CABINET

A meeting of the Cabinet will be held in Committee Rooms 1 & 2, Civic Centre, Lampton Road, Hounslow on Tuesday, 20 September 2016 at 7:00 pm

MEMBERSHIP

Councillor Steve Curran - Chair
Councillors Tom Bruce, Theo Dennison, Katherine Dunne, Richard Foote, Kamaljit Kaur, Amritpal Mann, Ed Mayne, Sue Sampson and Corinna Smart

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence, declarations of interest or any other communications from Members

2. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2016 (Pages 1 - 10)

   To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2016

3. CHAS512 Youth Justice Plan for Hounslow 2016/17 (Pages 11 - 72)

4. CHAS506 Hounslow Compact (Pages 73 - 98)

5. REG 429 Recycle 360 Business Plan (Pages 99 - 181)

6. CEX127 Town Twinning (Pages 182 - 194)

7. CEX129 Quarterly Performance Monitoring Report (Q1) (Pages 195 - 270)

8. Monthly Revenue Financial Monitoring -

9. CEX126 Monthly Financial Monitoring (Pages 271 - 318)

10. Exclusion of Press and Public

   To resolve that the public and press be asked to leave the meeting during discussion of the remaining items of business because exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 is likely to be made known.

   Please note that members of the public and press must leave the meeting at this point.

11. CEX126 Appendix F (Pages 319 - 321)

12. REG392 Fountain Leisure Centre (Pages 322 - 336)

13. CEX120 Contract for the Supply of Non-Permanent Staff (Pages 337 - 344)

14. Urgent Business
Any business which the Chair agrees to accept on grounds of urgency.

15. **Any other items which the Chair considers urgent and are exempt from publication**

16. **Date of next meeting: 11 October 2016**

**Recording and Reporting on Public Meetings**

Please note that members of public can choose to record, or report in other ways, on this public meeting. If you wish to do so then please read the Council’s protocol which can be found on the Council’s website at [http://democraticservices.hounslow.gov.uk/documents/s107608/Protocol%20on%20reporting%20at%20meetings.pdf](http://democraticservices.hounslow.gov.uk/documents/s107608/Protocol%20on%20reporting%20at%20meetings.pdf). Copies of the protocol are also available at the meeting.

The Council asks that you avoid recording members of the audience who are not participants at the meeting. The Council will seek to facilitate this. However, anyone attending a public meeting does so in the knowledge that recording may take place and that they may be part of that record.

**DECLARING INTERESTS**

*Committee members are reminded that if they have a pecuniary interest in any matter being discussed at the meeting they must declare the interest and not take part in any discussion or vote on the matter.*

Mary Harpley  
Chief Executive  
London Borough of Hounslow  
Civic Centre  
Lampton Road  
Hounslow TW3 4DN

Published on: 20 September 2016  
Supporting documents and background papers published electronically only can be supplied in hard copy on request.
At a meeting of the Cabinet held on Tuesday, 19 July 2016 at 6:00pm at the Committee Room 1, Civic Centre, Lampton Road, Hounslow.

**Present:**
Councillor Steve Curran (Chair)
Councillors Tom Bruce, Theo Dennison, Katherine Dunne, Richard Foote, Amritpal Mann, Ed Mayne, Sue Sampson and Corinna Smart

**Apologies for Absence**
There were no apologies for absence.

1. **Apologies for absence, declarations of interest or any other communications from Members**

   Councillor Katherine Dunne declared in respect of Item 4 that she was the Corporate Trustee for the David Henry Waring Home and therefore she would not be taking part in the vote for that item.

   Councillor Sue Sampson declared in respect of Item 4 that she was a Trustee appointed to the David Henry Waring Trust Management Committee and that she also would not take part in the vote for that item.

2. **Minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2016**

   The minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2016 were confirmed.

3. **REG 420 - Prospective Osterley Neighbourhood Area application**

   See the report by Councillor Steve Curran, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Corporate Strategy, Planning and Regeneration – Agenda Item 3

   The Chair, Councillor Steve Curran introduced the report and advised that the Council had received an application to designate a Neighbourhood Planning Area for Osterley, outlined in Appendix 1 with the boundary outlined in red. The Council proposed that the designated area be approved as in Appendix 2 of the report.

   The Chair had given permission for Councillor Louki to speak on this item for five minutes.

   The Chair advised that at Cabinet briefing it had been agreed that he would meet with Councillor Louki to discuss the proposed designated area in more detail. Subsequent to that meeting some changes to the designated area had been made.

   Councillor Louki referred to Appendix 1 which outlined the original area proposed for the Neighbourhood Planning Area for Osterley. He expressed concern that the changes made to the proposed designated area had resulted in the omission of Osterley Park. Councillor Louki urged Cabinet Members to refuse the report and he expressed concern that the amended area was not well thought out and could be subject to legal challenge.
Councillor Curran advised that it was for the Local Authority to designate the area and that the timeframe within which the area should be considered was 13 weeks. He advised that it was nearing the end of the 13 week timeframe and that residents had been consulted about the proposed area. Councillor Curran moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Theo Dennison.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

i. That Cabinet approved the recommendations of the report to approve an appropriate area to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area for Osterley.

ii. That Cabinet refused the application to designate the Neighbourhood Area shown on Plan 1 in Appendix 1

iii. That Cabinet formally designated the area shown on Plan 2 in Appendix 2

iv. Cabinet agreed that the designated area shown in Appendix 2 would be known as the Osterley Neighbourhood Planning Area.

4. CHAS 503 - Safeguarding the future use of David Henry Waring Home

See the report by Councillor Steve Curran, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Corporate Strategy, Planning and Regeneration – Agenda Item 4.

The Chair, Councillor Steve Curran introduced the report which identified a suitable regeneration option for the David Henry Waring Home that would enable the Home to continue to operate and be maintained in perpetuity. Cabinet had been advised that the Home was currently operating at a significant deficit and some of its accommodation was substandard and without intervention eventually the charity would be forced to cease operation. Councillor Curran moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Theo Dennison.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed.

Resolved:

i. That Cabinet agreed that the Council, in its capacity of Corporate Trustee, clarifies and establishes the governance arrangements for the David Henry Waring Trust, including the formal appointment of a named Cabinet Member charged with the responsibilities of the Corporate Trustee and re-affirming the roles and responsibilities of the Corporate Trustee and those of the Trust Committee, at the DHW AGM on 18th July 2016.

ii. That Cabinet agreed that the Council, in its capacity as a registered provider of social housing, develop proposals for regenerating the DHW home in order to safeguard the objectives of the Trust in perpetuity. This would involve:

a. transferring the site via lease agreement to the HRA;
b. planning for regeneration of the DHW home under the umbrella of the HRA;
c. putting in place plans for on-going maintenance via the HRA; and
d. adopting future arrangements for the management of the home jointly involving the Council as Corporate Trustee and the Trust Committee.

iii. That Cabinet agreed that subject to agreement of recommendation (2) above, that the proposals are further elaborated and referred to the Corporate Trustee to consult with the Trust Committee, and seek the agreement of the Charities Commission.

iv. That Cabinet agreed that a further report would be presented to Cabinet for approval for the final proposal including detailed regeneration plans and costs.

5. CHAS 504 - Future Delivery of Housing Planned Maintenance and Major Works Services

See the report by Councillor Katherine Dunne, Cabinet Member for Housing, Equalities and Inclusion – Agenda Item 5.

Councillor Katherine Dunne, Cabinet Member for Housing, Equalities and Inclusion, introduced the report which recommended that Cabinet agreed to transfer the delivery of the planned maintenance and major works services to Facilities Management 360 Ltd, a subsidiary of Lampton 360, with effect from January 2017. Councillor Dunne moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Steve Curran.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed.

Resolved:

i). That Cabinet agreed to award the contract for managing the delivery of the housing planned maintenance and major works services through Lampton 360 Ltd with effect from 1 January 2017, subject to its establishment of its subsidiary, Facilities Management 360 Ltd, and submission of a full business delivery plan demonstrating how it proposes to deliver the requirements of the Hounslow Housing draft service contract and specifications.

ii). That Cabinet agreed the preparatory transfer arrangements, set out at paragraph 3.16 of this report, ahead of awarding the contract on 1 January.

iii). That Cabinet delegated authority to the Director of Housing to amend the Hounslow Housing draft Service Contract and Specifications, as necessary, having regard to the final governance, operating arrangements and delivery plans of Facilities Management 360 Ltd.

iv). That Cabinet delegated to the Director of Housing, in consultation with the Lead Member for Housing, authority to agree the Facilities Management 360 Delivery Plan, carry out preparatory work and to commence transfer arrangements.

6. CHAS 505 - Blenheim Extra Care Scheme

See the report by Councillor Steve Curran, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Corporate Strategy, Planning and Regeneration – Agenda Item 6.

The Chair, Councillor Steve Curran introduced the report which dealt with a proposal to
redevelop the former Ex-Servicemen’s site with a 94 unit extra care development for entirely affordable housing tenure. Councillor Curran moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Theo Dennison.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

That Cabinet approved, subject to obtaining planning consent, the:

i. Total budget for the redevelopment of the Feltham Ex-Servicemen’s site for the provision of 94 units of extra care housing. To be funded as set out in the confidential appendix 1 of this report;

ii. Delegation of Authority to the Director of Housing in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Corporate Strategy, Planning and Regeneration to accept the tender offer for the new build construction contract;

iii. Appropriation of the Site edged red in Appendix 2 and delegation of authority to the Head of Governance to take all steps necessary for the appropriation of the land for planning purposes;

iv. Delegation of authority to the Director of Finance to authorise payment of compensation where the land is appropriated for planning purposes in reliance of s237 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to override any covenants if necessary.

The Cabinet also approved the:

v. Delegation of Authority to the Director of Housing in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Corporate Strategy, Planning and Regeneration to accept the tender offer for the enabling works package

7. REG 413 - Property 360 Business Plan

See the report by Councillor Steve Curran, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Corporate Strategy, Planning and Regeneration – Agenda Item 7.

The Chair, Councillor Steve Curran introduced the report which dealt with the collective land and assets that currently sat in the general fund and were considered to be surplus to requirements or no longer fit for purpose in their current use. The report identified each site, and the potential number of new homes that could be created subject to planning approval and site constraints. Councillor Curran moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Amrit Mann.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

i. Cabinet agreed that the Shareholding Board approve the Business Plan for Property 360, which incorporated, Lampton Development 360 LLP and Lampton Investment 360 Ltd.

ii. That delegated authority be given to the Board of Lampton 360 to approve individual schemes in the overall programme backed by an Investment Report on a site by site basis, in accordance with the parameters and hurdle rates outlined in the business plan, and at
section 5b of this report.

III. That delegated authority be given to Managing Director of Property & Development, for capital spend on individual schemes budgets currently identified at appendix 3, which are held within the General Fund, once approved by Lampton Board.

IV. Cabinet agreed that such sites be released for the purposes of residential development, subject to planning permission, supported by a RICS red book residual land valuation. Setting the value of the land to be paid by Lampton to LBH, taking into account the tenure mix achieved at planning.

V. Cabinet agreed that the shareholding Board approve the recruitment of a staffing structure to support this activity as identified at appendix 1 and 2, along with a loan of working capital to cover the costs.

VI. Cabinet agreed to authorise Lampton Development 360 LLP to progress the above development programme, on the basis of 40% affordable homes, (24% social rent and 16% Intermediate), 40% private sale homes, and 20% private rented homes, subject to a full investment report demonstrating the financial position of each site, which must be approved by the Lampton 360 Board, and meet the parameters and hurdle rates contained in the Business Plan.

VII. Cabinet agreed that a planning statement is established across phase I of the development programme, taking into consideration the merits and benefits of all 11 sites listed in appendix 3.

VIII. Cabinet approval was given to establish the subsidiary companies, Lampton Development 360 LLP, and Lampton Investment 360 Ltd.

IX. That Cabinet approval was given to establish the bank accounts for the above two subsidiary companies.

X. That Cabinet approval was given to commence the procurement of our JV Development Partner.

XI. That Cabinet approval was given to agree terms for funding for both development and investment activity, by way of an on-lending facility from LBH to Lampton Development 360 LLP and Lampton Investment 360 Ltd.

XII. That Cabinet approval was given for Property 360 to offer and deliver property consultancy services to London Borough of Hounslow, where they are unable to resource this service for themselves, or where we can compete with other external consultants and demonstrate value for money.

8. CEX 114 - Customer Services Strategy & Improvement Plan

See the report by Councillor Ed Mayne, Lead Member for Corporate Performance and Customer Care – Agenda Item 8.

Councillor Ed Mayne introduced the report which set out the current performance of customer services and proposed a Customer Services Strategy to transform the customer services offered. Councillor Mayne moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Corinna Smart
The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

i. That Cabinet noted the improvement plans to tackle the current underperformance in customer services

ii. That Cabinet agreed the approach in the report for transforming customer services over the next 2 years.

iii. That Cabinet agreed the Customer Services Strategy for the Council at Appendix A which outlines this transformation.

iv. That Cabinet delegated the authority for the delivery of this strategy and any related activities and actions to the Director of Customer Services and Communications, in consultation with the Lead Member for Corporate Performance and Customer Care.

v. That Cabinet agreed to receive updates on progress as part of the quarterly performance report presented to and agreed at Cabinet.

9. CEX 112 - Scrutiny Review of VCSE Savings

See the report by Councillor John Chatt, Chair of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee – Agenda Item 9.

Councillor Chatt advised that an OSC Task & Finish Group had examined the impact of reductions in funding to the VCSE sector and sought to explore ways of promoting self-financing skills, independence and resilience among VCS organisations. Councillor Curran moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Richard Foote.

Councillor Foote advised that as the Lead Member for Communities he would respond to the findings and recommendations within the report and report back to Cabinet in September.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

i. That Cabinet received the findings and recommendations of the review into the Impact of Voluntary, Community & Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector savings.

ii. That Cabinet agreed to consider and respond to the findings and recommendations within six weeks of receipt.

10. CEX 113 - Update on use of non-permanent staff (Overview & Scrutiny report 13.04.16)

See the report by Councillor Richard Foote, Lead Member for Communities – Agenda Item 13.

Councillor Richard Foote introduced the report and advised that the Council relied on staff employed on a variety of contractual arrangements. The different arrangements included
agency workers and contractors and for several years now the Council had set a maximum rate for non-permanent staffing as a corporate target which presented the maximum rate for non-permanent staffing as a corporate target. The target for 2015/16 was 6%, but this target had not yet been met. He advised that there were some areas with very high numbers of non-permanent staff for valid reasons. Councillor Richard Foote moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Theo Dennison.

Councillor Chatt suggested that OSC could look further into the authorisation process for non-permanent staff.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

i. That Cabinet noted the current position on the use of non-permanent staff across the Council.

ii. That Cabinet noted the specific reasons for the particularly high usage in five areas (adult safeguarding, social care & health; children’s safeguarding & specialist services; housing; ICT; and strategic planning, economic development & regeneration) and the prospects for reducing these in the short-term.

iii. That Cabinet endorsed the resolution of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of 13th April 2016 that the principle of “permanent is best” needs to be retained, but agree to continue with a corporate target of 6% rather than moving to different divisional targets, while recognising that at times this target is very difficult to achieve.

iv. That Cabinet endorsed the resolution of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee that future reporting of non-permanent staff roles should include:
- analysis of where the use of permanent staff creates quality issues
- a breakdown of different categories of non-permanent staff that reflected differing costs and employment conditions.

