

Community Safety and Environment Policy and Accountability Committee

Agenda

Tuesday 29 January 2019

7.00 pm

Small Hall - Hammersmith Town Hall

MEMBERSHIP

Administration	Opposition
Councillor Bora Kwon (Chair) Councillor Iain Cassidy Councillor David Morton Councillor Ann Rosenberg	Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler

CONTACT OFFICER: Amrita Gill
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
☎: 020 8753 2094
E-mail: amrita.gill@lbhf.gov.uk

Reports on the open agenda are available on the Council's website:
www.lbhf.gov.uk/councillors-and-democracy

Members of the public are welcome to attend. A loop system for hearing impairment is provided, along with disabled access to the building.

Community Safety and Environment Policy and Accountability Committee Agenda

29 January 2019

<u>Item</u>	<u>Pages</u>
1. MINUTES To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2018.	4 - 11
2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST <p>If a Councillor has a disclosable pecuniary interest in a particular item, whether or not it is entered in the Authority's register of interests, or any other significant interest which they consider should be declared in the public interest, they should declare the existence and, unless it is a sensitive interest as defined in the Member Code of Conduct, the nature of the interest at the commencement of the consideration of that item or as soon as it becomes apparent.</p> <p>At meetings where members of the public are allowed to be in attendance and speak, any Councillor with a disclosable pecuniary interest or other significant interest may also make representations, give evidence or answer questions about the matter. The Councillor must then withdraw immediately from the meeting before the matter is discussed and any vote taken.</p> <p>Where Members of the public are not allowed to be in attendance and speak, then the Councillor with a disclosable pecuniary interest should withdraw from the meeting whilst the matter is under consideration. Councillors who have declared other significant interests should also withdraw from the meeting if they consider their continued participation in the matter would not be reasonable in the circumstances and may give rise to a perception of a conflict of interest.</p> <p>Councillors are not obliged to withdraw from the meeting where a dispensation to that effect has been obtained from the Audit, Pensions, and Standards Committee.</p>	
4. 2019 MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY This report sets out the budget proposals for the services covered by this Policy and Accountability Committee (PAC). An update is also provided on any proposed changes in fees and charges.	12 - 33

- | | | |
|-----------|--|---------|
| 5. | MANAGEMENT OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES IN THE BOROUGH | 34 - 41 |
| | This report provides an overview of the systems and controls that we have in place to keep residents and other members of the public safe. | |
| 6. | REFUSE, RECYCLING, AND STREET CLEANSING CONTRACT OVERVIEW | 42 - 46 |
| | This report provides an overview on waste collection and street cleansing in the borough. | |
| 7. | WORK PROGRAMME AND DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS | 47 |
| | The Committee is asked to consider its work programme for 2018/19 and note the future meeting dates. | |

Community Safety and Environment Policy and Accountability Committee Minutes

Wednesday 5 December 2018

PRESENT

Committee members: Councillors Bora Kwon (Chair), Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler, Iain Cassidy and Ann Rosenberg

Other Councillors: Councillors Wesley Harcourt (Cabinet Member for the Environment) Sue Fennimore (Deputy Leader) and Stephen Cowan (Leader)

Officers: Claire Rai (Head of Community Safety), Ann Ramage (Bi-Borough Head of Environmental Health), Bev Sharpe (Assistant Director of Family Services), Fawad Bhatti (Social Inclusion & Policy Manager), Russell Butt (Communications Officer), Andy Stocker (Street Czar), Peter Smith (Head of Policy & Strategy)

Guests: Detective Sergeant Yasser Awad (Hammersmith Police Station) and Adam Matan (Chair of the Resident-Led Policing and Crime Commission)

1. **MINUTES**

Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler requested that actions relating to items 4 & 5 be followed up by the relevant officers.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor David Morton.

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

4. RESIDENT LED CRIME COMMISSION - DISCUSSION ITEM

Adam Matan, Chair of the Resident-Led Policing and Crime Commission introduced himself and noted that the Commission had begun its work looking at the root causes of crime and anti-social behaviour. A press release was published on the Council's website on 5 December 2018 updating residents of the current arrangements and providing an opportunity for residents to submit written evidence to the Commission. In addition, the terms of reference had also been approved following the Commission's first meeting held on 27 November 2018. The Commission agreed three main priority areas which look at how communities and key partners would work together to tackle concerns around crime. It would also focus on how to build better community resilience and ensure residents could voice their concerns with the Police and the Council. Furthermore, the partnership structure would also be reviewed going forward.

Peter Smith, Head of Policy & Strategy, explained that a breakdown updating residents of the timescales for reporting on all three key areas would be available within the next 6 months, once evidence and views had been gathered and analysed.

Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler felt that some residents felt disappointed by the introduction of the new arrangements and asked how the members of the Commission were selected. Peter Smith explained that the Council provided residents with the opportunity to submit an expression of interest to sit on the Commission and, once these were received, the Chair and Vice Chair were asked to appoint the members based on four specific selection criteria.

Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler raised concerns about the transparency and the independence of the selection process for the Commission. Adam Matan offered reassurances and explained that the Council Officers were not involved in the appointment of members. He worked in collaboration with the Vice Chair to appoint members based on the selection criteria. Furthermore, he noted that he was aware of the historical issues, however reiterated that this was an independent selection process.

Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler asked for clarification around the involvement of the Police going forward. Peter Smith noted that Superintendent Helen Harper, of the Metropolitan Police, was acting as an ex-officio advisor to the Commission and would be invited to all future meetings.

The Deputy Leader, Councillor Sue Fennimore explained that the Council had successfully launched nine Resident-Led Commissions to help develop policies for the borough and each Commission was developed independently. The administration appointed the Chair and Vice Chair; however, it was then their responsibility to separately select and appoint members of the Commission. In addition, she highlighted that the quality of applicants was outstanding and the aim of the Commission was to achieve good outcomes on crime within the borough.

The Chair asked what stakeholders would the Council engage with to ensure the success of this Commission. Peter Smith noted that the Vice Chair would like to work in collaboration with the Safer Neighbourhood Ward Panel Chairs and the Metropolitan Police - stop and search services. The Chair requested that young people within the borough were also provided with the opportunity to engage with the Commission.

Councillor Iain Cassidy asked what sort of work would be carried out to engage with local businesses across the borough. Adam Matan said that the Commission was at its very early stages of set up therefore a plan had not yet been finalised. However, the priority was to engage with existing partners to develop a strategy during the recommendation stage. Working in collaboration with local businesses and partners such as professional football clubs, Charring Cross Hospital and Westfield London would prove useful to tackle crime within the borough. In addition, residents were also able to submit written evidence to the Commission via the Council's website - this had been communicated to residents as part of the press release.

The Leader, Councillor Stephen Cowan, said that crime within the borough had increased, this therefore had placed a huge pressure on the community. He noted that he was grateful to the administration and everyone involved in the setting up of the Commission for their hard work and contributions made, to achieve successful outcomes, whilst pioneering ways to work with residents. Furthermore, the Council had appointed residents across the board with expert knowledge to step in and lead this Commission and help minimise issues relating to crime and antisocial behaviour within the borough. Community action panels would be set up to efficiently tackle some of the areas that were outside of the Police's remit.

A resident asked for further clarification around why the Council had made the decision to close the Safer Neighbourhood Board and develop a new crime and policing Commission. Councillor Stephen Cowan explained that after consultation with the Police, the Council had made a decision to move forward and refresh the board. Furthermore, he explained that documentation was circulated, which clearly outlined the reasons why the Council had made this decision as well as clarifying the next steps.

The Chair thanked Peter Smith and Adam Matan for their efforts and said that she was looking forward to receiving a more detailed update around the future progress of the Commission.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee noted and commented on the update

5. OPERATION PUGLIA

Detective Sergeant Yasser Awad provided a presentation outlining the role and key outcomes of Operation Puglia. This was set up in October 2017, in response to an increase in violent crime. This included a rise in the use of knives and firearms. Operation Puglia came to fruition in July 2018 as 78 individuals from across Hammersmith & Fulham (H&F), Kensington &

Chelsea (K&C) and Westminster City Council (WCC) were arrested during the enforcement phase of the operation. In addition, 15 juveniles from the Council were arrested and 71 individuals were charged with a total of 344 offences as part of the operation. Safeguarding was regarded as a key factor for consideration as work had progressed by incorporating a safeguarding custody and public protection hub as part of the arrest phase. This included a reception centre for children at risk.

Working in collaboration with multi-agencies was essential to tackling the exploitation of children and the intimidation of local communities of these criminal gangs. The Youth Offending Service convened multi-agency meetings after the enforcement phase to consider whether any of the young people arrested were victims of modern slavery. Furthermore, tenancy action was taken and as result 16 Council tenancies were identified as being directly involved in the drug activity.

A resident asked whether any of the individuals that were convicted of drug dealing were drug addicts. DS Yasser Awad explained that majority of the people that were arrested were drug dealers and not addicts, however outreach workers were working with these individuals to identify any drug use ensuring that appropriate support was in place if this was the case.

Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler asked out of the individuals that were arrested, how many were sent to prison and whether the Police were satisfied with the sentences issued. DS Yasser Awad explained that some of the individuals that pleaded early, depending on their age were issued with fines and criminal behaviour orders, however the exact figures could be provided after the meeting. In addition, the courts issued set levels of sentencing based on the crime that was committed i.e. drug runners could be sentenced to a maximum of three years. He added that sentencing didn't always act as a deterrent but certainly took the criminals off the streets for a period to prevent further crime related activities.

Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler noted that majority of the arrests made were from the borough, compared to the other two boroughs and asked if the Police expected this to be the case. DS Yasser Awad said that he had been working in this borough for many years and from his experience this wasn't unexpected. The Police found there to be higher number of drug dealers, operating in this area, compared to the other two boroughs. However, was impressed at the number of arrests made and the decrease in the drug activity as a result of Operation Puglia.

