnership Plan against the four priority themes of the plan. This update will include an in-depth look at the strategic priority Street Drug Market and Substance Misuse. |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and lead officer contact | Description, Comment and Purpose of item |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | Metropolitan Police Service Hackney Borough DCS Marcus Barnett, CE BCU Commander | |
| 15th July 2020 All Council meetings will be held remotely. Papers deadline: Fri 3 rd July 2020 | Update on Housing Services' Fire Safety works | Housing Services in Directorate of Neighbourhoods and Housing David Padfield Director of Housing | Information about Hackney Council's fire safety works with input from Hackney's Resident Liaison Group. |
| | Evidence Session for Exploring the work of Housing Associations in Hackney Scrutiny Review | Various Housing Associations and London Borough of Hackney James Goddard, Interim Director, Regeneration | This session will explore: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The strengths of formal partnership arrangements 2) Community investment by housing associations, approaches to supporting their residents to succeed, and partnership with the Council to improve social and economic wellbeing. 3) Improving recycling on estates across the borough. |
| 30th September 2020 | Update on Thames Water Main Burst in | Thames Water Steve Spencer – | An update from Thames Water on their progress of repair works, a status update on residents returning to their homes (home owners, private tenants, council tenants, registered social landlords and leaseholder) and an outline of |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and lead officer contact | Description, Comment and Purpose of item |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>All Council meetings will be held remotely.</p> <p>Papers deadline: Fri 18th Sept 2020</p> | the N4 area | <p>Operations Director Tim McMahon – Head of Water Asset Management</p> <p>Ofwat Carl Pheasey - Director Strategy & Policy</p> | <p>your investment plans, timescales and the improvements you expect to achieve from this investment plan.</p> <p>An update from Ofwat on the progress of performance for Thames Water, accessibility of this information locally and investment in improvements by Thames Water.</p> |
| | Update on the Impact of Covid 19 on Hackney's Housing Service | Director of Housing David Padfield from LBH | Hackney Housing to provide an update on the impact of Covid 19 on Hackney's Housing Service in relation challenges and opportunities; business as usual activities; repairs; financial position; support to residents and customer service. |
| | Executive Response to LiH Scrutiny Review - Council and partnership response to escalation in serious violence review | Tracey Anderson Overview and Scrutiny Officer | <p>The Cabinet response to the LiH's recommendations following their scrutiny review looking at the <i>Council and partnership response to escalation in serious violence review</i>.</p> <p>The Commission's review of the Executive's response to the recommendations made by LiH.</p> |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and lead officer contact | Description, Comment and Purpose of item |
|--|--|---|--|
| | Update on Thames Water Donation for Lea Bridge Distribution / Use of Funds | Cllr Rathbone Ward Cllr for Lea Bridge | Update on recommendation for distribution / use of funds fro Ward Councillors and The Commission to approve the allocation of funds (taking into consideration the recommendation by the local ward councillors from Lea Bridge Ward) and to agree the governance process or any restrictions on the donations e.g. for a specific use. |
| | Discussion about work programme for 2020/21 | Tracey Anderson, Overview and Scrutiny Team | The Commission to agree the work programme items for 2020/21. |
| <p>9th November 2020</p> <p>All Council meetings will be held remotely.</p> <p>Papers deadline: Wed 28th October 2020</p> | Stop and Search | Metropolitan Police Service Hackney Borough DCS Marcus Barnett, CE BCU Commander | TBC |
| | | Metropolitan Police Service HQ - Professionalism Commander Catherine Roper | |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and lead officer contact | Description, Comment and Purpose of item |
|---|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 14th December 2020 All Council meetings will be held remotely. Papers deadline: Wed 2 nd December 2020 | TBC | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and lead officer contact | Description, Comment and Purpose of item |
|---|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <p>18th January 2021</p> <p>All Council meetings will be held remotely.</p> <p>Papers deadline: Wed 6th January 2021</p> | TBC | | |
| <p>11th February 2021</p> <p>All Council meetings will be held remotely.</p> <p>Papers deadline: Mon 1st February 2021</p> | TBC | | |
| <p>22nd March 2021</p> <p>All Council meetings will be held remotely.</p> <p>Papers deadline: Wed 10th March 2021</p> | TBC | | |

| Dates | Proposed Item | Directorate and lead officer contact | Description, Comment and Purpose of item |
|--------------|----------------------|---|---|
| | | | |

This page is intentionally left blank