11. REG 393 - Schools Capital Maintenance Programme 2016-17

See the report by Councillor Tom Bruce, Cabinet Member for Education & Children’s Services– Agenda Item 11.

Councillor Tom Bruce introduced the report which sought Member approval of the Schools Capital Maintenance Programme 2016-2017 as outlined in Appendix A of the report. Councillor Tom Bruce moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Steve Curran.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

i. That Cabinet approved the Schools Capital Maintenance Programme 2016-17 as outlined in Appendix A.
ii. That Cabinet agreed to include all listed items on the Council Annual Procurement Plan as Appendix A items (where decisions are delegated to the Director of the Service Area).

iii. That Cabinet agreed to delegate authority to the Executive Director of Regeneration Economic Development and Environment or such officer authorised to act on his behalf to modify the schemes and budgets if necessary following site investigations and to agree the addition of emergency priority projects identified in future condition surveys or site investigations. If projects were changed, the overall budget would not be exceeded.

iv. That Cabinet agreed that all future reports for approving Schools Maintenance Programmes are made as Single Member Decisions by the Cabinet Member for Education & Children’s Services.

12. REG 417 - New initiatives to tackle the housing crisis, regenerate the borough and conserve heritage assets

See the report by Councillor Theo Dennison, Cabinet Member for Finance and Citizen Engagement – Agenda Item 12.

Councillor Theo Dennison introduced the report which proposed changes to the teams dealing with Planning Policy, Conservation and Design, Environmental Strategy, Economic Development and Regeneration to strengthen the Council’s capacity to deliver new corporate priorities across the full range of their responsibilities.

Councillor Corinna Smart advised that as the Heritage Champion she wished to be involved in the review of locally listed heritage assets. Councillor Dennison agreed that Councillor Smart’s input would be very beneficial. Councillor Theo Dennison moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Steve Curran.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

i. That Cabinet approved in principle a new staffing structure for the Regeneration, Spatial Planning, Business and Environmental Strategy service and agreement to proceed to consulting staff on its implementation.

ii. That Cabinet approved the delegation of authority to the Executive Director of Regeneration in consultation with the Director of Finance to draw funds from the Planning Development Grant reserve in support of these proposals.

iii. That Cabinet approved the allocation of £86,000 from the Administration element of the Community Infrastructure Levy in 2016/17 to support improvements to the delivery of s106/CIL projects.

iv. That Cabinet approved the allocation of up to £524,000 from the New Initiatives fund in 2016/17 to meet any shortfall in the funding necessary for the purposes outlined in this report.

13. CEX 111 - Quarterly Performance Report (Q4 2015-16) (including annual review of Business Plan Performance Indicators)
See the report by Councillor Ed Mayne, Lead Member for Corporate Performance and Customer Care – Agenda Item 13.

Councillor Ed Mayne introduced the report which presented the quarter four performance data, covering the period from January to March 2016. The report covered performance for all of the Business Plan performance indicators (BPIs) and milestones (BPMs), under the seven themes of the 2014/16 Business Plan. Councillor Mayne moved the recommendations of the report. These were seconded by Councillor Steve Curran.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

i. That Cabinet noted and discussed the report on quarter 4/end of year 2015/16 performance data.
ii. That Cabinet noted the London-wide LAPS performance data for Q3 2015/16 (retrospective).
iii. That Cabinet agreed the revisions to the performance indicators as set out in Annex E.

For appendix E containing the Business Plan, Cabinet agreed the content of the draft Business Plan 2016/17 for publication, including the following:

- Final suite of indicators and milestones, with targets for 2016/17
- Revised indicators
- New indicators
- Deleted indicators

14. CEX 125 - Monthly Financial Monitoring

See the report by Councillor Theo Dennison, Lead Member Finance & Citizen Engagement - Agenda Item 4.

Councillor Theo Dennison introduced the report and moved the recommendations. These were seconded by Councillor Steve Curran.

The recommendations had been moved and seconded. Members considered the report and all the issues and options contained therein and in conclusion the recommendations were agreed unanimously.

Resolved:

i. That Cabinet noted the allocation of £4m inflation funding as detailed in paragraph 4.2. This included
   - £2.6m pay related inflationary costs
   - £1.4m of contractual uplifts
ii. That Cabinet noted the update on the Council’s performance against the key corporate financial indicators
iii. That Cabinet noted the summary of write offs awaiting approval.
15. **Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

16. **REG 413 - Property 360 Business Plan**

The confidential appendix, exempt from publication, was taken into account when Cabinet considered the item in the public part of the meeting.

17. **CHAS 505 - Blenheim Extra Care Scheme (Confidential Appendix 1)**

The confidential appendix, Appendix 1, exempt from publication, was taken into account when Cabinet considered the item in the public part of the meeting.

18. **Date of next meeting: Tuesday 20 September 2016**

The date of the next meeting was noted as Tuesday 20 September 2016.

The meeting finished at 6:55 pm.
1. Details of Recommendations

The Cabinet is asked to agree the contents of this report and the annual Youth Justice Plan and approve its submission to the Youth Justice Board and Borough Council.

If the recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit, link to Values</th>
<th>Dates by which they can expect to notice a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Youth Crime and anti-social Behaviour.</td>
<td>With immediate effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Report Summary

1. This report deals with the Youth Justice Plan for Hounslow for 2016-17. It is the duty of each local authority to, in consultation with partner agencies, formulate and implement an annual Youth Justice Plan (section 40(1) 1998 Crime and Disorder Act). The relevant statutory partners of the council are the police, the national probation service and the health authority.

1.1. The plan must specify how Youth Justice Services are to be provided and funded, and how the local Youth Offending Team or Service is composed, and funded, how they operate and the functions they perform.

1.2. The plan must be submitted to the national Youth Justice Board; this year the date for submission is 30th September. The plan must be placed in the public domain once submitted (section 40 (4) 1998 Crime and Disorder Act).
2. The plan recommends that priorities for action should be Reduction in the number of First Time Entrants to the Criminal Justice system, Reduction in the rate of proven Reoffending, Reduction in the use of Custody, and Reduction in the incidence of serious youth violence.

3. These recommendations are being made as they are national and/or Mayoral priorities. They support the council’s priorities, outlined in the community plan, to reduce crime and the fear of crime.

4. Additional funding is not required, and the financial contribution from the council and its partners has been sustained at the same level as for 2015/16.

5. An additional point to note is that the Youth Offending Service is a multi-agency partnership, and is supported in cash or in-kind by contributions from partner agencies. These are specified in section 3 of the plan.

3. **Reason for Decision and Options Considered**

3.1. Members may wish to consider the progress made against the key objectives identified in the local Youth Justice Plan for 2015/16 and the issues and challenges emerging for 2016/17 and beyond. This plan contributes to the corporate plan objective ‘Making Hounslow a safe borough by reducing crime and anti-social behaviour…’. This plan focuses on reducing young people’s involvement in crime and anti-social behaviour.

3.2. The timescale for submission of local Youth Justice Plans to the Youth Justice Board for approval on behalf of the Secretary of State have been extended until September 30th 2016 and members are asked to agree this plan for submission.

4. **Key Implications**

4.1. The targets are outlined in section 5 and illustrate continuous improvement in Reducing reoffending and the use of custody. Reducing First Time Entrants, performance has plateaued, but remains in excess of the target.

Serious youth violence, and, in particular, knife-enabled offences remain a source of concern. The plan outlines actions being undertaken by the YOS and partner agencies to achieve a reduction in these types of offences.

5. **Financial Details**

a) **Financial Impact On The Budget (Mandatory)**

The Youth justice plan will be delivered within the existing revenue budgets for 2016-17.

b) **Comments of the Assistant Director Strategic Finance**

The plan is fully funded from existing resources provided by the council and its partners.

6. **Legal (to be completed in conjunction with the Legal Department)**

This plan has been formulated and is submitted to members for information pursuant to section 40 (1) of the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act.
c) Comments of the Assistant Director Corporate Governance

The Assistant Director – Corporate Governance recommends the decision to accept the report.

7. Value for Money

A formal bench-making test has not been undertaken. However, current performance as outlined in section 5 of the plan compare favourably with other YOT’s in London. The rate of proven re-offending remains above the regional average but is now showing a downwards trajectory. The actions taken to improve performance are outlined in section V of the plan.

8. Sustainability Impact Appraisal

It is a statutory requirement for each local authority to establish a Youth Offending Team or Service. However, there are a variety models for delivery the required services, which will be considered by the Youth Crime Management Board, and members will be advised of the choices available in due course once the Taylor Review has received ministerial sign-off and has been published.

9. Risk Management

The current resourcing of the YOS is sufficient to enable implementation of the Youth Justice Plan in 2016-17. However, the Council and its partners continue to face fiscal challenges, and any in-year resource reductions will require a re-appraisal of planned priorities. Further, the Taylor Review may require a transformation of the way services are configured and delivered in future. Once the Review is published Council officers will advise members of any likely change in legislative, and options for members to consider with respect to the future delivery of Youth Justice Services.

10. Links to Council Priorities

A key priority for the council, as outlined in the community plan, is to reduce crime in the borough, and enhance local people’s sense of safety.

11. Equalities, Human Rights and Community Cohesion

The Youth Justice Plan has a focus on continuous improvement in the disproportionate representation of ethnic minority groups in the Youth Justice System.

12. Staffing/Workforce and Accommodation implications:

The Youth Justice Plan has no implications for the workforce, or the accommodation strategy.

13. Property and Assets

There are no implications for council property or assets.
14. Any Other Implications
   None.
15. Consultation

Statutory partners, the police, National probation service, and health authority have been consulted and have approved the Youth Justice Plan.

16. Timetable for Implementation

The plan is already in operation.

17. Appendices

The Youth Justice Plan - App 1.

18. Background Information

There is no background information required.
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Executive Summary

Each local authority area is required (section 40, Crime and Disorder Act, 1998) to produce in consultation with statutory partner agencies (National Probation Service, Police Service and Health authority) an annual local Youth Justice Plan. The plan must describe the local arrangements for the delivery and funding of Youth Justice Services, and how the Youth Offending Service will fulfil its statutory functions in relation to reducing youth crime and anti-social behaviour. The plan must describe the local strategy to meet the three national priorities of reducing the number of young people who enter the Criminal Justice System for the first time (FTE’s), Reduce the rate of proven re-offending young people, and reducing the use of custody, either for Remand or Sentencing of young people. The legislation defines a young person as aged between ten years, the age of criminal responsibility in the UK, and 17 years, inclusive. The plan must report on performance against these three priorities, and any other priorities that are determined locally.

Local performance is outlined in section 5 and illustrates continuous improvement of service delivery but highlights some challenges to be address. In summary:

• The number of FTE’s has risen since 2013/14 but remains within the target of 140 set against the baseline of 2010/11. The likely explanations for the recent increase are 1) The process for determining whether a young person is suitable for diversion or caution has become more robust in order to reduce the numbers of those diverted who come to further notice for offending due to lack of timely and effective intervention, and 2) An increasing trend towards more serious offences involving violence against the person and or controlled drugs. In common with other London Boroughs Hounslow has seen an increase in knife-enabled offences, 110% increase although the majority of the offences are perpetrated by 18 to 25 year olds.

• The rate of proven re-offending rose to a level significantly greater than the London average but the last three quarters reporting evidences a steady downward trend. A key driver for the increase was the rate of re-offending of out of court disposals (Cautions and Youth Conditional Cautions). An action plan to sustain recent improvements and continuously improve performance in line or better than the London average is outlined in section 5 and Appendix 1.

• The use of custody has seen significant reductions from two years ago and these have been sustained in 2015/16 despite the level of seriousness of offending within the borough. This reflects the courts confidence in YOS proposals to sentence is to address offender behaviour and to supervise young offenders in the community effectively.
The foregoing is encouraging but Hounslow faces some challenges in the months and years ahead. The movement of low-income families from inner-London boroughs to outer London boroughs. The demography of the borough is changing and generating some challenges to local services that, historically, have been associated with the inner-city. In section 5 issues arising from emerging drugs market and the potential difficulties arising from local criminal networks coming into conflict with those emanating from outside the borough attempting to exploit the opportunities. This presents are outlined. Hounslow is not a designated gang’s borough but a timely response is required before some of the related problems become entrenched. The development of a local gang prevention and Disruption strategy is work in progress. Similarly, the Youth offending cohort in Hounslow is comparable with other outer-London boroughs and even some inner-London authorities. This requires a greater focus on preventative services and early intervention to address the underpinning causes of offending behaviour, which is discussed in section 4 and 5 to reduce the numbers requiring more intensive interventions.

These strategic developments are occurring at a time of financial constraint, and uncertainty about the future direction of travel of key services.

The commitment of the Council and its partners to the Youth Crime agenda remains unequivocal and this is reflected in the sustained contributions in-cash and in-kind to the YOS. However, the grant funding to the YOS from the Youth Justice Board has been further reduced for 2015/16. The level of resourcing for the YOS and the measures taken to mitigate the impact of reduced grant funding are described in section 3. Clearly, further reductions will have a negative impact on the YOS’ ability to meet operational and strategic targets in future.

The Taylor review of the Youth Justice System has indicated the need for transformation. The current model of service delivery with multi-agency Youth Offending Teams has been successful, in terms of reducing youth crime, and reducing the numbers of young people in custody since its inception in 2000 and this is acknowledged by government. However, rates of re-offending by a small but significant number of young people is too high nationally, and the patterns of offences committed are becoming increasingly violent. The Taylor Review was scheduled for publication on June 27th but was delayed following the result of the referendum on membership of the European Union. A further date has not yet been announced. Once the review is published council officers and partners will consult on the implications for the delivery of services and will formulate proposals for future arrangements for elected member’s approval.
Section I: Introduction
Each local authority is required, in consultation with partner agencies, to formulate, publish and implement a Youth Justice Plan annually (section 40, Crime and Disorder Act 1998). The plan describes how Youth Justice Services are to be provided, delivered and funded in Hounslow during the period 2016/17.

The last local Youth Justice Plan for Hounslow covered the period 2014-2016, two years, with, as is required by statute, an annual update in 2015. This plan is for one year only, 2016/17, in recognition of the fact that the Youth Justice System is entering a period of change.

In the autumn of 2015 the Secretary of State announced the Taylor Review of the Youth Justice System which is due to report in September 2016. The review is comprehensive and although its findings and recommendations are as yet uncertain significant change to the why Youth Justice is organised and services delivered is anticipated. However, in the interim it is imperative that the progress made in tackling youth crime is sustained, and that is the primary aim of this year’s Youth Justice Plan.

The Council has an ambitious community plan to improve the life chances of the borough’s residents. Local schools perform highly in terms of GCSE results and there is a focus on preparing young people for future employment. The Council has ambitious plans for the regeneration and economic development of the borough by attracting inward investment. A key priority is to reduce crime and the fear of crime which can provide barriers to investment and attracting a skilled workforce to support the economic development of the area. During 2015/16 there was a 22% reduction in the number of priority offences committed, which are those seven offences considered by the Mayor of London’s office for policing and crime the key offences to reduce to promote public safety and reduce the fear of crime. These include burglary, robbery and offences of violence against the person. Reducing youth crime is a critical success factor in improving community safety as it constitutes approximately 20% of the total offences committed, and timely intervention to promote desistence will prevent adult recidivism. However, it is a concern that offences of serious youth violence have increased by 12%, and knife-enabled offences have increased by 110% in 2015/16 compared to the previous year. The number of offences remains lower than many other London boroughs but the trajectory of these offences requires intervention and the course of action is described in section V.