A resident asked what was the scope for operation Puglia and whether this was a rolling operation. Furthermore, he asked for clarification around what actions were taken in relation to the juveniles that were arrested to prevent further crime within the borough. DS Yasser Awad explained that this was an unprecedented move and was a direct response to a rise in violent crime linked to gang activity and drug supply across the three boroughs at the time. In addition, all 15 juveniles were charged on the day of arrest and remanded to go to court the next day. The Police would look at working with the Youth

Offending Services to enforce conditions on these individuals as part of the longer-term strategy, however this was still a working progress.

Bev Sharpe, Assistant Director of Family Services explained that the Council was working with the juveniles and would continue to offer them support services and engage them in positive activities to ensure that they were not being exploited. In addition, most remained engaged with the Youth Offending Services through a bespoke intervention plan devised to address the issue leading to their involvement in crime.

Councillor Ann Rosenberg asked how crime was monitored within the borough. In response DS Yasser Awad explained that ward officers, uniformed Police officers and the Council's CCTV unit worked in collaboration to gather intelligence and ascertain the suitable strategies to tackle crime across the borough.

Councillor Iain Cassidy asked how many Council properties were directly affected by cuckooing and what measures were put into place to protect tenants that were at risk going forward. In response DS Yasser explained that 4 Council addresses were impacted as a result. Criminal behaviour orders were put into place against the perpetrators. Welfare checks were also conducted by the Police in relation to the victims. Furthermore, Claire Rai, Head of Community Safety explained that injunctions would be put into place by the Council to provide additional protection for the victims as soon as any vulnerabilities were identified. The Council would try to maintain the tenancy of the individual at risk and therefore a less enforcement-based approach was considered to be more effective.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee reviewed and commented on the report.

6. THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGY FOR THE CCTV NETWORK

Andy Stocker, Street Czar gave a presentation and provided an overview of the Council's strategy for its CCTV network and its plans to expand CCTV coverage, particularly on housing estates. The Council was also expanding its general street level coverage east on Hammersmith Road and Lillie Road, and south into the Imperial Road regeneration area. Over the last financial year (2017/18) the Council installed 8 new public space CCTV cameras, 160 new housing estate cameras and 30 new deployable cameras. He showed slides that outlined the future expansion plans for 2018/19. There were plans to install CCTV in 6 new housing estates, 2 housing estate digital upgrades and 10 new deployable cameras.

Partnership working with the Metropolitan Police was essential to the number of arrests made in 2017/2018. 508 people were arrested in the borough that would have not been without the CCTV operators working jointly with the Police. Local Police teams at Hammersmith Police station had full access to live and recorded CCTV images – this allowed the Police to investigate crimes on the borough more swiftly. Furthermore, the Council was exploring

opportunities for different types of technologies that would speed up response times and overall increase the number of arrests made.

Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler asked for clarification around the implementation date for the digital upgrade at Fulham Court. In response, Andy Stocker said this would take place in 2019 (Q1).

Councillor Victoria Brockbank-Fowler said that she was impressed by the work that was being carried out by officers and the Police around the Council's CCTV network and asked if residents had approached the Council directly for CCTV to be installed in public streets. Andy Stocker noted that a street map, highlighting all the CCTV installations within the borough was available upon request. He explained that the Council had little CCTV on residential streets as it was challenging to justify the implementation of camera's down side streets due to practicality and legal reasons. In addition, it was noted that the legislation relating to private land and public streets was different.

A resident asked if he could install a CCTV at the front of his house due to some ongoing issues he was experiencing on his street. Andy Stocker noted that there was a tool kit available online that could be installed. Furthermore, he needed to adhere to certain principles and would require the permission of his landlord to proceed with the implementation. Councillor Sue Fennimore asked that the resident discussed this further with Andy Stocker and Claire Rai outside of the meeting to resolve this matter.

Councillor Iain Cassidy, referring to page 17 of the agenda pack asked for clarification around who the third part links were. Andy Stocker explained that they were partners such as Westfield London, Professional Football Clubs, Housing Associations, and Charring Cross Hospital. He explained that their CCTV network would feed into the Council's operator, working in collaboration to improve response times and tackle crime.

Councillor Victoria Brocklebank-Fowler asked how many people were present in the control room at one time. Andy Stocker said that there were two operators watching the screens in the control room each day. The control room was often used as a base for running Police operations. Police officers co-located with the Council team, combing their knowledge with the CCTV operator's camera skills to target offenders. Furthermore, the Council was exploring ways to implement artificial intelligence methods to improve efficiency going forward.

The Chair asked whether the Council's CCTV network was robust. Andy Stocker confirmed that the Council owned the entire network and was fully managed and controlled by the Council – therefore it was very safe and not susceptible to interference.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee reviewed and commented on the report

7. REVIEW OF THE REGULATION OF INVESTIGATORY POWERS ACT (RIPA)

Claire Rai, Head of Community Safety introduced the report and outlined the role of RIPA. This provided a statutory framework for Police and public authorities to use surveillance and communications data where necessary and proportionate for preventing or detecting crime or preventing disorder. She showed slides that explained how the cameras had been used and what issues were tackled last year. Since November 2012 a Council could only authorise directed surveillance to prevent or detect criminal offences that were either punishable by at least 6 months imprisonment or were related to the underage sale of various prohibited items. From September 2017 to October 2018 the Council had used these powers twice to identify perpetrators and Anti-social behaviour (ASB) and drug dealing. Officers were currently working on a sovereign policy for the Council and would be seeking cabinet approval to end the agreement with Kensington and Chelsea (K&C).

The Chair asked whether officers had received any complaints regarding the use of these powers due to the intrusiveness of this act. In response Claire Rai explained to use surveillance the Council must consider whether this was 'necessary and 'proportionate' compared to the crime that had been committed. An authorising officer who was not connected with the operation would review the application. If satisfied that the requirements of the Act and the Council's policy were met, would authorise the application - this would then be considered by the magistrate's court for approval.

Ann Ramage, Bi-Borough Head of Environmental Health added that this was a well-established service. This was also considered a useful tool to the Council in solving high risk crime activities. Furthermore, this legislation was used in other services across the Council to prevent and tackle any ongoing issues. The whole process was also overseen by an Audit Commission and the Council had not received any complaints. The Commission would usually provide a list of recommendation which were taken into consideration and actioned accordingly.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee reviewed and commented on the report.

8. WORK PROGRAMME AND DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The PAC's work programme was noted. The next meeting would be held on 29 January 2019.

Meeting started: 7pm


Meeting ended: 9pm

Chair

Minutes are subject to confirmation at the next meeting as a correct record of the proceedings and any amendments arising will be recorded in the minutes of that subsequent meeting.

Contact officer: Amrita Gill
Committee Co-ordinator
Governance and Scrutiny
☎: 020 8753 2088
E-mail: amrita.gill@lbhf.gov.uk

Agenda Item 4

	London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham COMMUNITY SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE 29 January 2019
2019 Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)	
Report of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Commercial Services	
Report Status: Open	
Classification: For review and comment.	
Key Decision: No	
Wards Affected: All	
Accountable Director: Sharon Lea – Strategic Director of Residents' Services	
Report Authors: <u>Corporate Overview</u> Hitesh Jolapara – Strategic Director, Finance and Governance Emily Hill – Assistant Director, Corporate Finance <u>Residents' Services</u> Christina Cato - Director for Finance and Resources	Contact Details: Tel: 020 8753 3145 E-mail: emily.hill@lbhf.gov.uk Tel: 020 8753 1979 E-mail: christina.cato@lbhf.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. Cabinet will present their revenue budget and council tax proposals to Budget Council on 27th February 2019. A balanced budget will be set in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- 1.2. This report sets out the budget proposals for the services covered by this Policy and Accountability Committee (PAC). An update is also provided on any proposed changes in fees and charges.
- 1.3. The council is entering into the 10th year of government-imposed austerity. This year's reduction in government investment is £3.5m, meaning a total reduction of £73m (a real terms reduction of 59% from government).

- 1.4. Government resource assumptions, that are used to calculate Government grant for the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham (LBHF), model the Council increasing council tax by 3% in 2019/20. Council Tax has not increased in LBHF in recent years and was last reduced in 2015/16, bringing it to its lowest level since 2002/03. Over the last four years the Band D charge of £727.81 has reduced by 8.4% in real terms and is 34% lower than the London average of £1,112.
- 1.5. The government has modelled an adult social care precept since 2016/17. Government funding modelling assumes that this has been applied despite LBHF choosing not to apply it over recent budgets. Due to the continued high levels of inflation in the social care market and the Government's continued failure to propose a long-term funding solution to social care funding, for the first time the Council proposes to allow 2% of the government's adult social care levy for 2019/20. This compares to the 8% precept assumed, by the government, over the four years to 2019/20.
- 1.6. In accordance with the administration's policy of keeping the council tax low while protecting and improving services, the Council's budgeted council tax increase is restricted to an inflationary increase of 2.7%. This is pegged to the August 2018 increase in the Consumer Price Index and below the August Retail Price Index increase of 3.5%.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1. That the Policy and Accountability Committee (PAC) considers the budget proposals and makes recommendations to Cabinet as appropriate.
- 2.2. That the PAC considers the proposed changes to fees and charges and makes recommendations as appropriate.

3. THE BUDGET GAP

- 3.1. The 2018/19 gross General Fund budget¹ is £560m of which the **net budget requirement of £151.8m** is funded from council resources (such as council tax and business rates) and general government grant.

¹ Figures exclude capital charges and internal service level agreements. These have a net nil impact on the budget.

Table 1 - 2018/19 Budget requirement

Budgeted Expenditure	£'m
Housing Benefit Payments	145
Departmental Budgets	415
Gross Budgeted Expenditure	560
Less:	
Specific Government Grant (including housing benefits and dedicated schools grant)	(272)
Fees and charges	(65)
Contributions (e.g. health, other boroughs)	(49)
Other Income (e.g. investment interest, recharges to the Housing Revenue Account)	(22.2)
Net Budget Requirement	151.8

- 3.2. For 2019/20 the forecast budget gap, before savings, is £10.3m, rising to £48.6m by 2022/23. The budget is based on several key assumptions regarding resources and expenditure.