However, overall the direction of travel is positive in terms of youth crime reduction. The number of youth offences receiving a substantive outcome in 2015/16 was 426 compared to 496 the previous year, a reduction of 14%. Offences of Domestic burglary fell by 69%, non-Domestic burglary (commercial premises) fell by 67% and Robbery fell by 66% compared to 2014/2015. However, offences of violence against the person remained at 126 for 2015/16 the same as the previous year, while drug offences rose by 11%, which includes both possession of controlled drugs for personal use and possession with intent to supply. Historically these offences have predominantly involved cannabis as the drug of choice, but more recently there is a
concerning trend for offences to involve Class A drugs, which entails a greater rise to the health of the user and greater involvement by organised criminal networks.

The possible links between drugs supply and violent offences is a concern for the Hounslow Community Safety Partnership. Partner agencies are in the process of formulating a strategy to prevent young people’s involvement in crime, and more serious crime in particular, which will be published under separate cover later in the year.

In the Youth Justice Plan for 2014-16 the reductions in youth crime were acknowledged but this was tempered by concerns relating to an increasing rate of re-offending by young people already in the criminal justice system. The rate of re-offending has been significantly higher than the London average. However, during 2015/16 the rate of re-offending has begun to decline in response to the actions taken and further reductions are anticipated over the next 12 months to bring Hounslow more in line with the London average. The data analysis and the resulting action plan is outlined in section V.
Section II: Structure and Governance
2.1 **Structure of the Service**

The Youth Offending Service (YOS) is comprised of staff from a range of professional backgrounds (see Appendix II: organisational chart). All of the statutory partner agencies, Local Authority, Health, National Probation service and Metropolitan Police service provide staff as ‘contributions in kind’ as required by the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998.

Governance and Strategic Management oversight is provided by the Youth Crime Management Board (YCMB) see below.

2.2 The organisational changes noted in the last annual update of the Youth Justice Plan for 2015/16 have all been fully implemented and embedded. Most notably the transfer of responsibility for Out of Court Disposals (OOCDS) from Targeted Youth Support to the YOS was achieved in August 2015. Three posts were transferred from TYS to the YOS to assist in completion of this work (see Appendix II).

2.2.1 This change has led to improved service being offered to young people referred for an OOCD (see section V).

2.3 Partner agencies have maintained their level of contributions (see Section III).

2.3.1 As noted in the plan for 2014/16 there have been gaps in health provision for the YOS.

In 2015 the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) approved the funding for a band 7 Child and Adolescent mental health (CAMHS) practitioner. However, attempts to recruit a suitable candidate have so far been unsuccessful. A further recruitment campaign is underway.

A bid to the CCG to fund a general nurse practitioner to provide screenings, and where appropriate comprehensive health assessments and referrals for young people was supervised by the YOS was unsuccessful. After reviewing feedback from the CCG a revised business case will be submitted to address key areas such as sexual health, immunisation and so on, which young offenders may not have accessed previously due to their non-engagement with universal services.

2.3.2 Following a national consultation concerning the contributions to YOT’s made by the National Probation Service the status quo has been made. A fulltime equivalent Probation Officer will continue to be seconded to the YOS to manage the high-risk offenders and facilitate the effective and timely transfer of young offenders from the YOS to the Probation Service at the age of 18 years.
2.4 Governance for the YOS and the strategic management of the Youth Justice System lies with the Youth Crime Management Board (YCMB), chaired by the Director of Children, Housing and Adult Services (CHAS). All of the statutory partners Metropolitan Police, Health, National Probation Service and Community Rehabilitation Company are represented on this board at a senior level and we are able to commit resources or agree policy decisions on behalf of their parent agencies.

2.5 The governance arrangements for the over-arching local Community Safety Partnership (CSP), which were revised in April 2015, have facilitated greater integrated planning and service delivery across the partnership and clearer lines of accountability for individual partner agencies in achieving strategic partnership objectives. Reducing youth crime is a strategic priority for the CSP, as it constitutes approximately 20% of the total volume of crime locally, and research suggests that early intervention to disrupt an offending career can reduce the likelihood of future adult recidivism. A multi-agency group is currently formulating a strategic plan for presentation to the CSP to further reduce the numbers of young people involved in offending and anti-social behaviour.

2.5.1 The YOS is represented at management level at a number of sub-groups of the CSP, including tackling violence against women and girls, multi-agency risk assessment conferences (MARAC) which coordinates services to reduce domestic violence, anti-social behaviour, and operation Concordia. The latter is police-led and coordinates the sharing of intelligence and resulting actions to reduce offences of serious youth violence in the borough.

2.5.2 The YOS is also represented at the following strategic fora; the Substance Misuse Recovery Board, and the Local Safeguarding Children’s Board.

2.5.3 Involvement in all of these strategic groups enables the YOS to better inform of the range of services available to support young offenders on the path to desistence. It also enables the YOS to influence partner agencies and other council services to take account of their role in reducing youth crime in the performance of their statutory duties.

2.6 The YCMB is committed to process of continuous improvement in service delivery resulting in improved outcomes for young offenders and their families, the victims of crime, and the wider community. The YCMB has approved this plan (see Appendix I).

2.6.1 The YCMB has strategic oversight of partnership activities to reduce youth crime, anti-social behaviour and protect the public and promote law abiding life-styles amongst young people.
The annual Youth Justice Plan outlines the priorities for the partnership and reports on progress against existing objectives.

Performance is monitored closely by the Board which receives quarterly reports against key national and local performance indicators. Progress to date is outlined in section V and areas for improvement are identified.

The YCMB has approved the annual Youth Justice Board on behalf of the constituent partner agencies all of which are represented on the board (see attached approval sheet).
Section III:

Resources and Value for Money
3. There have been some changes to the resourcing of the YOS since the local Youth Justice Plan was last updated in 2015.

3.1 Funding from the Youth Justice Board effective practice grant has been reduced by £76,834. This occurred in two tranches, an in-year reduction in the autumn of 2015 of £47,720, and a further reduction of £34,114 for 2016/17. The in year reduction was unplanned, but was absorbed by, equally unplanned, staffing reductions. The recruitment and retention of case managers with the necessary qualifications remains a challenge, and will be discussed below.

3.1.2 The net reduction of £76,834 in the financial contributions from the YJB reduces the capacity of the service to respond to the new challenges of a greater focus on crime prevention through early intervention and the emerging challenge of gang-involved offending, whilst also managing the statutory workload. This places a greater emphasis on the need for integrated working with partner agencies which is discussed in sections IV and V.

3.2 Contributions from partners have remained constant.
### Youth Justice Plan – Resources 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staffing Costs</th>
<th>Payments in Kind</th>
<th>Other Delegated Funds</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>£ 128,531.00</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£ 128,531.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and Crime Commissioner</td>
<td>£ 119,512.00</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£ 33,922.00</td>
<td>£ 153,434.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>£ 47,197.00</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£ 5,000.00</td>
<td>£ 52,197.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>£ 58,000.00</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£ 58,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>£ 840,780.00</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£ 840,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YJB (after 12% cut)</td>
<td>£ 341,263.00</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£ 14,000.00</td>
<td>£ 355,263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>£ 39,392.00</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£ 7,000.00</td>
<td>£ 46,392.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£ 1,516,675.00</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£ 59,922.00</td>
<td>£ 1,634,597.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### YJB Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staffing Costs</th>
<th>Payments in Kind</th>
<th>Other Delegated Funds</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Practice Grant</td>
<td>£ 326,189.00</td>
<td>includes Unpaid Work Order (all staffing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Attendance Centre</td>
<td>£ 29,074.00</td>
<td>£15K staffing, £14K non-staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total YJB</strong></td>
<td>£ 355,263.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU Staff X 2</td>
<td>£ 74,512.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPAC contrib RC</td>
<td>£ 33,922.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>£ 45,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total MOPAC</strong></td>
<td>£ 153,434.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Funding Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staffing Costs</th>
<th>Payments in Kind</th>
<th>Other Delegated Funds</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td>£ 7,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troubled Families</td>
<td>£ 39,392.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 'Other' funding</strong></td>
<td>£ 46,392.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The Local Authority has maintained its level of funding to the YOS. The contributions to the local authority’s medium financial strategy with full year effect in 2015/16. Further reductions are not planned but the pressure on the Council’s finances presents a risk going forward.

• The Metropolitan Police Service have maintained their contributions in kind of 2 full-time equivalent police officers.

• Following a national review of their contributions to YOT’s the National Probation Service have confirmed that the contribution of 1 x FTE Probation to Hounslow YOS will be maintained. An additional sum of £5,000 will be paid to the YOS as a management charge. The calculation was based on current workloads including the number of young offenders requiring transition to the probation service at 18 years old. This is a further indication of the volume of work currently undertaken by Hounslow YOS.

• The Clinical Commissioning group have agreed to fund a Band 7 Child and Adolescent mental health nurse employed by the west London Mental Health Trust to be deployed within the YOS. This will both meet the statutory duty of health to contribute in-kind to the YOS establishment, but will also meet an identified need for the mental health screening, assessment and treatment of young offenders. However, this post has proven difficult to recruit to, which is a common difficulty not unique to Hounslow.

In order to make the post more attractive to suitable candidates the YOS and WLMHT have agreed to modify the role and job description. In future the post holder will be based in CAMHS but with a protected caseload of YOS clients who can be seen either at the YOS or at a clinic, whichever is appropriate to the circumstances. The post will be re-advertised after the summer.

3.3 The Grant funding from the Mayor’s office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) is now in its final year. We await an announcement from the new Mayor as to the criteria and process for bid for the next phase of funding commencing in April 2017.

The substance misuse and mentoring projects have been successful in achieving positive outcomes for young people, and their discontinuation would be a problem. We will consider alternative funding streams once the mayoral priorities are more clear.

3.4 The Troubled Families programme funds 1 x YOS officer in the Out of Court Disposals team. This funding is secure until March 2017, and its continuation is dependent upon the wider programmes performance and ability to claim payment by results funding from the Department of Communities and local government. It is a clear objective for this year and going forward to improve integrated working with partners delivering services for Troubled families to improve outcomes for young people and to demonstrate the impact of the Troubles Families programme.
3.5 The Community Safety Partnership has increased its contribution to the Appropriate scheme for 2016/17 from £3,500 p.a. to £7,000. The scheme provides support during police interviews under caution for children under 18 years unaccompanied by a responsible adult and, also, vulnerable adults. The funding covers the cost of volunteer training and expenses incurred by volunteers while providing a service to policy custody.

3.6 The Junior Attendance centre, transferred to the management of the YOS from the National Offender Management Service in April 2015, by the Youth Justice Board. The review demonstrated that the centre was compliant with the service specification. The funding allocation from the Youth Justice Board is secure for the foreseeable future, but is dependent upon continued demonstration of impact in terms of usage rates, and the achievement of positive outcomes for young people in relation to reduced rates of re-offending and participation in accredited learning. The centre is now an accredited centre for AQA awards and young people have the opportunity to build up a portfolio of achievement to support applications for further education, Training or employment.

3.7 The effective practice grant has been committed as outlined in the Table 2 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Resource</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Outcome supported</th>
<th>Developing Good Practice</th>
<th>Costs (Full Year Projection)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Manager</td>
<td>1 X F.T.E.</td>
<td>Reduction in custody</td>
<td>Management of complex cases</td>
<td>£ 57,090.00</td>
<td>Job Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Re-offending</td>
<td>Lead officer delivering service to the Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Public Protection</td>
<td>Reducing Remands to Youth Detention by</td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Safeguarding</td>
<td>improved bail assessment and supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan (YJB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.O.S Officer(s)</td>
<td>1 X F.T.E.</td>
<td>Reducing Re-offending</td>
<td>Resettlement</td>
<td>£ 44,717.00</td>
<td>Youth Justice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Public Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.O.S Officer(s)</td>
<td>1 X F.T.E.</td>
<td>Reducing Re-offending</td>
<td>Delivery of Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (bail and sentencing)</td>
<td>£ 92,031.00</td>
<td>Youth Justice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Public Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Justice Worker</td>
<td>1 X F.T.E.</td>
<td>Reducing Re-offending</td>
<td>Direct victim offender mediation</td>
<td>£ 40,466.00</td>
<td>Youth Justice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Public Protection</td>
<td>Victim liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of materials for working with young offenders vis Victim empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Worker</td>
<td>0.6 X F.T.E. plus sessional support</td>
<td>Reducing Re-offending</td>
<td>Deliver 3 X SFSC groups per annum and assess / intervene with parents individually where appropriate</td>
<td>£ 25,513.00</td>
<td>Youth Justice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sessional worker co-works group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Engagement Worker (KYPE)</td>
<td>0.5 X F.T.E.</td>
<td>Reducing Re-offending</td>
<td>Increasing access to E.T.E. for young offenders</td>
<td>£ 18,167.00</td>
<td>Youth Justice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Information Coordinator</td>
<td>1 X F.T.E.</td>
<td>All Youth Justice Outcomes measures</td>
<td>Providing management information concerning YOS performance to enable targeted improvement activity</td>
<td>£ 44,717.00</td>
<td>Youth Justice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of Asset data to inform resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>YJ Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Attendance Centre Coordinator</td>
<td>1 X F.T.E.</td>
<td>All Youth Justice Outcomes measures</td>
<td>Providing management information concerning YOS performance to enable targeted improvement activity</td>
<td>£ 11,737.00</td>
<td>YJ Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessional Staff Staff Training</td>
<td>210 hours per annum</td>
<td>Reducing Re-offending</td>
<td>Supervising Reparation Activities</td>
<td>£ 20,000.00</td>
<td>Youth Justice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing Custody</td>
<td>Supporting attendance of appointments</td>
<td>£ 825.00</td>
<td>Youth Justice Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting Staff Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 355,263.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YJB COSTED DEVELOPMENT GRANT ALLOCTION 2016/17</th>
<th>£ 355,263.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total CDP Spend Projection</td>
<td>£ 355,263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CDP Shortfall</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>£ 354,438.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Shortfall</td>
<td>£ 825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous allocation for Groupwork and Training not available</td>
<td>£ 22,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.1 In last year’s plan some of the funding was allocated to the development work necessary to prepare for the implementation of AssetPlus, a revised and improved assessment framework for Youth Justice.

AssetPlus was launched in Hounslow in June 2016. Staff have been trained in the use of the application, and the necessary adjustments to ICT hardware have been completed. To date the transition has been successful, and further costs associated with implementation are not anticipated.

3.8 A significant proportion of the YOS income is allocated to staffing costs with minimal funding for non-salaries expenditure in relation to training, the commissioning of services, such as psychiatric reports for court, and service running costs.

The YOS structure, including all the established and seconded posts, sessional workers and volunteers is outlined in Appendix III.

3.9 The Recruitment and Retention of key staff remains a challenge. This is a London-wide problem exacerbated by downward pressure on salaries and the increasing cost of housing in London. Children’s social care are experiencing similar challenges and the YOS will be included in a broader strategy for the recruitment and retention of staff going forward.
Section IV: Partnership Working
4.1 The challenges for the YOS and its partners identified in the plan for 2014-16 still obtain:

i. to sustain and strengthen existing partnerships in the context of increasing fiscal pressures across the partnership.

and

ii. to develop new partnership and new ways of working to continuously improve outcomes for young people and their families.

The following will illustrate the approach to meeting these challenges.

4.2 The joint protocol between YOS and Children’s social care was noted in the updated plan published in 2015, and this has become embedded resulting in more integrated practice. There is still further work to do in relation to refining a joint approach between the Corporate Parenting service and the YOS to promote desistence from offending of a small number of older looked after teenagers involved in prolific offending. This group, though numerically small, commit a disproportionate number of offenders and also present a range of challenges to Children’s Services due to their complex needs. Children’s Services are currently collaborating with YOS to design a bid for Innovation funding to, in part, address the needs of this cohort. This will build upon the successes achieved by the Step Change project, which has offered multi-systemic therapy and functional family therapy to prevent entry into care and promote desistence from offending.

4.2.1 The Local Authority is committed to becoming a signatory to the Home Office concordat for children in custody (police detention), which is currently in draft form for consultation. However, the YOS, Children’s Social Care and the local Children’s Safeguarding Board have already agreed the principles outlined in the Concordat, and they have been summarised in the current joint protocol between the YOS and Children’s Social Care.

4.3 In January 2015 the YOS and the local police agreed a joint protocol concerning the management of Out of Court Disposals (OOCDs), the role of police officers deployed into the YOS, the provision of Appropriate Adults to support young people interviewed in connection with an offence, and other related issues. The protocol remains current, but is scheduled for review this year.

4.4 After the termination of the London Regional Contract with Serco to provide placement to unpaid work orders the YCMB gave due consideration to developing a bespoke service with the devolved funds. However, the volume is low, only 3 young people, and the funding is small only £8,000 p.a. so it was decided to purchase this service from the Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) in London. This decision was reviewed in January 2016 and it was agreed to continue this arrangement until March 2017 when it will be
clearer as to how Youth Justice Services will be reconfigured following the Taylor Review.

4.5 Hounslow YOS signed the protocol with the National Probation Service (NPS) in February 2016. This has been extended into a local agreement with the NPS and CRC to formalise the transfer of cases from the YOS at age 18 years, and the responsibilities for the delivery of Extended supervision for young offenders sentenced as a juvenile to a Detention and Training order but released into the community post their 18th birthday.

4.6 The YOS and its partners face several challenges in the coming year and beyond.

i. to reduce the proven rate of re-offending by young people:

The rate in London is currently higher than the London average, which is a significant concern for the local partnership. The YCMB has ownership of the local strategy to reduce re-offending which is outlined in section V, and Appendix II provides a summary of the action plan.

ii. The incidence of Serious Youth Violence remains a concern and the increase in knife-enabled offences is of particular concern. The Community Safety Partnership is formulating a multi-agency strategy to reduce the carrying of knives by young people under the age of 25 years. This will build on the work already underway by the Police, YOS and Operation Concordia.

iii. Hounslow is not defined by the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) as a ‘gangs borough’, but there is evidence of an emerging problem of gang-involved offending. This relates to organised criminal enterprise involving several individuals often centred upon the supply of controlled drugs. Hounslow does not have the same volume of gang or group offending experienced by some neighbouring boroughs but there is a trend towards this type of activity possibly due to the changing demography of the borough motivated by the lower cost of housing compared to inner-London boroughs. The profile of offenders coming to the attention of Operation Concordia for this type of activity is predominantly males aged 18 to 24 years. Those under 18 years are the exception to the rule, and are often peripheral. However, it does not indicate that timely early intervention is a critical success faster in reducing serious offending in the future.

A small multi-agency group, chaired by the Director of Children’s Specialist Services, has been charged by the YCMB with the task of developing a Youth Crime Prevention Strategy. This task group will report in the summer of 2016. The aim is to disrupt the pathways for young people into serious criminality and divert them into a law-abiding
life-style at an earlier stage in the development of a criminal life-style than hitherto.

These challenges must be addressed in the context of reducing resources available to the Council and its partners.

iv. The local Magistrates Court at Feltham, which also houses the Youth Court is scheduled for closure at the end of September 2016.

As of October 2016 all young offenders usually resident in Hounslow will appear at Ealing Magistrates Court, which is set aside for youth matters each Thursday. This day will be shared with Ealing YOS. Discussions are in progress to establish joint processes and procedures with Ealing to ensure that we jointly provide a consistent and high quality service to the court.

v. Hounslow Faces some challenges in relation to the prevention of violent extremism, in particular the possible radicalisation of disaffected youth by either radical Islamist elements or Far Right extremists.

The council and its partners have a robust prevention strategy to counter radicalisation overseen by the Stronger United Community Group (S.U.C.G) of which the YOS is a member.

At present there is little evidence of young people being influenced by radical propaganda, although it is freely available on the internet. If any young people raise concerns they are screened for extremist beliefs, but none, as yet, have required any intervention to counter radicalisation.

All YOS staff have received the Home Office approved WRAP 3 training.
Section V:
Performance against Key Outcomes
5. Performance against key outcomes

5.1. The following provides a summary of performance against key national and local performance indicators. Below each indicator a commentary and analysis provides an explanatory context for the performance and outlines any areas for improvement identified.

5.2. National Indicator 19: Rate of proven re-offending of young offenders.

**Figure 1: Rate of Re-offending**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul 12-Jun13</th>
<th>Oct 12- Sep 13</th>
<th>Jan 13- Dec 13</th>
<th>Apr 13 – Mar 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. in Cohort</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Re-offenders</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Re-offences</strong></td>
<td>282</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binary Rate</strong></td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London Binary Rate</strong></td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Binary Rate</strong></td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hounslow Frequency Rate</strong></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London Frequency Rate</strong></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Frequency Rate</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1. The rate of Re-offending is calculated by means of a rolling yearly cohort of offenders who then commit a further offence within 12 months. The rate of re-offending is measured in two ways:

- Binary Rate – measures the proportion of young people who re-offended within the follow-up period of 12 months.
- Frequency Rate- measures the average number of offences per young person within the 12 month follow-up period

Young people enter the cohort by receiving a substantive disposal caution or conviction or by being released from custody during the selected period.
There is a 6 month follow-up period after 12 months of tracking so that any offences committed during but not proven until after the tracking period can be included.

The most recent validated data available is for the cohort who offended during the period April 2013 to March 2014. The data is verified for accuracy both locally and nationally by the Youth Justice Board with reference to the Police National Computer.

The table above illustrates the trend of re-offending which peaked in the October 2012 to September 2013 cohort after a period of incremental deterioration since 2009/2010. The binary rate of re-offending has declined in the last two quarters reported from 50.8% to 46%. However, the rate of re-offending both Binary and Frequency remains higher than the London average, although the gap is beginning to narrow.

The downward trend has continued, recently validated data for the period July 2013 to June 2014 reports a binary rate of 44.8%. We anticipate alignment with the London average binary rate by quarter 4 2015/16.

5.3. **Analysis**

The local partnership is keenly aware of the need to improve performance in this area and has engaged with the Youth Justice Board’s regional project to reduce re-offending. The analysis was conducted in January 2016 in relation to the January to December 2013 cohort of offenders. The data analysis identified some key areas for improvement.

5.3.1. 17 year olds are the largest age group and commit the highest number of offences but 14 year olds who have the highest binary and frequency rate of re-offending. This is particularly significant as the earlier onset of a criminal career the greater the likelihood of future adult recidivism.

However, further analysis indicates that the majority of 14 year olds were initially dealt with through Out Of Court Disposals, Cautions or Youth Conditional Cautions. A separate analysis of this cohort indicates that 35% re-offended as compared to a London average of 29%.

The out of court disposals have been delivered by Targeted Youth Support while the YOS only worked with the Court population. A review of this service in 2015 identified a number of shortcomings in the approach to out of court disposals and so this function was transferred to the YOS in August 2015. This has enabled a robust and timely assessment of need and the likelihood of re-offending to be completed prior to the decision made in conjunction with the police as to whether the young person should be diverted from the criminal justice system, given a Youth Caution or a Youth Conditional Caution which is enforceable with non-compliance with an intervention programme resulting in prosecution for the original offence. Those young people who are cautioned or diverted are offered a voluntary intervention to reduce the likelihood of re-offending. It is too early to demonstrate the impact on the rate
of re-offending but levels of engagement by young people and their families are promising.

5.3.2. The gender profile of offending is fairly typical across the Youth Justice system with only 14% of the cohort being young women. However, although young women are not statistically significant in terms of re-offending they are characterised by complex needs and are often vulnerable to harm including sexual exploitation. The YOS has developed and implemented a specific programme for young women to address these issues.

5.3.3. Black young people are disproportionately represented in the offending cohort, 23% compared to 10% of the general population aged 10 to 17 years in Hounslow. Also, the frequency rate is 2.15 compared to the white cohort which is 0.99. The disproportionate representation of black young people, particularly males, is a national issue and not specific to Hounslow, but reducing disproportionality is a priority locally (see below).

5.3.4. Further analysis of the 2013 cohort indicates that the second highest group where those entering the cohort with a disposal that required no intervention from the YOS, this includes Youth Cautions, Conditional Discharges and fines. The majority of these were Youth Cautions and as noted in 5.3.1 this group will now all be assessed prior to an out of court disposal being made and will be offered an intervention programme on a voluntary basis as there is no power to enforce. However, levels of engagement since September 2015 have been encouraging and will be closely monitored with action taken to improve engagement where necessary. Similarly, those receiving a fine or a Conditional Discharge that are not already supervised by the YOS will be offered a voluntary intervention.

5.3.5. It is of note that 40% of those who re-offended did so in the first 3 months, and this group was responsible for 53% of all further offences, thereby inflating both the binary and frequency rate of re-offending. A significant proportion of this group fall within in the Out Of Court Disposals cohort, and the need to more proactively engage these young people in a timely intervention has already been discussed in 5.3.1. However, the YOS has also taken steps to increase the timeliness of assessment and intervention with Young People sentenced in court. The timescale for intervention are now in excess of those required by the National Standards for working with young offenders to ensure that young people continue to take the disposal seriously and engage with interventions to change their behaviour. The YOS revised the timescales and implemented use of the YJB’s live-tracker tool to monitor the effectiveness and timeliness of the response to further offending, such as increasing the intervention level and frequency of supervision provided in order to reduce the frequency level of re-offending. It is too early to assess the impact upon performance but after 3 months of use only a very few young people have re-offended, but there are likely to be some offenders that haven’t yet been detected and brought to justice. However, early indications are positive.
5.3.6. The majority of re-offences were either of the same seriousness as the initial offence or, as in most cases, more serious. The most common offences being those of violence against the person or drugs offences. These are often offences committed in groups, which creates another dynamic that is resistant to interventions to promote desistence from offending. This will be discussed below in reference to the local objective to reduce offences of serious youth violence.

5.3.7. Finally the analysis indicates that 15 young people committed more than 5 offences each, which was significant in inflating the frequency rate. Ten of these young people were children Looked After, and were mostly late entrants to care aged 15 years or older.

This suggests that 3 strategic action are required.

i. The YOS and the Corporate Parenting Service need to take a more integrated approach to working with this cohort with complex needs. Joint planning and integrated working has improved considerably over the past 12 months.

ii. Earlier and more effective intervention is required with young people and their families, who are on the edge of care and coming to the notice of police. The Troubled Families Programme, and the Innovation fund Step Change Project are targeting this group of young people and their families as a priority.

iii. Those young people who continue to be assessed as at high risk of offending at the end of their YOS intervention or Court Order should be offered continuing support upon exit.

This is problematic as the YOS is not sufficiently resourced to provide this, and a Youth Crime prevention sub-group of the YCMB has been tasked with co-ordinating partnership activity to address this gap in provision.

The re-offending action plan is attached in summary form detailing actions, timescales and arrangements for monitoring performance is attached as an appendix.5.4 As noted in the Youth Justice Plan for 2014/16 a number of measures have been put in place and become embedded to reduce the rate of re-offending going forward:

5.4.1 All young people receive a Restorative Justice intervention, including victim-offender mediation, indirect mediation including letters of apology, and victim awareness sessions to develop an understanding of the impact of offending on the victims and the community.

5.5 Reduce the number of First Time Entrants to the Criminal Justice System.
The measures the impact of prevention and diversion by monitoring the reducing numbers of Young People cautioned or convicted for an offence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Time Entrants (FTE)</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of offences committed by F.T.E during 2015/16 is 124, which is 70% of all youth offences. Offences of violence against the person constitutes 35% of F.T.E offences, and drugs offences constitute 14%.

5.5.1 Analysis

The key drivers for first time offending are offences of violence, drugs offences and links to group offending, particularly in relation to drugs supply.

Black young people are disproportionately represented in the cohort of First Time Entrants, 23% compared to 10% of the local 10 to 17 year old population. However, this group are similarly represented disproportionately in offences of violence and drugs offences. The representation of white young people is proportionate to their representation in the general population. However, Asian youth are underrepresented, 9% of First Time Entrants compared to 34% of the 10 to 17 year old population.

The disproportionate representation of black young people is a cause of concern, but numbers are small, there were only 124 F.T.E in 2015/16, and, therefore, an analysis in terms of percentages can be misleading. This caveat notwithstanding disproportionality has been an issue resistant to change for many years both nationally and locally, and requires further action (see below).

5.5.2 The numbers of F.T.E’s have risen (see the table above), but remain within the target for 2015/16 of 130. However, the number of F.T.E has risen over the past 2 years, it was 103 in 2013/14. There are a number of possible explanations for this:

i. The increasing trend towards offences of violence and drugs offences which are more likely to result in charge or caution than measures of diversion.

ii. A more consistent approach to decision-making in relation to Out Of Court Disposals since the transfer of responsibility to the YOS in August 2015. The assessed likelihood of re-offending now has a greater impact on decisions in relation to disposal, and will inevitably result in some young people being cautioned who might previously have been diverted from the criminal justice system without an intervention. This number is likely to be few but the YOS will monitor outcomes for young people to ensure that young people are not unnecessarily criminalised whilst also taking appropriate action to reduce the rate of re-offending through positive intervention.
iii. The demography of the borough is changing as families move from inner-London in response to changes in the benefits system and the higher property costs in inner-London.

iv. The increase in knife-enabled offences across London has resulted in more proactive policing methods, including the use of stop and search, which inevitably increases the number of young people coming to attention for possession of controlled drugs and so on.

5.5.3 The local partnership is committed to the diversion of Young People from the Criminal Justice System wherever appropriate and consistent with the protection of the public and the safeguarding of young people. This requires timely and effective intervention at the earliest point possible in the development of offending and anti-social behaviour.

The following strategic actions have, therefore, been agreed.

a. All young people diverted from the criminal justice system following a referral from the police for an out of court disposal will be assessed, criminogenic factors identified and an appropriate intervention offered. Prior to the transfer of responsibility to the YOS nearly 20% of this cohort committed a subsequent offence within 12 months. The impact of the change in approach on offending will be reviewed in October/November 2016, and, if necessary, an improvement plan presented to the YCMB for approval.

b. Research evidence suggests that early intervention before patterns of offending and anti-social behaviour become entrenched results in improved outcomes. However, the identification of those at risk of involvement in crime prior to coming to police notice is challenging. A task and finish group has been meeting since February 2016, and will produce a draft youth crime prevention strategy for YCMB approval in January 2017. The aim is to identify at risk young people by reviewing referrals from schools for behaviour support, referrals of concern to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub, young people involved in anti-social behaviour, and the siblings of young offenders. It is the intention that these young people will be offered enhanced support to prevent a progression towards offending behaviour.