Table 2 - Budget Gap Before Savings

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
	£'m	£'m	£'m	£'m
Base Budget	151.8	151.8	151.8	151.8
Add:				
- Cumulative Inflation (includes pay)	3.0	8.2	13.4	18.6
- Cumulative headroom	0.0	6.0	12.0	18.0
- Growth	10.8	10.7	10.4	10.4
Budgeted Expenditure	165.6	176.7	187.6	198.8
Less:				
- Government Resources	(15.2)	(10.4)	(9.9)	(9.4)
- Business Rates	(74.2)	(75.6)	(77.1)	(78.6)
- Forecast 2018/19 100% Business Rates Growth Pilot Surplus	(2.0)			
Council Tax & Collection Fund Surplus	(59.4)	(59.8)	(60.4)	(61.0)
Adult Social Care Precept	(1.2)	(1.2)	(1.2)	(1.2)
- Use of Developer Contributions	(3.3) *	(3.3) *	0.0	0.0
Budgeted Resources	(155.3)	(150.3)	(148.6)	(150.2)
Cumulative Budget Gap Before Savings	10.3	26.4	39.0	48.6

* The Base Budget also includes funding of £1.7m from developer contributions for enhanced policing.

Budget Assumptions

- 3.3. Grant funding has been cut in each year since 2010/11. The total reduction since April 2010 to April 2019 has been £73m. This is a cash terms reduction of 47% and real terms reduction of 59%. Funding is forecast to reduce by a further 5% per annum from 2020/21 onwards with no continuation of new one-off funding of £4m received in 2019/20.
- 3.4. **An adult social care precept** of 2% is modelled for 2019/20. This will generate additional income of £4.6m over 4 years and £1.15m in the first year. The Council is committed to use such funding to support adult social care. The 2019/20 budget proposals include provision of £4.1m for adult social care spend pressures and inflation. Part of these pressures will be met from increased better care funding grant of £1.8m and winter pressures grant of £0.9m.
- 3.5. **An inflationary Council Tax** increase of 2.7% is modelled for 2019/20. A 2.7% increase will generate additional income of £6.3m over 4 years and £1.56m in the first year. This will add £19.65 per annum (5.4p per day) to the Band D Council tax charge. Council tax will remain the third lowest in the country.
- 3.6. **The business rates system will change** for a third successive year. A rates revaluation in 2017/18 was followed by a pilot 100% rates retention scheme (for any growth in business) for London in 2018/19. Government has decided to reduce this to a 75% retention pilot in 2019/20.

Table 3 – Business Rates Retention Scheme

Business Rates Retained:	Proportion of Rates Income		
	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
Hammersmith & Fulham	30%	67%	48%
Greater London Authority (GLA)	37%	33%	27%
Government	33%	0	25%
	100%	100%	100%

- 3.7. London Local Government worked to take forward a 100% business rates retention pilot for London from April 2018. This pools business rates across the 33 London Boroughs and GLA. Under this arrangement London keeps 100% of any growth in business rates, though business rates valuations and levels are still set by Government. Updated mid-year modelling identifies a one-off benefit to LBHF of £2.0m from the pool and this is included in 2019/20 forecast resources. Final figures will be confirmed in September 2019.
- 3.8. For 2019/20 the government has ended the 100% pilot. London Local Government has negotiated a new pilot however the imposition by

Central government of a 75% pilot will reduce the benefits to the London Boroughs and GLA. Indicative modelling suggests a one-off benefit for LBHF of £1.2m. This modelling is based on an aggregation of high level estimates and before Boroughs have submitted detailed 2019/20 figures. The actual benefit will not be confirmed until September 2020. This sum is not taken account of within the 2019/20 budgeted resources.

- 3.9 Under the 75% pilot LBHF potentially receives a share of London’s future business growth. The pilot arrangements also require compensating adjustments in other funding streams.

Table 4: Changes to 2019/20 Funding Streams from the 75% Business Rates Pilot

	No-Pilot	With Pilot
Business Rates Baseline	76.9	123.0
Tariff payable to the Government	16.1	45.0
Funding Baseline	60.9	78.0
Revenue Support Grant	17.1	0
Total LBHF Funding	78.0	78.0
Safety net threshold	73.4	74.1

- 3.10 Table 4 sets out the sum assumed (£78.0m) by the Government in the 2019 Local Government Finance Settlement. In recent years the Council has received less than the assumed sum of business rates due to the impact of rating appeals. A safety net threshold is set which guarantees a minimum income to the Council. A further advantage of the pilot is that this threshold is set at a higher level (by £0.7m).
- 3.11 An updated forecast for business rates will be carried out by all boroughs in January 2019. This will provide greater clarity on the LBHF estimate and the potential benefits from the pilot pool arrangements.
- 3.12 The Government are undertaking a ‘**fair funding**’ review which will inform the 2020/21 Local Government Finance Settlement. This will impact on how grant and business rates are distributed between authorities. A Green paper is also due on the longer-term funding for adult social care. These changes, combined with current economic uncertainty, add significant risk to the funding forecast beyond 2019/20.
- 3.13 Planning obligations under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), known as s.106 agreements, are a mechanism which make a development proposal acceptable in planning terms, that would not

otherwise be acceptable. They are focused on site specific mitigation of the impact of development. Property developments have placed increased pressure on council services in recent years.

- 3.14 Legal tests governing the use of s.106 agreements are set out in regulation 122 and 123 of the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended. The tests are:
- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - Directly related to the development; and
 - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 3.15 Local planning authorities are required to use the funding in accordance with the terms of the individual planning obligation legal agreement. This will ensure new developments are acceptable; benefit local communities and support the provision of local infrastructure. In LBHF there are three broad categories of s.106 contributions received:
- for a specific purpose defined and described in the s.106 agreement (such as specific highway works)
 - for a general functional purpose defined and described in the s.106 agreement but with geographical constraints (such as provision of community infrastructure in the White City area)
 - for a general purpose defined and described in the s.106 agreement but with no borough geographical constraints (such as economic development, education purposes, community safety initiatives etc).
- 3.16 Provided the Council respects the obligation to maintain a reasonable relationship with the developments and complies with the specific terms of each of the s.106 agreements giving rise to the funds, the Council has a degree of discretion as to how it allocates and spends some of the general purpose funds. The council has analysed all its s.106 agreements to determine funds with general purposes that can be considered for budgeting purposes. As is usual in these circumstances, many areas of Council activity that have faced increased demand following new developments offer a good fit with the purposes of some of the uncommitted s.106 funds which can therefore be lawfully used to finance such activities.
- 3.17 The 2019/20 budget assumes that £3.3m of expenditure will be funded from s.106 resources. In addition, contributions of £1.7m per annum are assumed towards the provision of enhanced policing. The Council has considered the level of general purposes funds available and has forecast s.106 receipts in hand at the end of 2018/19 of £11m. After estimating future receipts and commitments, including 2019/20 budget commitments, £9.6m is forecast to be in hand at the end of 2019/20. The forecasts are based on assumptions around implementation and completion of planning applications, as approved, the expected time of developments commencing and reaching trigger points. Looking further ahead, the level of uncertainty around trigger points increases and forecasts are less certain.

- 3.18 **Inflation.** A pay award of 2% per annum has been modelled. Inflation has also been provided, on a case by case basis, to meet contractual requirements.

GROWTH, SAVINGS AND RISKS

- 4.1 The growth and savings proposals for the services covered by this PAC are set out in Appendix 1 with budget risks set out in Appendix 2.

Growth

- 4.2 Budget growth is summarised by Service Area in Table 5.

Table 5: 2019/20 Growth Proposals

Service Area	£'m
Children's Services	3.3
Growth & Place	0.1
Public Services Reform	2.6
Social Care	3.6
Council Wide	0.7
Zero Based Budgeting and Service Redesign	0.5
Total	10.8

Savings

- 4.3 The Council faces a continuing financial challenge due to overall Central Government funding cuts, unfunded burdens, inflation, and demand and growth pressures. The budget gap will increase in each of the next three years if no action is taken to reduce expenditure, generate more income through commercial revenue or continue to grow the number of dwellings and businesses in the borough.
- 4.4 To close the budget gap for 2019/20, savings (including additional income) of £10.3m are proposed.

Table 6: 2019/20 Savings and Additional Income

Service Area	£'m
Children's Services	(1.3)
Corporate Services	(0.3)
Finance & Governance	(1.6)
Growth & Place	(0.8)
Public Services Reform	(0.8)
Residents' Services	(2.4)
Social Care	(3.1)
Savings	(10.3)

4.5 The saving proposals are categorised by savings area in Table 7.

Table 7: Categorisation of Savings and Additional Income

	2018/19 £'m	2019/20 £'m
Business Intelligence	(0.4)	0.0
Budgets realigned with spend and income	(0.2)	(1.8)
Commercialisation	(3.4)	(0.5)
Estate Rationalisation	(0.1)	0.0
Income	(0.5)	(0.1)
Outside investment secured	(0.1)	0.0
Prevention	(1.6)	0.0
Procurement / Commissioning	(5.1)	(1.6)
Service reconfiguration	(3.1)	(4.1)
Staffing / Productivity	(0.9)	(2.2)
Total All Savings	(15.4)	(10.3)

Budget Risk and Reserves

- 4.6 The Council's General Fund gross budget is £560m. Within a budget of this magnitude there are inevitably areas of risk and uncertainty particularly within the current challenging financial environment. The key financial risks that face the Council have been identified and quantified. They total £26m. Financial risks of £19.5m were identified when the 2018/19 Budget was set.
- 4.7 The level of balances and reserves are examined each year in light of the medium-term opportunities and risks facing the authority. The latest reserves forecast to 2021/22 assuming no overspends is set out in Table 8.

Table 8: Reserves Forecast to 2021/22

	Opening balance	Budgeted contributions to 2021/22	Commitments to 2021/22	Total
	£m	£m	£m	£m
Earmarked reserves	(79.146)	(7.691)	50.267	(36.570)
King Street Decant Costs				27.300
Estimated profit from JV				(11.100)
Forecast earmarked reserves				(20.370)
General balances				(19.004)
Earmarked restricted reserves				(15.583)
Total reserves				(54.957)

4.8 The existing commitments include:

- The planned investment of earmarked reserves on council priorities (for example implementing the IT strategy, incentive payments to landlords or managed services implementation).
- Prudently setting aside amounts to protect against budgetary risks such as the £14m regarding the forecast shortfall in Dedicated Schools Grant for the **High Needs Block**.
- The existing commitments include £5.4m of planned invest to save investment. The Council is considering capitalising such expenditure in accordance with a Government Regulation on the flexible use of capital receipts. Should such expenditure be capitalised the forecast balance of reserves will increase.

4.9 Funding for pupils with **high needs** is provided through Dedicated Schools Grant from government. A recent children's services finance survey showed that London boroughs were spending £78m more than their high needs grant allocation, with 32 out of 33 boroughs reporting a shortfall. For LBHF the cumulative shortfall in funding is forecast to be £14.2m by the close of 2018/19. The Council is developing options for a deficit recovery plan and has contacted the government to discuss funding levels. It is also discussing how this should be treated on the Council's Balance sheet following a consultation by the Education Funding Agency. Pending further clarification, the Council has set aside a reserve to cover the potential deficit.

4.10 Looking to the future an anticipated use of reserves is a planned investment of £27.3m in the King Street West Regeneration project with a forecast profit of £11.1m coming back to the Council from the proposed Joint Venture profits. This scheme will be considered at Full Council on 23 January 2019. The Council will benefit from efficiencies

in delivering modern, inclusively designed and fit-for-purpose office and civic accommodation for its staff and visitors, as well as for small and start-up businesses. It also avoids the need for significant capital investment in the existing Town Hall and Town Hall Extension, which in 2017 was estimated at between £29.2 million and £53.5 million for both buildings, depending on the extent of refurbishment works undertaken. These figures exclude professional fees (estimated to be at least £2million to tender stage) and the cost of decanting staff to allow works to take place.

- 4.11 Maintaining reserves and balances at an adequate level is essential to the future financial resilience of the Council. For example, an overspend of £4.9m is forecast in the month 6 Corporate Revenue Monitor. This will be a further call on reserves unless the overspend is tackled by year-end.
- 4.12 Reserves can only be spent once. The forecast to 2021/22 identifies a tightening in the Council's finances that will need careful management and review. Continued focus will be required on keeping spend within budget and avoiding the use reserves to balance future budgets and rebuilding reserves for future investments.

5 FEES AND CHARGES

- 5.1 The budget strategy assumes:
- Social Care charges frozen
 - A standard uplift of 3.5% based on the August 2018 Retail Price Index for other charges
 - Case by case review for commercial services that are charged on a for-profit basis. These will be varied up and down in response to market conditions, with relevant Member approval.
- 5.2 The exceptions for this Committee are attached in Appendix 4.

6 2019/20 COUNCIL TAX LEVELS

- 6.1 The administration proposes to increase the Hammersmith and Fulham element of 2019/20 Council Tax in line with inflation, by 2.7%. A 2.7% increase will generate additional income of £6.3m over 4 years and annual income of £1.56m and will add £19.65 per annum (5.4p per day) to the Band D Council tax charge. As set out below, 52% of dwellings are liable for 100% council tax with exemptions/discounts for Council Tax Support claimants, students, care leavers and single person households.

Table 9: Liability for Council Tax

Total dwellings in the borough	88,700
Reductions:	
Exemptions (mainly students, includes care leavers)	(3,600)
Council tax support claimants (elderly & working age on low income)	(11,200)
Single person discount (25% discount)	(28,200)
Dwellings liable for 100% of Council tax	45,700 52%

- 6.2 **An adult social care precept** levy of 2% is budgeted for 2019/20 with a freeze in future years. This will generate additional income of £4.6m over 4 years and £1.15m in 2019/20. This will increase the Band D Council Tax charge by £14.55 (4p per day).
- 6.3 The Mayor of London's draft budget is currently out for consultation and is due to be presented to the London Assembly on 24 January 2019, with final confirmation of precepts on 25 February. The current Band D precept is £294.23.
- 6.4 The change to the LBHF Band D charge is set out in Table 10. The current LBHF Band D charge of £727.81 is 34% lower than the London average of £1,112. The overall Band D charge, including the GLA precept, is the third lowest in the country.

Table 10: LBHF Band D Council Tax Charge

2018/19 LBHF Band D charge	£727.81
Proposed 2019/20 Increase of 2.7%	£19.65
Proposed 2% Adult Social Care precept	£14.55
2019/20 Total LBHF Band D charge	£762.01

7 Comments of the Executive Director for Residents' Services on the Budget Proposals

- 7.1 The Residents' Services Group (RSG) is proposing a total controllable expenditure budget of £78.6m for 2019/20, of which £60.8m is expected to be recovered through income. The total controllable net budget is therefore £17.7m. In addition to this, corporate charges and income, which are not controlled by the service group, total a net £19.9m. This is shown in table 11 below.

- 7.2 Savings proposals totalling £2.446m are included in the proposed budget for 2019/20. These are also summarised in Table 11 (and detailed in Appendix 1).

Table 11 – Residents’ Services Budget 2019/20

* These savings are included in the budget figures in the table

Directorate	Expenditure £000	Income £000	Net Budget: 2019-20 £000	Savings 2019-20 £000
Building Control and Technical Support Services	1,571	(947)	624	
Cleaner, Greener & Cultural Services	12,822	(4,772)	8,049	136
Customer Services	16,638	(4,149)	12,489	
Environmental Health, Community Safety & Emergency Planning	8,486	(4,633)	3,853	130
Executive, Finance and Contingency	843	(136)	707	
Leisure & Parks	5,081	(2,306)	2,775	88
Libraries	2,381	(522)	1,859	
Other LBHF Commercial Services	4	(290)	(286)	50
Parking	10,873	(39,308)	(28,435)	1,850
Prevent	0	0.00	0	
Street Cleansing and Street Enforcement	11,938	(230)	11,708	117
Transport and Highways	7,969	(5,421)	2,548	75
Total Controllable Budgets	78,606	(62,716)	15,891	2,446
Capital Charges	13,260	0.00	13,260	0
Corporate and Departmental Overheads	12,788	(2,343)	10,445	0
Total Corporately Managed Budget	26,048	(2,343)	23,705	0
Total Residents Services Budgets	104,654	(65,059)	39,596	2,446

Transport & Highways and Parks & Leisure

- 7.3 The Transport and Highways directorate is targeting efficiencies and income generating initiatives of £75,000 in 2019/20. For Leisure and Parks various proposals totalling £88,000 are put forward. These include rationalising contracts and maximising commercial rental income from parks and open spaces assets. The budget includes contract inflation of £285,000 toward Grounds Maintenance and Highway works contracts.

Parking

- 7.4 The Parking Service is operating effectively and efficiently to deliver the Council’s priorities in maintaining the highway/transport infrastructure and management of emissions. The introduction of cashless parking has resulted in efficiencies and increased income. The parking budgets have been realigned to reflect this. The service is expected to generate more income in 2018/19 than budgeted and this performance is projected to continue in 2019/20. This will deliver the proposed saving of £1.850m for 2019/20 and will continue on an on-going basis in future years.

Environmental Health, Community Safety & Emergency Services

- 7.5 The Environmental Health service - Use of s.106 funding will allow the council to deliver current service levels at reduced cost, saving the council £120,000. A review of the Licensing team, to reduce management costs in Licensing team, by reviewing s.113 arrangements and officer responsibilities will save £10,000.

Cleaner, Greener and Cultural Services (CGCS)

- 7.6 A sustained reduction in waste disposal costs is only possible through the reduction of waste generated by residents and an increase in recycle which would contribute to £117,000 of the £136,000 savings currently being achieved by the heavily discounted recycle rate. A proposed inflationary uplift on commercial waste fees and charges, being flexible with fees and charges for different kinds of customers, rather than having an across the board increase in fees for all customers, is expected to deliver the remaining £20,000 in income in 2019/20.

Commercial Services including Street Cleansing and Street Enforcement

- 7.7 The Commercial Directorate has savings of £10,000 identified from increased legal disbursements income. A review of contract efficiencies has identified potential savings. The proposals are not yet fully developed but are expected to deliver savings of £83,000. Plans will continue to be developed in 2019/20. A further saving of £24,000 will be delivered by ending the subsidy for the Shepherds Bush convenience used by TfL staff.

Executive Support and Finance

- 7.8 A review of Business and Executive Support will save the Council £50,000 from 2019/20.