5.6 Reducing the use of custody for sentencing and remand.

The performance in 2015/16 illustrated that the improvements made in recent years have been sustained despite an increasing trend towards more serious offending as noted above. The rate of custodial sentencing as a proportion of total sentencing was 4.25% compared to a target of 5%.
The trajectory over the past 3 years is illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of sentencing occasions</th>
<th>No. of Young People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The custodial rate of 4.25% has improved considerably since the 2012/13 baseline of 8.5%, and is lower than the London average.

The Youth Justice Board provide comparative data, which, to take account of the differing population sizes of Local authority areas, is calculated as the rate of custodial sentencing per 1000 of the 10 to 17 year old population. (see below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hounslow</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regards to this measure Hounslow is closer to the nation average than the London average.

The reduction in custodial sentencing suggests that the court has confidence in the delivery of effective supervision in the community by the YOS.

5.6.1 There has also been a reduction in the number of young people remanded in Youth Detention Accommodation (custody).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers are, of course, small but nonetheless there has been a reduction of 43% since 2013/14.

It is noteworthy that the 9 young people that of the 9 young people remanded to YDA two were female. This reflects the trend noted in previous plans of young women becoming involved in more serious offences.

The general reduction in remands to YDA suggest that the court has confidence in the YOT’s provision of bail supervision and support in the community.
The disproportionate involvement of black and other ethnic minority groups in the criminal justice system is a matter of enduring national concern. The Government has commissioned an enquiry, led by David Lammy, which is due to report in the near future.

The tables below illustrate the level of disproportionality in Hounslow in the use of custody during 2015/16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reduction in custodial sentencing is positive. It would appear that contrary to national and regional trends Black young people are under-represented in this cohort but the numbers are so small that conclusions cannot be drawn as to whether this will be an enduring trend.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is evidence of the disproportionate representation of black young people in the remand population, but again numbers are too small to identify any trends.

5.7.1 The disproportionate representation of black and other ethnic minority young people is evident in the general population of young offenders supervised by the YOS. The data is presented below by type of offence and the representation of differing ethnic groups compared to their proportion of the general youth population aged 10 to 17 years. A breakdown of First Time Entrants also indicates the disproportionate involvement of black young people by 13%, so the level of disproportionality is fairly consistent throughout a young person's journey through the Youth Justice System. This is reflected throughout the Criminal Justice System and is not specific to Hounslow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>FTE offences</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black young people have highest disproportionate involvement (13%) in First Time Entrants.

The drivers for this are the same as for offending in general as described above, offences of violence, drugs offences and, links to group offending. The proportion of FTE’s as a proportion of the whole offending repopulation is significant, and strengthens the argument that the crime prevention strategy needs to be refreshed.

The number of FTE has increased which was anticipated following the implementation of a more robust approach to the assessment and intervention in relation to young people referred for Out Of Court Disposals. However, the number remains within target and this approach is expected to impact upon the rate of re-offending over the next year.
### Disproportionate involvement of different ethnic Groups in offending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>all offences</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black young People were over represented in offending by 11, White 8% and Mixed Parentage Young People were slightly over represented.

The data below indicates that Black YP were disproportionately represented in judicial outcomes in relation to Drugs offences, which suggests a greater involvement in organised crime and group offending. This groups disproportionate involvement in offences of violence would support this trend analysis. However, numbers are relatively small and an analysis of trends in terms of percentages can be misleading.
Offences 2015/16

Violence against the person offences were highest in the cohort followed by Drugs and Theft and Handling, these offences categories were 57% of total offences. Drugs offences include possession with intent to supply as well as possession for personal consumption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Categories</th>
<th>Offence Count 2015/16</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIOLENCE AGAINST THE PERSON</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUGS OFFENCE</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEFT AND HANDLING</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMINAL DAMAGE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTING OFFENCES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREACH OF STATUTORY ORDER</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC ORDER</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE THEFT</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEXUAL OFFENCE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREACH OF BAIL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC BURGLARY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACIALLY AGGRAVATED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON DOMESTIC BURGLARY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREACH OF CONDITIONS DISCHARGE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAUD AND FORGERY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Violence against the Person (VAP)

77 young people committed 126 VAP offences during 2015/16, which was 43% of total offending population. 17 female 60 male.

There was reduction of 4 young people compared with 2013/14.

VAP offences decreased from 126 (2013/14) to 94 (2014/15) and increased again in 2015/16 to 126 offences

Some YP of this list have committed other offences and counted under different offences categories as well. Violence against the person is the highest committed offences which led to substantive outcome during 2015/16. Similar trend was shown in 2013/14.

Of 126 violence offences, 13 (10%) offences were possession of knife/bladed article committed by 12 YP which is 7% of total offending.
Of VAP offences 50% offences were assault by beating and assault on police officer. 36 (29%) offences were assault by beating and 27 (21%) assault of on police officer.

Disproportionate involvement of different ethnic groups in VAP offences.

White YP were over represented by 13% followed by black young people who were over represent by 7%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>VAP offences</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drugs offences**

Drugs offences were the most commonly committed offence, predominantly the Possession of Cannabis. 45 young people committed 79 drugs offences during 2015/16, which was 25% of total offending population. 3 female 42 male.

Of 79 drugs offences, 45 - 57% were possession of controlled drugs B (Cannabis) 13 - 16% were possession of controlled drugs A (Heroin, Cocaine) 17 – 22% were possession of controlled drugs class A with intent to supply and supply.

The possession and supply of class A drugs increased in 2015/16 compared with 2013/14.
Possession of Class A drugs increased by 7 offences and supply of Class A drugs increased by 10 offences. Drug Offences decreased from 71 (2013/14) to 60 (2014/15) and increased again in 2015/16 to 79 offences.

Black young people were disproportionately involved in Drugs offences. This has increases in 2015/16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Drugs offences %age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011 %age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Theft and Handling

The most common committed offence was shoplifting, the trend of theft from motor vehicle offences increased. Theft of Pedal Cycle decreased.

Over all theft and handling offences decreased during 2015/16 from 59 to 38. 28 Young people committed 37 offences, 3 female and 25 male. 16% of total offending.
White young people were over represented by 13% and Chinese or other ethnic group by 7%. Black and Mixed young people slightly over represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Theft and Handling offences</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Robbery**

There was a significant reduction of robbery offences during 2015/16. From 50 offences to 17 offences.

14 young people committed 17 Robbery offences, 8% of total offending. One female and 13 male.
Again, black young people are disproportionately represented but the numbers are too small to draw definitive conclusions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Robbery offences</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robbery offences decreased from 50 (2013/14) to 23 offences (2014/15) and further decreased to 17 offences in 2015/16

DOMESTIC BURGLARY/ NON DOMESTIC BURGLARY

There was a substantial reduction in burglary offences during 2015/16. From 21 offences to 7 offences. 4 domestic burglary and 3 non-domestic burglary.
This is 4% of total offending, only white and black YP were involved in burglary offences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Burglary offences</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criminal Damage**

One of the highest committee offences during 2015/16 and increased compared to 2013/14.

Criminal damage offences increased from 22 (2013/14) to 42(2014/15) and decreased to 30 offences in 2015/16

Only three ethnic groups identified in criminal damage. White Young people disproportionate involvement is high compared with others.
### Disproportionate involvement - Criminal Damage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Criminal Damage offences</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motoring offences**

There was 15% increase of motoring offences during 2015/16 compared with 2013/14.

18 YP committed 30 motoring offences, all male, which is 105 of total offending.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>No. YP</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Motoring offences</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>General Population Mid 2011</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>Disproportionate involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9,981</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7,772</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7.2 The disproportionate representation of black young people in the criminal justice system has been an identified issue for many years has been resistant to change.

We look forward to the findings of the Lammy enquiry and will implement any forthcoming recommendations that resources permit. In the interim the YOS will continue to promote improvement in culturally sensitive approaches to assessment, planning and intervention for young people and their families. This is achieving by subjecting all key case documents to a standardised and rigorous quality assurance progress, further safeguards are as follows:
a) All young people complete an E-survey enabling them to express their views about the services they have received, including their personal and cultural relevance.

b) The YOS group work programme to address offending behaviour, victim empathy, and social and life skills will complete Level 2 with project oracle. This process reviews the quality and impact of interventions provided for diverse groups of young people.

c) Continue to engage with local third sector organisations who can engage purposefully with young people from culturally diverse backgrounds to prevent involvement in offending through early intervention, provide additional support to those young people in the system, and continue to support after exit.

5.8. As evidenced by the Re-offending table at the beginning of this section the total offending cohort, and, the volume of work met by the YOS has remained fairly static over the past 2 years, the cohort size was 193 young people in 2015/16. Rates of re-offending are reducing, but the seriousness of offences, including those of First Time Entrants is increasing, and offences involving drugs and the use of violence are becoming more prevalent.

5.8.1. The sustained volume of offending and the number entering the Criminal Justice System provides further evidence of the need for a greater emphasis on prevention and early intervention before statutory services are required as discussed above.

5.8.2. The pattern of offending suggests that substance misuse is a lifestyle choice for many young people which poses a risk to their physical and mental health. Also, the possession of controlled drugs is itself a criminal offence, and the pursuit of this lifestyle creates further risk of criminality, offences committed to find the purchase of drugs, involvement in drugs supply and so forth.

This, in turn, creates the circumstances necessary for local network or ‘gangs’ to become involved in drugs supply or for external groupings to take advantage of gaps in the market. There is considerable evidence of such criminal networks or ‘gangs’ entering relatively low crime areas, suburbs in the home counties or coastal towns, to exploit these opportunities. The resulting competition with local networks or other external groupings can lead to violence.

There is little intelligence concerning external groups operating within Hounslow as yet but clearly the potential is there, and for local networks to become increasingly active. In recognition of this challenge the community safety partnership has tasked a multi-agency task group to draft a Gangs Reduction strategy, and this will report to the CSP in the autumn of 2016.
The transfer of responsibility for the Young Peoples substance misuse service from the Local Authority to Public Health in July 2016 will provide opportunities for a greater focus on prevention and early intervention to pre-empt substance misuse and the associated behaviours and social difficulties becoming entrenched. It will also facilitate an improved range of effective interventions for those few young people who require treatment to address problematic substance misuse.

5.8.3. A further concern is the increasing levels of violent offending which cannot entirely be reduced to an emerging gang culture. Knife-enabled offences rose by 110% in 2015/16. The number of stabbings remain low relative to many other London Boroughs but the sharp increase is a concern. The majority of perpetrators and victims are in the 18 to 25 year old age range but clearly a significant opportunity exists for diverting children and young people from a lifestyle that involves carrying offensive weapons. The joint work planned with the Police and Children’s Services is outlined in Section 4.

5.9. The YOS has not been inspected by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation recently but the local partnership scrutinises published thematic inspections for learning points, and sustain continuous improvement.

5.9.1. HMIP have recently published a thematic inspection of YOT’s work with young people to promote desistence from offending, and found that the knowledge and understanding of Desistence Theory is often deficient.

However, Hounslow YOS launched the Asset Plus framework in June 2016, and staff undertook extensive online and classroom based training in preparation. This is now being refreshed through monthly learning and Development sessions.

5.9.2. A thematic inspection of referral orders reported that lay panel members often felt undervalued by YOT’s, and disengaged from work with young people. We are fortunate to have a number of committed panel members, and are currently consulting with them to improve levels of engagement, and ensure that the value we place on their contribution is fully communicated.

5.9.3. Finally, HMIP have recently inspected the effectiveness of transition arrangements from YOS to the National Probation Service, and have produced a general action plan for improvement. Locally, the YOS and NPS are reviewing arrangements against these recommendations, and will present a health check and improvement plan to the YCMB in November 2016.
### Hounslow Youth Justice Re-offending Action Plan, May 2016 update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>a) Interventions, both group and individual have been reviewed recently.</td>
<td>i. Reduce the rate of re-offending, binary and frequency, for girls, 14 year olds and black young people in line with Regional and National trends over the next year. Interim measures of YOS impact. Twice yearly performance reports monitoring levels of engagement with interventions, for the 3 identified cohorts.</td>
<td>H.Y.O.S</td>
<td>Timescale for implementation immediate</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Integrated Action Plan revised and implemented in March 2015 to facilitate greater engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Group work programme achieved level 1 status from Project Oracle, which includes assessment of diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Specific girls group launched in Feb 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Offence specific victim-focussed groups to commence in March re. violent offences, acquisitive crime, and drugs offence to promote awareness of impact of offending behaviour on victims and the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Strength based interventions for BAME YP to be explored on YJB effective practice library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Reduce the rate of re-offending, binary and frequency, for girls, 14 year olds and black young people in line with Regional and National trends over the next year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. % of OOCD’s engaging in an intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. % completing an intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. % of girls, 14 year olds, BAME youth subject to court orders that are revoked and resentenced after breach proceedings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action(s)</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>Review Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. To ensure that young people are effectively engaged as soon as the disposal is made (Inc. referral orders) to reduce the proportion who offend early | a) Procedures and Guidance to case Managers review, revised and re-issued Jan 25th to reduce administrative delays across all intervention types.  
b) Y.P sentenced to a Referral Order after a PSR will attend a Panel within 5 days of sentence.  
c) All YP sentenced to RO without reports to be seen at least weekly until RO panel to seek engagement and monitoring.  
d) Referral order panel volunteers additional recruitment scheduled March 2016 to reduce delays of Initial Panels caused by lack of capacity  
e) All staff will receive training on speech and language needs to improve how interventions tailored to their needs in February 2016. | i. Initial appointment for all court ordered interventions within 1 working day.  
ii. Pre-court appointments within 2 working days of receipt of MG3  
iii. 95% of Initial Referral order panels convened within 20 working days | Head of YOS/Management Team | February 2016 (completed) | September 2016 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Review Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. To ensure that, following the review of pre-court interventions and the decision to bring them in-house, the re-offending rate for this tier reduces in line with the national average | a) Brought in house September 2015.  
b) Re-audit against NS in September 2016.  
c) All staff are now completing core ASSET before decision made on intervention.  
d) All YP screened by substance misuse worker the YJLD worker.  
e) Review compliance of YC/YCC on quarterly basis, ensuring that those with non-compliance are appropriately responded to.  
f) Pre-Court cases will be encouraged to provide feedback on services received via viewpoint. Feedback is collated quarterly and reviewed by the management team.  
g) Feedback will be used to improve access to Universal Services and / or Specialist Services where appropriate to promote desistence from offending as part of an exit plan. | i. Reduce the rate of re-offending for OOCD’s in line with regional and national trends over the next year.  
ii. Regular case sample audits to determine whether interventions are tailored to individual need and risk.  
iii. YOS to provide twice yearly reports concerning young people’s feedback on service received and the service’s response. | HYOS/Operations manager | Re-Audit National Standards compliance to Monitor improvement against baseline in April 2015 Sample case audits – September 2016 | Review of outcomes of re-offending rate after 1 year June 2017 Nov 2016 March 2017 |
| 4. Ensure that interventions are tailored to assessed need and risk. | |