8 Equality Implications

- 8.1 A draft Equality Impact Analysis (EIA), which assesses the impacts on equality of the main items in the budget proposals relevant to this PAC, is attached as Appendix 3. A final EIA will be reported to Budget Council.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000
LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT

No.	Description of Background Papers	Name/Ext. of holder of file/copy	Department/ Location
1.	None		

Appendix 1 – Savings and Growth Proposals

Appendix 2 – Risks

Appendix 3 – Draft Equality Impact Assessment

Appendix 4 – Fees & Charges not Increasing at the Standard Rate

Residents Services

Financial Strategy Savings			Budget Change			
Service	Description	Delivery Risk (H-M-L)	2019-20 Budget Change Cumulative (£000's)	2020-21 Budget Change Cumulative (£000's)	2021-22 Budget Change Cumulative (£000's)	2022-23 Budget Change Cumulative (£000's)
Savings						
Highways Projects	Cycle street furniture advertising	High	(25)	(25)	(25)	(25)
Parks & Open Spaces	Events income	Medium	(30)	(30)	(30)	(30)
Parks & Open Spaces	Licensing for companies using parks for large exercise groups	Medium	(10)	(10)	(10)	(10)
Leisure Centres	Improved leisure facilities contract	Medium	(30)	(30)	(30)	(30)
Parks & Open Spaces	Various small initiatives including 17/18 underspends, sponsorship, sustainable planting	Medium	(18)	(18)	(18)	(18)
Street Scene Enforcement	Increase legal disbursements income	Medium	(10)	(10)	(10)	(10)
Commercial Waste	Increase commercial waste income	Medium	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)
Waste Action	Targeted increase in recycling	High	(116)	(116)	(116)	(116)
Business Support	Deletion of Business Support posts	Low	(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)
CCTV	CCTV staff - investment of applicable S.106	Medium	(80)	(80)	(80)	(80)
CCTV	CCTV maintenance - investment of applicable S.106	Medium	(40)	(40)	(40)	(40)
Highways Maintenance and Park & Leisure	Better procurement in parks	High	(50)	(50)	(50)	(50)
Environmental Health Licensing	A review of the Licensing team.	Medium	(10)	(10)	(10)	(10)
Public Conveniences	End subsidy for Shepherds Bush convenience used by TfL bus drivers	Medium	(24)	(24)	(24)	(24)
Waste & Enforcement	More robust enforcement strategy for night time waste	High	(83)	(83)	(83)	(83)
Parking	Realign budgets with current income and expenditure levels	Low	(1,850)	(1,850)	(1,850)	(1,850)
Total Savings			(2,446)	(2,446)	(2,446)	(2,446)

Residents Services Risk/Challenges

Department & Division	Short Description of Risk	Risk				Mitigation
		2019/20 Value (£000's)	2020/21 Value (£000's)	2021/22 Value (£000's)	2022/23 Value (£000's)	
All	Shared Services Review - Disaggregation of the bi-borough arrangements with RBKC.	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Zero-based budgeting approach
Various	budget areas dependent on Section 106--risk of slow-down of receipts in the future if there is downturn in developments	2,900	1,800	1,800	1,800	
Customer Services	£481k MTFS staffing, £150k Channel Saving, £20k OOH Contract, £90k H&F Direct Loss of Court Costs, (£tbc)-Operational cost of Ethical Debt collection (Total £741k)	741	741	741	741	Workshops being held with 1st Credit to understand costing model and a request has been made for these costs to be centralised.
Waste Disposal	Waste disposal rates and tonnages increase by more than budgeted	-	326	501	tbc	Regular finance review and reporting through DMT. Continue to progress action plans to target reductions in general waste tonnages and increase recycling.
Ducting Contract	Risk that the current ducting concession contract has reduced with no alternative provider or substitution	250	250	250	250	Work with the concession holder to identify new large contracts. Regular finance review to monitor concession holder's performance. Departmental reserves set aside.
Registrars	Loss of Nationality Checking Service income, resulting from Home Office shift to online digital services. £100k average annual income achieved since April 2016.	100	100	100	100	Identify alternative income generating potential within the service area, although this may be limited (look to other boroughs for opportunities). Seek support from the Commercial Team to increase income as far as possible.
EH Private Housing - Selective/Additional Licensing	New private housing licensing income does not cover the additional administration costs in full	300	300	300	300	Closely monitor to ensure that expenditure is reduced in line with any reductions in income. Report progress on this Commercial business case to the Commercial Board
CGCS	Waste Contract process and re-procurement	200	200			Work with contract holder to identify vfm savings and efficiencies. Regular contract monitoring to ensure that performance is maintained and expenditure reductions are aligned to targets.
Parks and Leisure	Leisure Centre Contract	70	40			Work with contract holder. Regular contract monitoring to ensure that performance is maintained and income projections are aligned to targets.
CGCS	Procurement process for cleansing contract	100	100	100	100	
Culture/ Community Safety - Commercial Savings	"Commercial income savings not achievable due to market conditions Events: Commercial services income target for markets and events £100k CCTV: Commercial services income target for deployable CCTV not being achieved £100k Professional Witnesses: Lack of uptake of this new service £20k"	220	220	220	220	Work with the Commercial Director to develop and implement plans. Regular finance review to monitor service demand. Report through DMT and Commercial Board.
Filming	Filming income budgets not delivered in full	125	125	125	125	Fully mobilise and exploit new filming and events location library. Work with the Commercial Team to maximise sales.
Street Cleansing and Street Enforcement - Waste Action Team	£671k Inflation on the SERCO has been held back by FCS whilst efforts are made to find equivalent savings on the existing contract which is due to be re-tendered by April 2021. There is a budget risk if the savings cannot be found. £84k prior year MTFS Unachievable savings	755	755	-	-	Corporate to award the contract inflation to the department in-year if the anticipated savings cannot be found through renegotiating the existing contract.
Libraries & Archives	Commercial and SmartOpen savings targets not achieved. There is uncertainty about how the full commercial savings target will be achieved. The high target stems partially from the decision in 2017/18 not to follow a trust model. Additionally the achievement of the SmartOpen savings target from 18/19 requires capital investment.	280	230	230	230	Focus on actions to improve income through Libraries Transformation Board. Agree Smart Open investment as invest to save scheme. The service could delay committing to library resource spend and delay recruitment.
Highways & Projects	Metro Wireless contract	73	73	73	73	

Department & Division	Short Description of Risk	Risk				Mitigation
		2019/20 Value (£000's)	2020/21 Value (£000's)	2021/22 Value (£000's)	2022/23 Value (£000's)	
Parks & Open Spaces	2019/20 MTFS: Improved usage of parks for events not being delivered	30	30	30	30	Reviewing budgets and staffing- Parks are not responsible for events so savings would need to come from elsewhere not yet identified
Parks & Open Spaces	2019/20 MTFS: Savings resulting from various 2017/18 underspends not being repeated	18	18	18	18	Closely monitor budgets and aim to achieve target
Parking	Parking suspensions income may fall if the wider economy slows, leading to reduce property development activity and reduced demand for parking bay suspensions.	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	Parking fees not set to raise income, so no mitigation proposed
Parking	Receipts from moving traffic offence penalty charge notices will fall if driver behaviour improves.	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	Reducing offences is the object of moving traffic penalties, so a reduced income would be a sign of success
Parking	Risk of delay in introducing call-back function	45	45	45	45	The service would consider making other adjustments to its staffing.
Building Control	There is an income shortfall on Building Control. This is primarily due to the current recession in the construction industry as a result of the uncertainties surrounding Brexit and the increased competition from the private approved inspectors.	250	250	250	250	Further opportunities being explored to identify new commissions (internal and external)
Environmental Services (Inc CPA)		8,457	7,603	6,783	6,282	-

DRAFT Equality Impact Analysis (EIA) of main budget proposals for Residents' Services

RS1 Cycle street furniture advertising - £0.025m

Advertising revenue will be increased by utilising the space available on cycle street furniture. This will not adversely impact any specific user groups.

RS6 Better procurement in parks - £0.050m

Rationalisation of council contracts where similarities exist (e.g. Housing and Parks do similar things to highways but use different contractors). Currently working with Parks to deliver their footpath programme using the Highways framework contractor. This will have a neutral impact on residents of the borough.

RS11 Events income - £0.030m

Utilising the parks and open spaces within the borough to maximise commercial rental income will result in approximately £30,000 of additional income. The charge will be met by the event's organiser and it is not believed that this will have a negative impact on any specific user group.

RS12 Licensing for companies using parks for large exercise groups - £0.010m

The initiative will see increased revenue through the introduction of charges for professional group trainers in local parks. This is already common place in the surrounding areas with the Royal Parks, Wandsworth, Ealing and Kensington and Chelsea already benefiting from this measure. This will enable better regulation of areas with heavy usage thereby making the park more enjoyable for all users. This initiative will not impact any specific user groups.

RS13 Improved leisure facilities contract - £0.030m

Leisure centres have recently been renovated meaning all users will benefit from access to higher quality sports facilities. The increased usage is expected to bring financial benefits to the Council.

RS14 Various small initiatives including 2017/18 underspends, sponsorship, sustainable planting - £0.018m

RS14 is the amalgamation of minor savings initiatives. The majority of this is made up of underspends on 2017/18 budgets. This will have no impact on the service provided and will therefore not affect any specific user groups. Small savings will also be made from changes to maintenance contracts, for example, reducing costs by using low maintenance sustainable plants.

RS19 A review of the Licensing team - £0.010m

This initiative involves reviewing the current working arrangements of the licencing team. By reviewing Section 113 arrangements with Kensington and Chelsea and officer responsibilities it is expected that a reduction in management costs will occur. These changes are not anticipated to have any impact on service delivery to residents. Any staffing changes will go through the outlined HR procedures.

RS29 Increase legal disbursements income - £0.010m

Increased income will be generated from an increase in Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) activity by Street Enforcement targeting waste dumping and fly tipping. This will not have any impact on any specific groups as the use of these legal notices includes the requirement for a public interest test and an assessment of the scale and nature of the offence committed and the appropriateness of serving the notice. The issuing of FPN's will be proportionate, justified and targeted against the worst offenders.

RS46 CCTV staff - investment of applicable S.106 - £0.080m

This saving will not have any impact on the residents of the borough or staff. The saving will be made on a substitute funding basis, meaning the exact same service will be available but the funding of this will come from alternative sources.

RS47 CCTV maintenance - investment of applicable S.106 - £0.040m

£40,000 is currently spent on maintenance of the council's CCTV service. By funding this through S106 funding it will free up the revenue budget to be spent elsewhere in the council. Altering the funding source will not have any impact on the service which is currently supplied and will therefore have no adverse equalities impact.

RS35 Increase commercial waste income - £0.020m

By increasing the flexibility of fees and charges for commercial waste, the council will be able to attract customers from different areas of the market. Moving from the current rigid fee structure will not impact any specific user groups.

RS36 Targeted increase in recycling - £0.116m

This saving will be made by increasing the recycling rate within the borough. Waste disposal rates for 2018/19 are estimated to be £27.00 per tonne for recycling and £155.80 for general waste. Therefore, diverting waste from the general waste stream to recycling allows for significant savings. This proposal will not adversely impact any user groups.

RS49 More robust enforcement strategy for night time waste - £0.083m

This saving relates to the current clear all waste policy. At present all waste left out overnight is removed by the council. It is proposed that instead of removing waste the council will take more of an enforcement approach and will ensure waste is disposed of correctly. This will focus on increasing income through commercial revenue and ensuring waste collection is paid for by the appropriate party. The council will issue fines if waste procedures are not adhered to. This initiative will not have an impact on any specific user groups.

RS52 End subsidy for Shepherd's Bush convenience used by TfL bus drivers - £0.024m

The toilets at Shepherds Bush Green is the last toilet in the borough which receives any subsidy. The toilets have minimum usage, ie mainly used by TFL bus drivers. Eliminating the whole toilet budget will result in £24,000 savings. It is not believed that this initiative will have an impact on any protected characteristics as the toilet is rarely used by members of the public.

RS39 Deletion of Business Support posts - £0.050m


The Business Support function is currently operating with a number of vacant posts. Deleting these posts will have no impact on service delivery or on the staff in the team.

Residents' Services Fees and Charges 2019-20

SERVICE	Fee Description	2018/19 Charge (£)	2019/20 Charge (£)	Proposed Variation (%)	Reason for exception to inflationary increase
FILMING/PHOTOGRAPHY	Location Fee				
FILMING/PHOTOGRAPHY	Mortuary	£282 plus £60 staff overtime	£282 plus £60 staff overtime	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
FILMING/PHOTOGRAPHY	Town Halls	£282 plus £60 staff overtime	£282 plus £60 staff overtime	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
FILMING/PHOTOGRAPHY	Schools	25% passing on fee	25% passing on fee	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
FILMING/PHOTOGRAPHY	Fulham Palace	25% passing on fee	25% passing on fee	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
FILMING/PHOTOGRAPHY	Community Centres	25% passing on fee	£282 plus £60 staff overtime	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
COMMUNITY SAFETY	COMMUNITY SAFETY				
COMMUNITY SAFETY	Motorcycle recovery - individual	£50.00	£50.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
COMMUNITY SAFETY	Motorcycle recovery - insurance company	£110.00	£110.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
COMMUNITY SAFETY	Return of Stray Dogs to Owners	£25.00	£25.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
COMMUNITY SAFETY	Stray Dogs- Statutory Fee	£25.00	£25.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
COMMUNITY SAFETY	Stray Dogs- Administration Fee	£25.00	£25.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
COMMUNITY SAFETY	Stray Dogs- Kennelling (per day)	£12.50	£12.50	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
COMMUNITY SAFETY	Vets Fees	Variable	Variable	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
Neighbourhood Wardens	Neighbourhood Wardens				
Neighbourhood Wardens	Neighbourhood Warden Patrols (per hour)	£100.00	£100.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
TRANSPORT	TRANSPORT				
TRANSPORT	Parts	Cost + 10.5%	Cost + 10.5%	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
TRANSPORT	Fuel - Diesel / Petrol / LPG	Cost + 8.5 to 10.5%	Cost + 7.5 to 10.5%	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
TRANSPORT	Ad Hoc Vehicle Hire	Cost + 10.5%	Cost + 10.5%	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
TRANSPORT	Management and Administration Charge	Total Cost (excluding Fuel and NSEs) + 10.5%	Total Cost (excluding Fuel and NSEs) + 10.5%	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
PARKING	Parking Permits				
PARKING	Residents - Individual's first permit (6mths)	£71.00	£71.00	➔ 0.0%	Fees to be set in accordance with Parking Policy
PARKING	Residents - Individual's second permit (6mths)	£260.00	£260.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Residents - Individual's first permit (Yearly)	£119.00	£119.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Residents - Individual's second permit (Yearly)	£497.00	£497.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Residents - Discounted permit charges (Green vehicles)	£60.00	£60.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Business first permit (6mths)	£464.00	£464.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Business second permit (6mths)	£735.00	£735.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Business first permit (Yearly)	£791.00	£791.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Business second permit (Yearly)	£1,310.00	£1,310.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Doctors	£125.00	£125.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Zone A	£2.80	£2.80	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Zone A - Visitors	£1.80	£1.80	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	More Serious	£130.00	£130.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Less Serious	£80.00	£80.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Towaway	£200.00	£200.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	1-5 Days	£40.00	£40.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	6-42 Days	£60.00	£60.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	43 days +	£80.00	£80.00	➔ 0.0%	
PARKING	Third Party fees charged for valuation services	£580.70	£580.70	➔ 0.0%	
Food Hygiene Rating Scheme	Food Hygiene Rating Scheme				
Food Hygiene Rating Scheme	FHRS Revisits/Rescore	£273.00	£273.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
Food Hygiene Rating Scheme	Telephone Advice	£75.00	£75.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
Food Hygiene Rating Scheme	Telephone advice/pre compliance check	£259.00	£259.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
Private Water Supplies	Private Water Supplies				
Private Water Supplies	General Charges				
Private Water Supplies	Risk Assessment (for each assessment)	£500.00	£500.00	➔ 0.0%	Above inflation - statutory cap removed
Private Water Supplies	Analysing a Sample				
Private Water Supplies	Regulation 10 - single and small supplies - non-optional parameters*****	£25.00	£25.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
Private Water Supplies	Commercial and Large Supplies - taken during check monitoring	£100.00	£100.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift
Private Water Supplies	Commercial and Large Supplies - taken during audit monitoring and monitoring under Regulation 11 (radioactive substances) for all supplies	£500.00	£500.00	➔ 0.0%	No uplift

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES				
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Civil Marriage/Civil Partnership/Naming Ceremonies/Vow Renewals (including rehearsals)				
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Notices				
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Notice of marriage/civil partnership	£35.00	£35.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Notice of marriage/civil partnership (subject to Home Office referral)	£47.00	£47.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Consideration of Divorce/Dissolution (outside of British Isles) by LRS	£50.00	£50.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Consideration of Divorce/Dissolution (outside of British Isles) by GRO	£75.00	£75.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Waiver (reduce 28 day notice period)	£60.00	£60.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	RG's Licence	£15.00	£15.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Conversion of a Civil Partnership into Marriage				
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	At Register Office	£45.00	£45.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Completing the declaration	£27.00	£27.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Signing the declaration in a religious building registered for same sex couples	£91.00	£91.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Register Office, Hammersmith Town Hall				
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Monday - Thursday	£46.00	£46.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Rose Room, Hammersmith Town Hall				
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Fee for attendance at places of worship	£86.00	£86.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Copy Certificates				
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Copy certificate from historical records - administration fee	£5.00	£5.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Consideration of Space 17	£40.00	£40.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Consideration of Corrections by LRS	£75.00	£75.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Consideration of Corrections by GRO	£90.00	£90.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Cancellation & Booking Changes				
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Non-refundable deposit per notice	£35.00	£35.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Non-refundable deposit for ceremony bookings	£100.00	£100.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	Amendment administration fee for ceremony bookings	£35.00	£35.00	→	0.0% Statutory fees
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	European Passport Return Service Fees				
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	European Passport Return Service (Weekday)	£20.00	£20.00	→	0.0% Suggested Home Office Fee
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS & MARRIAGES	European Passport Return Service (Saturday)	£30.00	£30.00	→	0.0% Suggested Home Office Fee

Agenda Item 5

<p>London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham</p> <p>Community Safety and Environment Policy and Accountability Committee</p> <p>29 January 2019</p>	 <p>h&f hammersmith & fulham</p>
MANAGEMENT OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES IN THE BOROUGH	
Report of the Cabinet Member for Environment, Transport and Residents Services – Councillor Wesley Harcourt	
Open Report	
Classification: For review and comment	
Key Decision: No	
Consultation: N/A	
Wards Affected: All	
Accountable Director: Sharon Lea - Director for Residents Services	
Report Author: Graham Morrison Environmental Health Officer	Contact Details: Tel: 020 8753 3964 graham.morrison@lbhf.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. Infectious disease is one of the statutory responsibilities of the Food and Health and Safety team.
- 1.2. The council has a legal duty to receive notifications of infectious diseases (*including food poisoning outbreaks*) from Registered Medical Practitioners (RMPs), monitor, investigate and take action where necessary. This report provides an overview of the systems and controls that we have in place to keep residents and other members of the public safe.

2. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

- 2.1. Dr John Snow was a physician who is generally credited as the founder of modern epidemiology. In 1854 a cholera outbreak occurred. Up to then it was thought to be airborne via 'bad air', but he considered that 'germs' were ingested. He plotted cases on a map and investigated patients' movements. They had all drawn water from the pump in Broad Street (now Broadwick Street) in Soho. The pump handle was removed, and new cases stopped. The techniques used in tracing diseases today, remain largely unchanged.

3. KEY ISSUES

What is an infectious disease?

- 3.1. An infectious disease is a disease caused by pathogenic microorganisms, such as bacteria, viruses, parasites or fungi that can be spread, directly or indirectly, from one person to another. There are 31 diseases listed as notifiable, which are shown in the table below. (World Health Organization).