**Notes:**
- HYOS/Operations manager
- NS = National Standards
- YJLD = Youth Justice Liaison
- OOCD = Offenders on Community Corrective Dispositions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Review Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. To ensure that those coming to the end of their order and are likely to re-offend are supported by the wider partnership e.g. T.Y.S | a) All young people with a likelihood of re-offending that is high to have a clearly defined EXIT strategy.  
b) Engagement with TYS, voluntary sector re EXIT plans.  
c) YOS will be taking on 18yr old cases extended supervision.  
d) Agreement required re TYS role with exit strategy and commissioning possibilities to provide this service  
e) Desistence based activities that build on life skills/interests to be explored from VSO, local area, charity funding. Agreements in place with Brentford and mentoring to be strengthened / maintained. | i. All YP whose likelihood of re-offending is assessed as high at the end of an intervention to have a clearly defined and agreed exit strategy.  
ii. To be reported from end Assets to the YMCB every 6 months. | HYOS | April 2016 | September 2016 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Review Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6. To ascertain the proportion of cohort members who are never worked with by the YOS during the cohort 12 month period, and consider how the YOS or wider partnership might support this group | a) Reviewed in January 2016.  
b) The non-intervention category is inflated in number by Youth Cautions who did not ordinarily receive an intervention in 2013. Since Sept 2015 this is no longer the case (rec.2). We have reviewed the number of Conditional Discharges and stand-alone fines issued Jan to Dec 2015 and this totals 6. The YOS offered this cohort a voluntary intervention from March 2016.  
c) Procedures have been updated and processes put in place so that from March 2016 YP who have no intervention will be provided with a leaflet on their sentence outcome and be offered an appointment by court officer.  
d) Letter and phone call will be made to out of borough court outcomes.  
e) All YP will be allocated a YOS worker and offer of intervention focusing on 4 key areas of work:  
   ➢ Crime and consequences  
   ➢ Offence-specific intervention  
   ➢ Restorative Justice  
   ➢ EXIT planning and signposting  
   This is a core offer and will be supported by individual activities to strengthen protective factors in order to promote desistence from offending in accordance with the initial assessment. | i. Reduce rate of re-offending, binary and frequency in line with Regional and National trends, over the next year.  
   ii. All YP subject to a conditional discharge or standalone fine to be offered an intervention with level of engagement to be monitored by YCMB every 6 months. | Head of YOS/Operations Manager | March 2016 Completed | September 2016 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Review Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7. The use of the YJB live Tracking tool to monitor current cohorts to prompt remedial action | a) Live tracker implemented in February 2016  
  b) Tracker will identify re-offending cases and provide line managers swift management information to ensure that case managers revise the asset, review IP accordingly. This will facilitate prompt remedial action in the event of a further offence or behaviour of concern to address the risk factors and reduce further repeat offending thereby reducing the escalation of the frequency rate.  
  c) Tracker data update will be reviewed on monthly basis as standing agenda item at management meeting. Trends that come from this will be responded to by management team.  
  d) LAC YP who are prolific offenders will be discussed at professional meetings to agree Joint working.  
  e) Monthly meetings with children’s home managers re behaviour in seeking restorative outcomes to continue.  
  f) VSO and other services that may offer effective additional desistence based service to YP to be explored and current arrangements with external services maintained / strengthened. | i. Reduce frequency rate of re-offending to Regional and Nation average over the next year.  
 ii. Timeliness of intervention plan reviews following a re-offence to be monitored and reported to YCMB every 6 months. | HYOS/ Data Manager | Ongoing | March 2016 |
## Management Board Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Adams</td>
<td>Executive Director of Children’s Services</td>
<td>LB Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui McShannon</td>
<td>Director of Children’s safeguarding and specialist services</td>
<td>LB Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Marks</td>
<td>Director of Education and Early Intervention</td>
<td>LB Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Jolly</td>
<td>Head of Service Delivery</td>
<td>National Probation Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI Wayne Matthews</td>
<td>Deputy Chief Inspector</td>
<td>Hounslow Metropolitan Police Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Waddington</td>
<td>Director of Joint Commissioning</td>
<td>LB Hounslow and Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Butler</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>West London Magistrates Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permijit Chadha</td>
<td>Community Safety Manager</td>
<td>LB Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Domeney</td>
<td>Head of Youth Offending Service</td>
<td>LB Hounslow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Newman</td>
<td>The Community Rehabilitation Company</td>
<td>CRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staffing Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strategic Manager (PT)</th>
<th>Strategic Manager (FT)</th>
<th>Operational Manager (PT)</th>
<th>Operational Manager (FT)</th>
<th>Practitioners (PT)</th>
<th>Practitioners (FT)</th>
<th>Administration (PT)</th>
<th>Administration (FT)</th>
<th>Sessional</th>
<th>Student / Trainees</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsourced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary /Casual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Children's Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Health (Substance Misuse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Health (Mental Health)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Health (Physical Health)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Health (Speech/Language)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unspecified Seondee Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Connexions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seondee Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Fixed-Term</th>
<th>Outsourced</th>
<th>Temporary/Casual</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Seondee Children's Services</th>
<th>Seondee Probation</th>
<th>Seondee Police</th>
<th>Seondee Health (Substance Misuse)</th>
<th>Seondee Health (Mental Health)</th>
<th>Seondee Health (Physical Health)</th>
<th>Seondee Health (Speech/Language)</th>
<th>Other/Unspecified Seondee Health</th>
<th>Seondee Education</th>
<th>Seondee Connexions</th>
<th>Seondee Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Manager</td>
<td>Operational Manager</td>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Sessional</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Black African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1. DETAILS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Cabinet is asked to:

1.1 Note and approve the new *Hounslow Compact* (Appendix A) which has been developed collaboratively and which underpins and supports the collaborative partnership work across the council with key VCSE partners and public bodies in Hounslow.

1.2 Support the adoption of the *Hounslow Compact* as the authoritative partnership agreement between public bodies in Hounslow and the voluntary, charitable, community and social enterprise sectors in Hounslow – known as the VCSE sector.

### If the recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit, link to Values</th>
<th>Dates by which they can expect to notice a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The clear, concise set of commitments contained in the <em>Hounslow Compact</em> will provide a framework to enhance collaboration and to govern working relationships between voluntary, community and social enterprise sectors and public bodies</td>
<td>Within 2016/17 financial year – the Compact will go to Cabinet and if passed will be followed up with a programme of internal and external communications to all of the signatories and stakeholders to raise awareness and ensure use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents and VCSE organisations will benefit from the closer working relationships that the <em>Hounslow Compact</em> will develop between the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sectors in meeting the changing needs of residents.
- Residents and VCSE organisations will benefit from the collaborative approach to managing and communicating changes to services that is one of the purposes of the Hounslow Compact.
- The Hounslow Compact will improve communication and information flow between organisations and with the general public.
- The Hounslow Compact aims to create sustainable and resilient communities by bringing the sectors together to deliver better services tailored to the needs of the community.

2. REPORT SUMMARY

The Hounslow Compact is a written agreement between the VCSE sector and statutory sectors about how they will cooperate and continue to develop positive working relationships for the benefit of Hounslow’s communities. The Hounslow Compact sets out to build on existing partnerships, develop a range of shared principles and undertakings and develop the relationship between the sectors through mutual respect and trust, so that better public services can be provided across Hounslow.

This agreement supports the aims of the “Thriving Communities and VCSE Strategy 2015 – 2019”

1. Empowered residents actively shaping their local area and enhancing civic pride across residents and communities
2. Enabling independence and resilience by building the skills, resources and capacity of residents, neighbours and communities.
3. A vibrant, self-sustaining and ambitious Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Hounslow Compact is essentially a code of practice for partnership working between public bodies and the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector in the borough. It links directly to the National Compact, an agreement between central government and the VCSE sector in England, which was established in 1998 and has undergone a number of revisions since.

3.2 The last refresh of the Hounslow Compact, which the Hounslow Together Board signed, was in 2011. It is currently based on a set of principles (respect, honesty and transparency, independence, diversity, equality, citizen empowerment, volunteering, common goals) and defines shared commitments in policy development, investing in outcomes and advancing equality.
In the past five years the role and work of the VCSE sector has continued to change and expand. In response to the changing landscape, Hounslow’s Community Partnerships Unit (CPU) developed the ‘Thriving Communities and VCSE Strategy 2015-19’. It aims to deliver three outcomes which are listed above. The Strategy includes a commitment to revise the current Compact to make it relevant and usable and reflect how the voluntary and public sectors currently work together to improve the lives of residents in Hounslow.

3.4 The review of the Hounslow Compact has been led by the Community Partnerships Unit (CPU) overseen by a Steering Group, which includes VCSE representatives from the Hounslow Together Board and members of Hounslow Community Network.

4. KEY IMPLICATIONS

4.1 The next 4 years require fundamental changes in the expectations of individuals, communities and service providers to make the most of reduced resources in the council. With reduced financial resources, it’s important that we reshape our approach to collaborative working to consistently spend our time on what we say we care about.

4.2 There is widespread recognition that the VCSE organisations bring distinct advantages to public service provision – particularly in terms of their access to and links with communities, understanding of individual and community need, capacity for prevention and early intervention, and ability to deliver personalised services. Voluntary organisations, communities, charities and social enterprises are now increasingly delivering public services in partnership with, or on behalf of, public sector organisations.

4.3 Hounslow Council currently supports the sector with a range of grants and contracts – in addition to delivering wider sector support and community engagement. However, in light of the budget savings required across the local authority in the next four years, funding to support for the VCSE sector in Hounslow is being reduced.

4.4 The sector is also experiencing a wider shift from funding through grants, to bidding for large contracts and commissioned services. In comparison with grant funding, these types of financing typically require a greater focus on cost and price, extensive bidding, monitoring and reporting requirements, outcome based payment, and shorter timeframes for delivery.

4.5 Recent public sector reforms have also resulted in the NHS, schools, Police and Crime Commissioners and Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) with increased spending and commissioning control, which has increased the complexity of the funding landscape further. Many smaller VCSE organisations have limited capacity to compete for contracts in this new environment. As a result, there is a growing focus nationally – and within Hounslow – on consolidating resources within the VCSE sector, increasing collaboration between organisations, and the development of consortia which can provide joint services, or become viable commissioned providers.

4.6 The review of the Compact is an opportunity to not only ensure the document reflects these policy developments, new commissioning structures and
changes to funding, but to help raise awareness of the agreement and the benefits it brings for partnership working.

5. **FINANCIAL DETAILS**

Comments of the Director, Finance and Corporate Services

5.1 The costs of implementing the Hounslow Compact must be met from within agreed budgets.

6. **LEGAL DETAILS**

Comments of the Head of Governance

Adoption of the Compact will help to ensure that decisions in relation to the VCSE sector are taken after proper consultation, and with due regard to the Council’s duties under equalities legislation.

7. **VALUE FOR MONEY**

N/A

8. **SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT APPRAISAL**

N/A

9. **RISK MANAGEMENT**

The Hounslow Compact should support better working relationships between public bodies and local community and other voluntary groups in the borough, based on the belief that these relationships can be conducted with trust, equality, respect and fairness. If these principles are fully upheld, then differences between partners should not become damaging disputes.

However we recognise that there may be times where the actions of partners do not meet the aims and values outlined in this Compact and that each party has the right to raise concerns, to be attended to positively and to receive a timely response. To address such cases the Hounslow compact contains a clear and detailed resolution process to help parties to resolve issues of concern in the most amicable way possible.

10. **LINKS TO COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

10.1 The *Hounslow Compact* complements the aims of the “Thriving Communities & VCSE Sector Strategy 2015-2019”

10.2 The adoption of the *Hounslow Compact* will contribute directly to these commitments in the Corporate Plan 2014 – 2019 to deliver active, healthy communities;

- Supporting people taking an active part in community life
- Ensure people in our community get on well together, supported by a strong voluntary sector
- Increase the VCSE sector’s ability to improve the lives of local people within the borough
- Promote citizenship, build trust and help prevent extremism

11. EQUALITIES, HUMAN RIGHTS & COMMUNITY COHESION
The Council has to give due regard to its Equalities Duties, in particular with respect to general duties arising from section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. Having due regard to the need to advance equality involves, in particular, the need to remove or minimize disadvantages suffered by equalities groups.

The Council has considered the relevance of the proposal to the provisions of the Equality Act 2010, in particular for those with the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation and the Human Rights Act 1998. The assessment concluded that the Hounslow Compact would not negatively impact on any groups with protected characteristics.

12. STAFFING/ WORKFORCE & ACCOMODATION IMPLICATIONS
Not applicable.

13. PROPERTY & ASSETS
Not applicable.

14. ANY OTHER IMPLICATIONS
Not applicable.

15. CONSULTATION
The Hounslow Compact document has been developed with substantial input from representatives of the VCSE sector in Hounslow. Where there has not been a formal consultation process, significant internal and external engagement is currently underway to give stakeholders the opportunity to comment on the document’s content, give their input and signpost any omissions and errors that need to be addressed.

16. TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION
Subject to approval by Cabinet in September 2016, the Hounslow Compact will be launched and made publically available on the council website.
17. **APPENDICES**
   Appendix A – The Hounslow Compact

18. **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**
   None.

**REPORT ENDS**
Working better together
A Compact For Hounslow

IN PARTNERSHIP WITH:
Foreword

It gives us great pleasure to welcome you to The Hounslow Compact on behalf of Hounslow Council, Hounslow Together and Hounslow Community Network.

Our joint vision is for a vibrant, self-sustaining and ambitious Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector in Hounslow and we are confident that this new Compact will help the council, public bodies and partners across the borough to continue to develop strong and resilient partnerships for the benefit of all of the residents of Hounslow.

As council budgets are being further reduced, partnerships will play a greater role in sustaining and increasing gains in the wellbeing and resilience of our communities and the VCSE sector. The unprecedented level of cuts is forcing us to review the way we provide services and support residents, but we are still firmly committed to developing a sustainable and independent VCSE sector who we can work in partnership with to support the communities we serve. This will mean communities doing more and having greater influence over services including being able to design them, with new opportunities to have a say and get involved in local activities.

In Hounslow we have over 700 VCSE organisations involving thousands of local volunteers. They provide a diverse range of services across the borough and what they all have in common is the ability to improve the lives of those who live, work, visit or volunteer in Hounslow.

This new Compact will help us to work better together as partners for the good of local residents. We have worked closely with the VCSE sector to ensure that this Compact demonstrates our shared values, principles and commitments and we value all of the many contributions that have been made in the drafting of the Compact.

The current period of austerity means change, challenge and opportunity for us all and we would urge you to read this Compact and consider how you and your organisation can contribute to us working better together.

Cllr Steve Curran
Leader of Hounslow Council

Cllr Richard Foote
Lead Member for Communities

Cllr Amrit Mann
Chair of Hounslow Together

Debbie Brenner
Chair of Hounslow Community Network
Purpose of the Compact

- This Compact is a voluntary partnership agreement between public bodies and the voluntary, charitable, community and social enterprise sectors in Hounslow - known as the VCSE sector.

- It will help all of the organisations that sign up to it to work together to enhance the effectiveness of both the council and VCSE organisations to meet the needs of the community.

- The Compact recognises and seeks to promote the proactive role played by Hounslow's VCSE sector, not only in providing services but also generating income, adding to the local economy, developing and utilising the skills of local people and strengthening local communities.

Working together to deliver better services

- Working together from the very earliest stages of policy and service development will enable ideas, information and resources to be pooled, preventing duplication. In order to create sustainable and resilient communities, we will plan together for the long-term, taking into account changing demographics and need. This will result in the best possible outcomes for all residents.