Acute encephalitis	Diphtheria	Malaria	Smallpox
Acute meningitis	Enteric fever (typhoid or paratyphoid)	Measles	Tetanus
Acute poliomyelitis	Food poisoning	Meningococcal septicaemia	Tuberculosis
Acute infectious hepatitis	Haemolytic uraemic syndrome (HUS)	Mumps	Typhus
Anthrax	Infectious bloody diarrhoea	Plague	Viral haemorrhagic fever (VHF)
Botulism	Invasive group A streptococcal disease & scarlet fever	Rabies	Whooping cough
Brucellosis	Legionnaires' disease	Rubella	Yellow fever
Cholera	Leprosy	SARS	

Role of the Health Protection Team (HPT)

- 3.2. The council's Food and Health and Safety team work in partnership with dedicated Consultants for the borough, from Public Health England, Health Protection Team.
- 3.3. Officers rely on the HPT for medical guidance, provided by Consultants in Communicable Disease Control (CCDC), consultant nurses, and support staff, who engage with European and world collaborating centers and laboratories.
- 3.4. The Proper Officer of the council is under a legal obligation to inform PHE and any other relevant body about notifications received. The council appoint CCDCs as Proper Officers for receiving Notifications from RMPs. The London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham has appointed five consultants as our Proper Officers for the purpose of Regulations 2,3 & 6 of the Health Protection (Notification) Regulations 2010, and for section 48 of the Public Health (Control of Diseases) Act 1984 as amended by the Health & Social Care Act 2008.

- 3.5. Based on the statistics that are provided, PHE collates and publishes monthly details of statutory notifications of infectious diseases by borough and disease, which can be found in a NOIDs Weekly Report;
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/768549/NOIDS-weekly-report-week52-2018.pdf

Proactive and reactive work to prevent the spread of disease

- 3.6. This area of work is highly sensitive and is restricted to fully qualified Environmental Health Officers (EHOs), with a degree recognised by the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health.
- 3.7. Some areas of this work, such as monitoring and carrying out inspections are routine but work activities require immediate action because the results can be life threatening, e.g. Legionella, Tuberculosis, and Listeria.
- 3.8. Food poisoning is a notifiable condition and outbreak cases are routinely investigated where evidence is sufficient.

Officer powers

- 3.9. Environmental Health Officers (EHOs) investigate cases of Infectious Diseases, which also includes cases of food poisoning and Legionella.
- 3.10. Environmental Health Officers have the power to close any business that poses a risk to health via the Courts or exclude people from work if they pose a risk to others.
- 3.11. Officers have not needed to close any businesses formally in recent years, as the preference is to work collaboratively where possible. E.g. in a large office block which experienced a Norovirus outbreak the company agreed to close voluntarily and immediately.
- 3.12. The law provides powers for people in certain circumstances to be suspended from work, and in extreme cases to be arrested and removed to hospital, (with judicial oversight).
- 3.13. The Regulations also provide other powers over buildings and objects e.g. disinfection or decontamination, excluding a child from school, or requiring details of children at the school, restricting access to see dead bodies and allowing for discretionary compensation to those who are formally excluded from work.
- 3.14. As the Council holds various statutory powers, officers assist also Public Health England with other matters especially where patients are being uncooperative. A good example of this is Tuberculosis cases.

Infectious disease plans and desktop emergency exercises

- 3.15. PHE consults EHOs about Infectious disease plans, which are regularly reviewed and updated to ensure that plans remain robust.
- 3.16. Officers receive update training from PHE, and partake in desktop emergency exercises. Examples of desktop exercises that officers have been involved in include: an outbreak of disease at HMP Wormwood Scrubs (*the last one was control and containment of a Norovirus outbreak*), what to do in the case of an Ebola outbreak or flu epidemic/pandemic and testing plans for the Olympics.

Food hygiene inspections and sampling

- 3.17. Statutory food hygiene inspections are a principal tool in the prevention of food poisoning. Businesses are risk rated A – E, where A are premises that present the highest risk.
- 3.18. The risk rating of premises is vital to manage the programme of routine inspections. Depending on the risk rating, food businesses are inspected anything from every 6 months (for A rated premises) to once every two years (D rated premises).
- 3.19. As of 31 December 2018, there were 2040 registered food premises.
- 3.20. All businesses are awarded a food hygiene rating of 0 – 5, with a ‘5’ being ‘very good’ and ‘0’ being ‘very poor’. The ratings for all food businesses inspected, are published on the Food Standards Agency (FSA) website.
- 3.21. At the end of 2018, food businesses within the borough had the following ratings: 2 As, 104 Bs, 482 Cs, 703 Ds, and 504 Es, with some 200 new businesses registering.
- 3.22. In addition to inspections, officers have a local food sampling programme.

How infectious disease cases are managed

- 3.23. The table below illustrates the process that is followed to minimise risks and harm in the event of an outbreak.

Case Management process
LA notified about food poisoning outbreak.
The CCDC confirms the type of food poisoning outbreak.
An Outbreak Control team is established and chaired by the CCDC.
Patients are identified via GP and other RMP Notifications & hospital mostly.
Patient is visited or called as part of the routine investigation to identify source, and in gastro intestinal (GI) cases in relation to stool samples.
Food hygiene inspection carried out at all identified outlets.
Food/water/stool samples are sent to the Public Health laboratory.
Daily teleconferences with officers and PHE/HPT are held throughout.
CCDC confirms when outbreak is over.
Outbreak report produced by HPT/PHE with Council input.

Cause and responsibility identified where possible.
Appropriate action by the council: advice, additional training or legal action.

3.24. Where formal/legal action is needed; this would be a warning letter, Statutory Notice, formal closure, or Court action.

Other joint working with PHE to prevent the spread of disease

3.25. Officers can become involved with Public Health England (PHE) over a diverse range of condition and issues, not all of which are Notifiable Diseases, but where medical advice is needed, or our help has been requested.

Type of disease/issue	Possible causes or those at risk
Food poisoning	Salmonella, Campylobacter
Food borne diseases	E. coli 0157:H7 (STEC) & Listeria
Norovirus outbreaks	in an institution
Legionella	cooling towers, old plumbing systems
Tuberculosis	patients refusing medication
Pica	typically children
Carbon monoxide poisoning	wood ovens, BBQ
Travel related diseases	Shigella dysentery, Typhoid

Costs, Effects, and Risk Groups

3.26. The cost to businesses is significant: staff sickness, lost productivity, food waste. Businesses might face legal action and court costs, negative publicity, and significant remedial costs especially with Legionella.

3.27. Outbreak investigations can consume significant amounts of staff time. A previous Salmonella case resulted in 60 customers ill with 20 hospitalized and officers were involved with the case for 3 months. This would be in the region of 1500 – 2000 hours.

3.28. Risk groups are the very old, very young, pregnant women, those with compromised immune systems, and those already ill. People who are ill pose a risk to those in risk groups. Workplaces with multiple management structures and relying on zero hours contracts can be problematic and prolong an outbreak.

3.29. Nationally, Infectious diseases are a significant health & economic drain on the UK and local areas, and account for 7% of deaths and an annual cost of £30bn. The control of food hygiene standards and the investigation of infections generally with the interventions provided to us by legislation supports the council’s vision of being the best and improving the experience of our residents and visitors.

Conclusion

3.30. H&F is a very cosmopolitan inner London borough which has seen an increase in developments both commercial and residential. We have over

2000 food business with start-ups registering weekly The Council has a statutory duty to carry out food hygiene inspections and to investigate food poisoning outbreaks. The inspections and investigation must be made by the EHOs who are legally competent to do so. EHO time is very resource intensive in these cases and can divert staff away from 'day to day' business.

- 3.31. Significant outbreaks in local businesses can reflect poorly on the borough generally, which presents a potential reputational risk.
- 3.32. H&F has major venues and events, including 3 football clubs, Olympia, and Westfield. These bring large numbers of visitors to the borough and benefits local businesses. However, a significant outbreak in any large gathering is likely to become news worthy on social media and press.
- 3.33. Officers will continue and react as needed to situations and any changes in legislation. To reduce this area of work would have implications for health and the spread of disease, and would mean that the Council would not meet its statutory duties

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 This work is an essential element in maintaining the health of our residents and preventing the spread of disease.
- 4.2 It is recommended that Members note the key importance and potential impact of this work in protecting residents and visitors to the borough.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Officers consulted the borough's dedicated consultants from the NW London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Health Protection Team in preparing this report.

6. EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The Council, when making decisions in relation to any of its functions, must comply with its public-sector equality duty as set out in s149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the Act).
- 6.2 Diseases afflict people indiscriminately and officers treat all cases equally according to the facts of the case. This work has low relevance in relation to its impact on the areas under the statutory duties contained in the equalities impact assessment for the Food and Health & safety team, but contributes towards the corporate priorities of the council, set out in the H&F Business Plan.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The legal duty for the Council is set out in the primary legislation of the Public Health (Control of Disease) Act 1984, as amended by Sections 129 and 130

of the Health and Social Care Act 2008. The Regulations applicable in these matters are the Health Protection (Notification) Regulations 2010, in particular Regulations 2,3, 6 and 7, the Health Protection (Local Authority Powers) Regulations 2010 and the Health Protection (Part 2A Orders) Regulations 2010.

The Council appoints proper officers as defined under Section 74 of the Public Health (Control of Disease) Act 1984, for the purposes of Section 48 of the Public Health (Control of Diseases) Act 1984, as amended by the Health and Social Care Act 2008 and in addition to Regulations 2,3,4 of the Health Protection (Notification) Regulations 2010.

Issues arising from investigations under the above legislation may result in actions taken under the Food Safety Act 1990, Food Safety and Hygiene (England) Regulations 2013 or Sections 2,3 and 4 of the Health & Safety at Work etc. Act 1974, in addition to the use of its powers under the Health Protection (Part 2A Orders) Regulations 2010. The Data Protection Act 2018 and General Data Protection Regulations 2018 are of central importance to the council.

Implications verified by: Champa Gurnani – Senior Solicitor, Legal Services, telephone 020 8753 2763.

8. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 This work is already undertaken by the Food Safety team and the continuation of this statutory duty will not require any additional resources going forward.
- 8.2 The 2010 Regulations removed the duty to pay compensation to those excluded from work, but replaced it with a power to do so if considered justified (e.g. in cases of real hardship). In H&F the decision is with the Director although there have been no cases where this has been funded since these regulations were introduced.

Implications verified by: Lucy Varenne – Interim Head of Finance – Residents Services, telephone 020 7341 5777.