- Hounslow Council supports the VCSE sector with a range of grants and contracts. However, in light of the budget savings required across the local authority, the level of funding to support the VCSE sector in Hounslow is being reduced. This changing financial landscape requires fundamental changes in the expectations of individuals, communities and service providers to make the most of reduced financial resources in the council. This will inevitably place increased demand on VCSE sector organisations to deliver public services in partnership with, or on behalf of, public sector organisations with an increasing reliance on local people taking the lead on improving their local areas through voluntary action.
By working better together we hope to create:

- Strong, diverse and independent communities within the Borough of Hounslow.
- A culture of partnership that promotes close and effective working relations between the sectors in Hounslow. This includes involving local people every step of the way so that the services they receive are tailored to their needs.
- A framework for continually improving ways of working together to achieve our shared goals.
- Collaborative and transparent design and development of policies, programmes and services.
- Responsive and high-quality services that meet the changing needs of residents.
- Collaborative approaches to managing and communicating changes to services, where these are required.
- A framework to increase the voluntary sector's capacity to deliver quality local services that people need, and that new types of services, which best meet people's needs are developed with and by the sector (possibly through new models of delivery).
- Equality of opportunity for all of the residents of Hounslow enabling them to live in an environment without discrimination, harassment and victimisation on the basis of race, religion and belief, gender, sexual orientation, disability, age and socio-economic status.

Further details of this commitment can be found at: www.hounslow.gov.uk/index/council_and_democracy/equality.htm

Our shared values

These are the shared values which underpin our partnership work and will be observed in enacting the Compact.

- Mutual responsibility for the success of the Compact.
- Promoting and developing mutual respect between all participating organisations and for all points of view.
- A commitment to enacting the Compact based on honesty, transparency and integrity between all parties.
- A commitment to promoting equality and inclusiveness.
- Support for and recognition of the special importance of volunteering in Hounslow to the well-being of residents, communities and neighbourhoods.
Our commitments

There are three key commitments contained in the Compact. Each one is supported by a range of actions to help all of the participating stakeholders to achieve the aims of the Compact.

1. Consultation, Engagement and Co-production

There will be meaningful engagement of the VCSE sector, service users and other stakeholders in the design and development of policies, strategies and services which affect them or their stakeholders - often referred to as co-production

a. Signatories to the Compact will seek to increase the use of co-production methods of delivering services between public bodies, the VCSE sector and service users to develop a greater understanding of local need and the most effective ways of responding to it.

b. Ensure that engagement activities place the service users at the centre of informing, influencing and shaping the services they receive.

c. Seek to identify and involve all those who have an interest in, or will be affected by, the outcomes of a decision in the formative stages of any consultation or service planning process. This should include the Council’s Community Partnership Unit & Hounslow Community Network.

d. Involve stakeholders in the selection of consultation or involvement methods, working with them to identify the most suitable method(s) for the communities they represent and, where necessary, provide a reason why a requested method cannot be used.

e. Ensure that consultation and engagement activities conform to the organisations’ procedures and statutory requirements.

f. Publicise any involvement opportunities as widely as possible so that they are accessible to all stakeholders. There are a number of very effective communications channels available for all stakeholders to use, including the Hounslow Hub website, the Hounslow Council website, Hounslow Council Evolve newsletter and HVSSS e-news.

g. Use a wide range of consultation and engagement methods that are suitable for the target audience. For example, provider events may be used to help shape services and contract opportunities, benefitting from the knowledge of the VCSE sector.

h. Monitor changing demographics and resulting need and priorities on a regular basis to ensure these are reflected in service design and delivery. The relevant information may be provided through channels such as the Hounslow Stats Bank (www.hounslowhub.org.uk) and Hounslow Insight (http://insight.hounslow.gov.uk/)

i. Capture the potential impact of proposed changes by providing opportunities for affected people to be meaningfully involved.

j. Timeframes for consultation should be realistic to allow sufficient time to provide a considered response. This should also take into account the effect of public holidays and school holidays wherever possible. The amount of time required will depend on the nature and impact of the proposal but will typically be between 4 and 12 weeks.

k. Inform stakeholders how their views have influenced decisions, including where and why they have not been acted on.

l. The council will reply to all enquiries and emails within 10 working days.

m. Open and timely discussions about any difficulties in service delivery will allow all parties to work together to improve performance or ensure a considered exit plan or service handover is in place. Lessons learnt will be shared amongst all stakeholders. Requirements around confidentiality and data protection will continue to be met.
2. Commissioning and Grant Funding

Support local VCSE organisations to play a more vital role in delivering services by opening up new opportunities and ensuring that commissioning and grant allocation processes are made as accessible as possible.

a. Provide, where practical, a range of funding options, including grants and contracts, enabling smaller organisations to play a role where they are best placed to do so.

b. Ensure that the criteria used to award grants and contracts are transparent and clearly communicated.

c. Take into account the time needed for bid writing and consortia development when setting submission timeframes. Hounslow Council will give voluntary and community groups at least six weeks to submit funding bids, except where shorter timescales have been set for reasons specified by external funders.

d. Support infrastructure services and initiatives that will help build the capacity of the sector and ensure they are contract and/or social investment ready.

e. Support leadership development in the sector and acknowledge the cost of employing highly skilled and experienced management.

f. Ensure that reporting and other contract requirements (e.g. insurance) are proportionate to the value of the contract/grant.

g. Ensure that the procurement process, including income requirements and consortium arrangements, does not exclude smaller groups where possible.

h. Hounslow Council and CCG will aim to pay agreed invoices to VCSE groups within 15 days.

i. VCSE organisations will have appropriate governance, monitoring and management systems in place to ensure that services are meeting identified need and delivering positive outcomes for service users. This will include obtaining feedback from the service users.

j. VCSE organisations will comply with all relevant legislation, including safeguarding requirements.

k. Explore all opportunities for joint funding bids between the VCSE and public sectors to maximise the level of external investment coming into Hounslow.

l. A primary purpose of the Compact includes a commitment to continuous improvement in ways of working together. To achieve this, at regular intervals we will review progress in implementing the Compact and share the lessons learnt to better inform joint working in the future as outlined in the section “Implementing The Compact”.

WORKING BETTER TOGETHER – A COMPACT FOR HOUNSLOW
3. Impact of policy & service decisions

Ensure that the social, environmental and economic impact of policy and service decisions are fully considered.

a. All signatories to the Compact should commit themselves to promoting and developing volunteering in the borough and recognising the benefits that volunteering can bring in the personal outcomes for volunteers and the wider value it brings to service delivery.

b. In accordance with the Public Services (Social Value) Act we will agree potential social value outcomes and measures for relevant contract opportunities with potential bidders and service users before procurement. This may include the development of volunteering opportunities and local skills, jobs or community businesses; a reduction in the demand for public services; or an increase in private sector investment.

c. All signatories to the Compact should commit to promoting the values of equality and human rights, regardless of age, physical disability, learning disability, gender, race, sexual orientation, faith, health (physical and/or mental) or socio-economic status.

d. All signatories to the Compact will ensure that their policies and services contribute to building personal and community resilience by building the skills, resources and capacity of residents, neighbourhoods and communities. Community resilience is about how people living in Hounslow deal with economic, social and environmental problems so that they can actually become stronger and more adaptable over time as they adjust to the problems they face. This could be by acquiring new skills, strengthening social connections and developing new physical resources.
Implementing the Compact

While not legally binding, this Compact should have authoritative status in setting out the ways in which public bodies, the VCSE sector and service users can work together in partnership to deliver better outcomes for all Hounslow residents.

A primary purpose of the Compact includes a commitment to continuous improvement in ways of working together. To achieve this, at regular intervals we will review progress in implementing the Compact and share the lessons learnt to better inform joint working in the future.

Raising awareness

- We want to encourage a range of stakeholders to sign up to the Compact and will work to raise awareness of the Compact, its benefits and successes.

- The Compact can be found on the website of signatory organisations, including Hounslow Council, Hounslow Hub, Hounslow CCG.

- Hounslow Council, Hounslow CCG and Hounslow Community Network will each nominate a Compact Champion to promote the Compact within their organisations and more widely across the borough.

- The Compact will be included in the induction of new employees and volunteers within signatory organisations.

- A review of the Compact actions will take place annually and be reported to Hounslow Community Network and VCSE Partnership meetings. This process will be led by the Compact Champions and a toolkit has been developed to support the review.

- We will share learning about Compact successes but also but also challenges faced, and how issues have been resolved.

Signing up to the Compact

- Any VCSE or public sector organisation can sign up to the Compact using the online form on the Hounslow Council website.

- VCSE organisations that are members of Hounslow Community Network are automatically signed up to the Compact.

Further information

London Borough of Hounslow
Community Partnerships Unit
E: community.development@hounslow.gov.uk
T: 020 8583 2450

Hounslow Community Network
E: info@hounslownetwork.org.uk
T: 020 8280 2281
APPENDIX

Resolving disputes in a positive way

The Hounslow Compact should support better working relationships between public bodies and local community and other voluntary groups in the borough, based on the belief that these relationships can be conducted with trust, equality, respect and fairness. If these principles are fully upheld, then differences between partners should not become damaging disputes.

However we recognise that there may be times where the actions of partners do not meet the aims and values outlined in this Compact and that each party has the right to raise concerns, to be attended to positively and to receive a timely response. In such cases, open dialogue and addressing issues at the earliest stage can help resolve issues in the most amicable way possible.

The proposed resolution process for the Compact is:

**Step 1: Face-to-face discussion and resolution**
In the first instance affected parties should seek to resolve the issue through direct and open discussion, identify the problem and its impact and how best to resolve it and move forward. Parties may also seek the advice of the Council’s Third Sector Partnership Manager or the Chair of Hounslow Community Network if appropriate.

**Step 2: Help from the Compact Champions**
If Step 1 has not successfully resolved the issue, it should be raised with the Compact Champions within the Hounslow Community Network, Hounslow Clinical Commissioning Group or Hounslow Council’s Community Partnerships Unit. They will work to help address the issue.

**Step 3: Mediation by Compact Review Group**
If required an unresolved issue can be considered by the Compact Review Group, a sub-group of the VCSE Partnership Group, whose membership will be independent of the complaint raised. It will make recommendations to help resolve the issue.

During this process recommendations and learning will be shared with the relevant Compact stakeholders to help improve the delivery of the Compact in the future.

**Step 4: Making a formal complaint**
We would hope that all complaints will be resolved before it requires a more formal process however, should issues not be resolved through discussion and mediation, complaints should be made using an organisations’ normal complaints procedures. If agreement still cannot be reached, the involvement of an independent arbitrator can be sought as follows;

**For complaints against the local authority**
The Local Government Ombudsman
www.lgo.org.uk/contact-us
0300 061 0614

**For complaints involving Hounslow CCG**
NHS Complaints Advocacy
nhscollections@voiceability.org
0300 330 5454

The Health Service Ombudsman
www.ombudsman.org.uk/make-a-complaint
0345 015 4033

The NCVO Compact Advocacy Programme
www.ncvo.org.uk

**Learning from disagreements and disputes**
Disagreements can provide the opportunity to reflect on the underlying and wider issues relating to the disagreement or dispute. These wider issues often need to be addressed in order to prevent the conflict from recurring in a different form. To ensure learning is shared, compact partners who have worked on a conflict together will ensure that they feed back the reasons, results and outcomes to the Compact Review Group, which will in turn undertake to work on the identified, underlying causes.
Glossary

CCG
Hounslow Clinical Commissioning Group is the clinically-led statutory NHS body responsible for the planning and commissioning of health care services for Hounslow. Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) were created following the Health and Social Care Act in 2012, and replaced Primary Care Trusts on 1 April 2013. There are now 209 CCGs in England.

Commissioning
The process of consulting, planning, procurement (buying), delivery and review of contracted services. Commissioning is increasingly a central part of the approach being taken in Hounslow to redesigning services because it often provides an opportunity to improve outcomes in the most efficient and effective way. The VCSE sector is largely concerned with commissioned public services such as health and social care.

Compact Champion
An individual within a partner organisation who takes on the responsibility for promoting the values and aims of the Compact to colleagues and fellow members of the organisation.

Consortium
An association of two or more entities participating in a common activity or the pooling of resources. The forming of consortia by small VCSE organisations may be a route to compete and tender for commissioned services. In the context of the Hounslow Compact such entities will be VCSE organisations, but may also include private sector organisations and those from the statutory sector.

Consultation
A formal process for taking into consideration the views of others in the decision making process.

Co-production
A way of working whereby decision-makers and citizens, or service providers and users, work together to deliver a service which works for them all. The approach is value-driven and built on the principle that those who are affected by a service are the ones best placed to help design and deliver it.

Demographics
The study of a population based on factors such as age, race, sex, economic status, level of education, income level and employment, among others. Demographics are used by governments, corporations and non-government organisations to learn more about a population’s characteristics for many purposes including policy development and service delivery.

Engagement
The process of involving people in the decisions that affect them. Consultation, involvement, information provision and partnership working are all examples of contributors to engagement. It can mean involving communities in the planning, development and management of services or it may be about tackling the problems of a neighbourhood such as crime and identifying the need for improved local services.

External funding
In the context of the Hounslow Compact, this refers to funding sources that do not come from statutory bodies such as Hounslow Council or the CCG. This could include Big Lottery Fund, BBC Children in Need, Comic Relief etc.

Grant
Funding awarded to an organisation to undertake a specific project or service, in accordance with specific criteria.

Stakeholder
An individual or group with an interest in the activities of an organisation. For example, the external stakeholders of a VCSE organisation could be Hounslow Council, other partner organisations and their service users. Internal stakeholders could be the employed staff, volunteers and their management committee or trustees.
We would like to thank the following groups and organisations for their valuable contribution and hard work in helping to develop the Hounslow Compact.

- Hounslow Community Network
- VCSE Compact Working Group
- Volunteering Hounslow
- Hounslow Clinical Commissioning Group
- West London Mental Health Trust
- Hounslow Voluntary Sector Support Service
- Hounslow VCSE Partnership
- Hounslow Council Community Engagement Network
- Hounslow Council Policy Network
- Hounslow Together
1. Details of Recommendations

The Cabinet is recommended to note:

- that Lampton 360 have addressed RSM’s concerns; and,
- that L360 have now established R360 as a subsidiary.
- Cabinet’s previous decision to award of the collection of Recycling and Waste service to Recycle 360 – once it has been established.

If the recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit, link to Values</th>
<th>Dates by which they can expect to notice a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All detailed as the December 2015 report (REG372)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Report Summary

This report shows the responses made by Recycle 360 in respect of the recommendations road map prepared by RSM.

As a result of this, Cabinet’s previous decision - to award of the recycling and waste collection service contract to Recycle 360 once established – will be actioned
3. Reason for Decision and Options Considered

3.1 Background

3.1.1 In December 2015 Cabinet, having agreed to continue with a kerb-side sort system for recycling and to the creation of a new waste depot site on land adjacent to Western International Market, agreed to invite Lampton 360 to prepare a Business Plan for the delivery of the recycling and waste service from 31 October 2016.

3.1.2 In April 2016, cabinet received a progress report with the following draft documents attached:
1. Waste and recycling service specification
2. Key Performance indicators (KPI’s)
3. Waste and recycling service level agreement
4. Waste and Recycling Contract Monitoring
5. Monitoring – Default Procedures
6. Arrangements for collections over Christmas

3.1.3 In June 2016, Cabinet received a report that agreed to award the recycling and waste contract to Recycle 360, a subsidiary of Lampton 360.