9. IMPLICATIONS FOR BUSINESS

- 9.1 The implications for compliant business are limited to employees absent due to sickness, or being formally excluded from work by the exercise of our statutory responsibilities.
- 9.2 The financial implications to businesses which cause outbreaks or put people's or safety at risk can be considerable by way of remedial work, Court appearances, reputational damage, the possibility of civil action by those affected, seizure of product, etc. In extreme cases Courts can impose custodial sentences upon hygiene failings.

10. COMMERCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 None, this is a Statutory function with no general power to charge or recharge (the council may recover its costs if it agrees to carry out a disinfection of decontamination, at the owner's request).

11. IT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 We have in place a Data Sharing Agreement and a Memorandum of Understanding with PHE.

11.2 Much of our information contains personal identifiable information (PII) and is transmitted by secure email and accessed by named officers only. Named officers have personal passwords to the Pathology laboratory IT system to access results.

11.3 Some of our information (e.g. outbreak reports) is owned by PHE. Matters which result in prosecution go into the public domain. However, certain applications to the magistrates will be held in a closed court as they would involve medical information pertaining to an individual.

11.4 Freedom of Information Act responses to requests must be either redacted or refused according to the circumstances. Global anonymised data are in the public domain via the gov.uk website.

11.5 Weekly and monthly HPT analysis is confidential and stored securely (6 years maximum) or deleted.

12. OTHER IMPLICATION PARAGRAPHS

12.1 There exists a small infection risk to staff (dependent on disease) which is additional to the background risk, where contact with patients who are infectious is needed, but this is risk assessed.

12.2 There is a prime risk to the community if people return to work or frequent crowded places whilst infectious, especially with conditions such as Norovirus, Influenza, or Tuberculosis.

13. BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

Agenda Item 6

<p>London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham</p> <p>COMMUNITY SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE</p> <p>29 January 2019</p>	
REFUSE, RECYCLING AND STREET CLEANSING CONTRACT OVERVIEW	
Report of the Strategic Director for Social Care & Public Services Reform	
Open Report	
Classification: For review and comment	
Key Decision: No	
Consultation: Programme Director, Procurement and Contracts and Street Czar	
Wards Affected: All	
Accountable Director: Director for Environment, Leisure & Residents Services	
Report Author: Lesley Gates, Waste Contract Manager	Contact Details: Lesley.Gates@lbhf.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Waste management in LBHF encompasses, waste collection and street cleansing, recycling, clinical waste, commercial waste & waste disposal. These services are managed through Resident Services except for the Serco contract which is managed through procurement. This report relates to waste collection and street cleansing.

- 1.1. These services provide high-profile front-line services to residents, businesses and visitors to the borough. The efficiency and effectiveness with which they are delivered impacts on residents' quality of life, and their perception of the council's overall performance and in particular, our ability to deliver a "cleaner, greener" borough.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Hammersmith & Fulham commenced a 7-year contract with Serco PLC in June 2008, (with the provision of extending for a further 7 years), to deliver street cleansing, commercial and domestic waste, and recycling collections., The extension was brought forward a year from 2014 to 2021 in order to align the end of the waste contract with that in The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea; for a possible future joint procurement.
- 2.2 The contract was designed to enhance value for money and improve service quality, representing a significant improvement over previously existing services. In the initial stages of the contract, Serco provided additional one-off resources for street cleansing improvements and investment in relation to littering and fly tipping. As the contract developed, Serco implemented a same-day waste collection and cleansing service and for street cleansing, enabling the council to be one of the top five cleanest boroughs in London.
- 2.3 Numerous changes have occurred throughout the contract lifecycle including a reduced client function, changing borough requirements due to the economic climate, the demands from an increasing population and infrastructure development and a need for innovation. The contract has become out-dated and needs overhauling to meet the current requirements of the Council. This can be achieved through a reprocurement exercise when the contract concludes in 20/21.

3. PROPOSAL AND ISSUES

3.1 Summary of Contractual Services

3.1.1 Waste Collections

- The collection of domestic waste from approximately 80,000 residential properties
- The collection of trade waste from approximately 2,600 businesses
- Over 396,000 individual collections are made each month. The level of missed collections averages 688 per month which equates to 0.04% of all collections made
- Bulky waste service (just under 6000 kerbside bulky collections were made in 2017/18)
- Numerous recycling collections such as WEEE, batteries and lightbulb collections
- Delivery of smart sacks and commercial sacks.

Refuse & Recycling Key Service standards

- Collection of missed collections in 24 hours
- Replace all bin lids at the time of collection

- Empty contents leaving no residue providing the waste and recycling is suitably contained
- Return bins to the original place where they were left
- Close all doors, gates and bin-chutes after collection
- Clean spillage arising from collections
- Collection times should not coincide with the start, finish and break times at educational establishments

3.1.2 Street Cleansing

220 km of carriageway and 500 km of footway are cleansed within the borough. About 1000 litter bins are emptied regularly and fly tips removed of which almost 17000 were reported last year (compared to around 4000 in 2008). In addition, as part of the borough's clear all policy, Serco proactively remove unreported fly tips, dog fouling and litter. The streets in Hammersmith & Fulham are some of the cleanest in London with over 96% of streets being kept to an acceptable standard of cleanliness.

A summary of cleansing services includes:

- 24/7 sweeping of pavements in the 3 main town centres
- 16-hour day cleansing in secondary shopping areas
- Same day refuse and recycling/cleansing on residential roads
- Cleaning and sweeping of open spaces
- Daily servicing of North End Road Market
- Emptying of all litterbins
- Provide emergency response service
- Weed treatment
- Leaf collection
- Winter gritting

Street Cleansing Key Service standards

- Achieve a high standard of cleanliness after each cleanse
- Remove reported flytips within 48 hours
- Empty litterbins if >80% full
- Remove reported dog fouling within 2 hours
- Remove reported flyposting boards within 24 hours
- To leave contractor bags in designated locations only
- Attend emergency responses within one hour

When the contract was procured in 2008 the Council created detailed specifications of operational requirements such as staff numbers and vehicle requirements. It then laid down a set of standards to be achieved, this has caused issues between Serco and the Council as to achieving those standards with the contractual operational requirements. This misalignment

of operational requirements and contract standards has caused issues with controlling the delivery of the contract.

3.2 Contract Monitoring

- 3.2.1 The contract was previously managed by a larger client team than in place at present to drive improvements through monitoring and applying the remedy and default provision. These provisions are to ensure when standards fall below the required levels these are addressed and rectified.
- 3.2.2 The Remedy and Default provisions of the contract allow for up to 200 rectification notices to be issued in any 4-week period before there is any financial impact on the contractor. In retrospect, this is now considered to be too high a level to effect significant change in contractor performance, although it should be noted that a more robust default system could have led to a higher contract price.
- 3.2.3 Following the need for council efficiencies from 2010, the client monitoring team has been reduced, and currently consists of three posts, it is proving difficult to maintain an effective punitive system along with day to day operational activities and general contract maintenance and management.
- 3.2.4 There is one performance mechanism, the measurement of NI 195, which is financially linked, however, following the payment of £29,000 to Serco, the use of the payment mechanism was stopped in 2015 which has been to the Council's advantage.

3.3 Current KPI Performance

- 3.3.1 Within the contract documentation, the Council set out the aspiration to be working towards the upper quartile performance for cleanliness and recycling rates in London. Current performance for this key performance indicator is provided in the table below. The customer service satisfaction indicator was removed as Corporate satisfaction surveys are no longer carried out.

KPI	Performance 2017/18	Performance 2018/19 (Q2)
NI 195 Cleanliness	4.06%	2.63%
NI192 Recycling rate	23.70%	23.73%*

*estimated figure

The current recycling rate achieved across the borough is 21.63%

3.4 Planned Contract Improvements

To progress change over the remaining life of the contract, the following approaches are planned:

- Serco to deliver clear and transparent Open Book accounting
- Establish KPIs and an effective default and rectification framework
- Agree a number of contractual mechanisms which will clarify the resource, financial model and processes to allow us to vary these and fully take any associated benefits
- A robust and well-resourced client side monitoring and management system together with a clear escalation process
- To be the greenest borough we will need to collect food and green waste, increase recycling, reduce contamination and put greater emphasis on waste minimisation campaigns
- We will reintroduce the Improvement and Efficiency Board to see which of these and other ideas to improve environmental and financial performance can be brought forward

A new managing director started with Serco Local Government in January 2019 and it is acknowledged that Serco's current financial reporting systems were not being properly applied and sufficiently transparent. LBHF are engaging to a greater extent with Serco senior management to ensure service improvements are achieved through the tail end of the contract to 2021. This is when a new procurement of a service contract will be completed.

4. BACKGROUND PAPERS USED IN PREPARING THIS REPORT

No.	Description of Background Papers	Name and contact details of responsible officer	Department/ Location
	Contract documentation for Waste Collection, Recycling and Street Cleansing Services	Lesley Gates	Public Service Reform

Community Safety and Environment PAC Work Programme 2018/19

29 January 2018		
Small Hall, HTH. 7:00pm		
ITEM	LEAD OFFICER	REPORT BRIEF
Budget Report	Christina Cato	This report sets out the budget proposals for the services covered by this PAC.
Waste Collection	Simon Davis	This report provided an overview on waste collection and street cleansing in the borough.
Management of Infectious Diseases in the Borough	Graham Morrison/ Stephanie Needham	This report provides an overview of the systems and controls that the Council has in place to keep residents and other members of the public safe.

27 March 2018 Small Hall, HTH. 7:00pm		
Potential items:		
ITEM	LEAD OFFICER	REPORT BRIEF
Parks and open spaces	Ullash Karia	To consider the Council's use of public and green spaces, including maintenance and facilities.
Parking	David Taylor	To consider the Council's parking policy and options on how this could be improved for the benefit of residents.
Electrical charging points	Ian Hawthorne	To consider the Council's strategy around electrical charging points.
The Council's recycling policy	Terry Oliver	To consider the Council's plan for recycling, the issues faced and options on how this would be improved.