3.1.4 Cabinet also received a report on the Gateway Review (undertaken by RSM) which recommended a number of revisions to the Lampton 360’s Business Plan before Recycle 360 was established.

3.2 Options

3.2.1 Appendix A shows Recycle 360’s response to RSM’s recommendations.

3.2.2 Appendix B shows Recycle 360’s revised Business Plan

3.2.2 The council has already taken the decision to award the recycling and waste service to Lampton 360 once Recycle 360 has been satisfactorily established.

4. Key Implications

4.1 Recycle 360 have provided a satisfactory response to the concerns raised by RSM

5. Financial Details

a) Financial Impact On The Budget (Mandatory)
Detailed financial figures will be reported to October Cabinet

b) Comments of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services
The Council’s Director of Finance & Corporate Services (s151 Officer) who commissioned the RSM review is comfortable that satisfactory progress has been made against the material findings. The identified risks will form the basis of Internal Audit review as Recycle360 evolves.
Further work is being undertaken to establish the contract cost, this is currently expected to be at a level which can be managed within the budget available for the service. There is a risk that delays to the delivery of the planned depot or other disruption to the plans could lead to additional pressure on this budget. Every effort needs to be made to avoid these risks escalating the contract cost and jeopardising delivery of savings previously approved.

6 Comments of the Head of Governance

The Head of Governance has noted the report

7. Value for Money
   All as detailed in the December 2015 report (REG372)

8. Sustainability Impact Appraisal
   All as detailed in the December 2015 report (REG372)

9. Risk Management
   All as detailed in the December 2015 report (REG372)

10. Links to Council Priorities
    A clean green borough

11. Equalities, Human Rights and Community Cohesion
    All as detailed in December 2015 report (REG372)

12. Staffing/Workforce and Accommodation implications:
    All as detailed in December 2015 report (REG372)

13. Property and Assets
    All as detailed in December 2015 report (REG372)

14. Any Other Implications
    Not applicable

15. Consultation
    Not applicable
16. **Timetable for Implementation**

The new service will operate from 31 October 2016

17. **Appendices**

Appendix A – Recycle 360’s response to RSM.
Appendix B – Revised Recycle 360 Business Plan

18. **Background Information**

Cabinet report. – 22 September 2015: -
REG 307: Waste and Recycling Service: proposed Future Arrangements

Cabinet report. – 15 December 2015: -
REG372 - Waste and Recycling: Decision on recycling collection method and in-house/LAC for delivery of service

Cabinet report – 26 April 2016
REG 381 – Proposed Delivery of waste and recycling service by Lampton 360.

Cabinet report – 28 June 2016
REG 408 - Future Delivery of Waste and Recycling Service
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSM Recommendation</th>
<th>Recycle 360 Response</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amend the tables and appendices of the Business Plan to ensure that all figures are correct and all cost elements are included.</td>
<td>An error has been found where the number of staff should have been shown to have reduced to reflect the change in service to a fortnightly collection of residual household waste for the period 1 Feb 2017 to 30 October 2017. The tables will be adjusted to take this into account and inserted into the final version of the Business Plan. As stated throughout the Business Plan, Recycle 360 is working with LBH staff to develop a shared services agreement in the form of Service Level Agreements for a range of support services. A project team meets weekly to ensure that the SLA’s are being developed to match our requirements. The aim is to have completed this work by 1 September 2016, so that Recycle 360 will have a clear understanding of all of the costs of these services. The major items of cost, namely labour and vehicles/plant, are as accurate as they can be as the pricing for vehicles is contained within the suite of SLA’s above. All of the alternative scenarios for delivering the service in the absence of a new depot facility and materials handling facility are being worked on with LB Hounslow officers.</td>
<td>Draft business plan updated but adjustments to the final contract sum for year 1 to be completed. Work is ongoing to finalise the SLA’s with the project team meeting weekly. Initial draft documents are being reviewed in respect of vehicle hire and maintenance via LBH Transport. It has been agreed that the Space Waye HWRC will be modified to accept recyclable materials until the new depot facility is completed. Recycle 360 will operate from the south side of the Southall Lane site using temporary facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSM Recommendation</td>
<td>Recycle 360 Response</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present the supporting detail to explain on-cost and sickness rates</td>
<td>Recycle 360 has applied the industry standard of 10 days/employee to estimate costs for sickness. Full details of sickness records are yet to be released by Sita-Suez as part of the TUPE transfer (they do not have to provide that information until 30 days prior to the effective date of transfer). Given the lack of information from Sita-Suez at this juncture, a contingency sum of 10% of the contract sum as estimated, was believed to be reasonable to enable for any adjustments to be made during the first year of operation. The 20% on cost for staff comprises 14% in respect of employers N.I. contributions and assumes a 6% employer contribution to the pension scheme. It is recognised that there are 15 of the potentially transferring staff currently on the LGPS which was allowed for in part within the contingency sum. Training is shown as a separate line of cost on the Cost of Delivery table on p.33 of the Business Plan and is not included within the 20% on cost calculation.</td>
<td>Nothing further to update until such time as Sita-Suez release sickness data as part of the TUPE transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work is still ongoing to determine the pension scheme provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSM Recommendation</td>
<td>Recycle 360 Response</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Develop and present medium-term cost projections for Recycle 360 (to 2020 to be consistent with the other 360 company’s plans) | Work is underway to develop the cost projections for providing the core service of recycling and waste collections from households. This should be completed by the end of July in terms of the larger elements of cost with further refinements once the SLA’s are agreed. The intention is to have final costs available by 1 September 2016.  
As far as Commercial waste activities are concerned, Recycle 360 is not planning any forecasting of costs at this stage. The Business Plan has been consistently clear that Recycle 360 will not enter the commercial waste and recycling market until the end of year 2. Once Recycle 360 can see the growth in the commercial business generated by LBWR and LB Hounslow, a better understanding of local market conditions can be developed. | Current financial models have been developed and tested. Awaiting data from LBH in respect of property growth assumptions, volumes of garden and food waste collected. Once this data has been received, the modelling can be completed and final year 1 estimates produced. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSM Recommendation</th>
<th>Recycle 360 Response</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Undertake sensitivity analysis on all cost elements for all activities. The results can be presented either as a range of values or as an aggregate of probable outcomes. Supporting information (sources, approach taken) should also be included in the Business Plan.</td>
<td>This analysis is being modelled currently and will be included in the final version of the Business Plan. It is anticipated that this work will be concluded around the end of July.</td>
<td>As stated in the previous slide, the models have been developed and tested. Once the requested data has been received, the sensitivities of property growth and its impact on waste generation can be factored in to identify any resource/cost implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undertake sensitivity analysis on the projected revenues and market growth for commercial waste activities. As above, the results should be presented within the Business Plan, along with supporting information.</td>
<td>As stated in 3 above, commercial waste operations are not the priority for Recycle 360 at this stage. The most important task ahead is to ensure that the Council’s Household Recycling and Waste collection service is delivered on 31 October whilst tackling the challenges of operating from a temporary site until the new depot facility is completed. It is vitally important that Recycle 360 apply its resource capacity to implement, improve and settle the service before venturing into the commercial waste market place. The approach being taken by Recycle 360 is sensible in allowing the commercial waste business to be developed by LBH and LBWR before identifying the most opportune time to transfer the business to Recycle 360. This is by far and away the safest entry route into the fiercely competitive world of commercial waste.</td>
<td>No further update planned at this stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSM Recommendation</td>
<td>Recycle 360 Response</td>
<td>Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A more detailed market assessment for commercial waste should be undertaken and the outcomes incorporated into the Business Plan. Consideration should also be given to interfaces with neighbouring authorities and the Council’s waste enforcement activities.</td>
<td>The first part of this recommendation was addressed as part of the response to RSM recommendation 3.</td>
<td>Nothing further to update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Council’s waste enforcement activities do not form part of the services that Recycling 360 will be delivering. This will continue to be carried out by LB Hounslow staff at the start of the contract. Recycle 360 will work closely with LB Hounslow staff to assist them in meeting their enforcement needs by supplying timely information where contamination of recyclable material is observed or where side waste is presented and contravenes LB Hounslow policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbouring authorities are using a different service model for the collection of household recycling and waste which does not allow for any real scope to find additional economies by sharing services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

This Business Plan sets out the direction of travel for the Waste and Recycling business of Lampton 360 for the first year of operation and outlines plans for subsequent years once the financial and operational implications are fully concluded.

The plan introduces Lampton 360 and explains how it was established by the London Borough of Hounslow (LBH) in 2012 with the objective of trading local authority functions to make financial surpluses and return them to the Council. Lampton 360 is a company that is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Council and is designed to operate in a way that allows the company to generate business beyond the Council services it supplies by up to 20%. This third party revenue generation opportunity will assist the Council in times of severe financial pressures.

The Vision and Values of the company and how they align closely with those of the Council are explained. Lampton 360 states very clearly that it is an organisation which is 'of the Council' but different, combining commercial expertise with a commitment to public service. It will seek out business opportunities with clients who share our values and where our activities are in line with the policies and values of our sole shareholder the London Borough of Hounslow.

There is a brief illustration of the drivers for change that have led to the creation of Lampton 360 as a vehicle for delivering Council services e.g. reduced Government funding continues, with little appetite for ring fencing services in the way that Health and Defence are protected. These limited financial resources will need to be allocated to areas of highest risk and to essential services such as Recycling and Waste, Housing, Highway Services and Social Care.

The plan describes the areas of business activity that Recycle 360 will be able to provide. Fundamentally, the Core Business activity is that of operating the household recycling and waste collection service. Other business activities are described briefly in this section ranging from the materials handling operation that will sort and prepare materials bound for the re-processing market place to commercial waste and recycling collections that will be introduced when a viable business has been developed between the Council and London Business Waste and Recycling (LBWR).

There is a brief outline of the overarching company structure to reflect the most tax appropriate way of operating as well as ensuring that the individual business units are able to better manage risks and trading functions are independent from each other. Making each business stream responsible for its own income and expenditure, and surplus that it is able to create. It also protects each trading entity from intragroup losses should they occur.

Recycle 360 will, initially, adopt the management and operational structure currently in place within Sita, the contractor, as part of the initial transfer of staff into the business. This is subject to ongoing discussions with Sita.
Section 4.0 sets out an explanation of the household recycling and waste collection service and shows the direction of travel in mobilising and transferring the current service from the current contractor, Sita-Suez, to Recycle 360. Risks are highlighted as well as any mitigating action within a risk register an extract of which is shown at appendix 2. There is also a description of the impact of the delays to the depot and materials handling facility which was highlighted by Recycle 360 in its Risk Plan.

The service will be delivered to align with the following documents that are to be recommended to LBH Cabinet on 26 April 2016:
- LBH Specification for Waste and Recycling Collection Services
- Service Level Agreement
- A suite of key performance indicators

Recycle 360 has closely reviewed the Specification and has prepared a table of itemised responses which explains any requirements for further detail from LBH as well as providing re-assurances as to plans in hand as part of the mobilisation preparation.

The mobilisation of the service is of importance to the Council and the approach taken by Recycle 360 is explained in section 6.0. Essentially, the Task list and mobilisation plans are described and the timeline and key milestones discussed. Also within this section of the plan are details in respect of what day 1 of the new operation will look like as well as explanations about to the new vehicle fleet, new ICT system on board the vehicles and its benefits. Recycle 360 also provides an insight as to how it will approach service quality and how seriously it treats all health and safety matters in respect of every aspect of its operations.

Section 7.0 describes the Materials Handling Facility operation which is a new operation for both Recycle 360 and the Council. Until the final tenders are received in respect of the baling equipment, conveyor feeds and plant and equipment, the costs of providing the operation remain unclear. Once the material flows and baling machine outputs are confirmed, the resource costs will be worked up. It should be noted that there has been a delay to the planned depot handover date of 31 October due to a major issue with the original construction contractor resulting in a termination of the contract. Discussions are well underway for the Council to work alongside a new delivery partner for the construction of the Materials Handling Facility, offices and vehicle workshop area. It is anticipated that the worst case scenario for completion and handover will be in the region of 6-9 months from 31 October 2016.

LBH require Recycle 360 to implement a change of service that will result in some operational savings with the added benefit of an increase in recyclable materials collected. The intention is to implement a fortnightly collection of residual waste during the spring of 2017. These have been factored into the contract value shown in section 11.0.

Section 8.0 describes some areas of Council activity that may be better placed within the operational environment provided by Recycle 360 e.g. stock control and distribution of containers for the recycling and waste services,
education and awareness raising in alignment with Council policies in respect of recycling and waste minimisation and performance management and KPI compilation and reporting.

Section 9.0 describes how the commercial recycling and waste collection business will be developed in order that Recycle 360 can pick up a viable business entity and why there is no immediate rush for Recycle 360 to enter the market-place on day 1.

Section 10.0 provides an insight into the planned efficiency improvements that will result from the introduction of a fortnightly residual waste service. It also describes a means of potentially further reducing costs with a beneficial impact on service delivery to residents.

The financial position in respect of the core service of household recycling and waste collection service is almost there apart from pinning down with greater certainty, the costs of the depot, estimated to be in the region of £950k p.a. for a full maintenance and insurance lease as well as a number of other services being purchased from the Council e.g. Payroll/ICT/Vehicle Hire/Fuel provision all covered by Service Level Agreements (SLA's). The work to identify the full costs which will be recharged to LBH through the contract fees is at an advanced stage and will be concluded during September. There is reference here to RSM who were brought in by the Council to review the Business Plans of all of the Lampton 360 businesses. In respect of Recycle 360 there were some recommendations made in respect of matters financial and these have been addressed and shown at appendix 4.

In conclusion, it is clear that it is essential that Recycle 360 are able to lift the existing household recycling and waste collection service from Sita-Suez and to deliver it from day 1 without major disruption. Running in parallel will be the work around designing the revised collection schedules to fit the requirements of a fortnightly collection of residual waste. This will mean working very closely with LBH to ensure that the communications plan is well designed and explains to residents the rationale behind the change and how it will affect them. Recycle 360 and LBH will benefit by having built confidence in each other to deliver a key statutory service before entering new markets as well as taking on some of the LBH functions that currently reside within the Commissioning and Contract Management area. This approach will decrease the risks to the financial viability of Recycle 360.
1.0 Introduction to Lampton 360

Lampton 360 was established by the London Borough of Hounslow (LBH) in 2012 with the objective of delivering and trading local authority functions to make financial surpluses. It is a company wholly owned by the council, with surpluses made being re-invested in the business as well as returning to the Council in the form of a dividend. There are no other beneficiaries. As a company owned by a local authority, under the ‘Teckal’ regulations it is able to increase its business by 20% with clients outside the council.

Since its establishment the financial pressures on Local Government have continued to grow and there is now a real urgency to find additional revenue streams if LBH is to protect services. A recent survey by the LGIU established that half of Unitary, County Councils and London Boroughs are in the process of establishing such trading vehicles.

Vision and Values that align with our sole shareholder

Vision

‘Lampton 360 exists to return surpluses to the London Borough of Hounslow, driven by a clear ethical and moral stance, maintaining high standards of quality, transparency and respect, where employees are treated well and reward goes beyond remuneration.

We are an organisation which is ‘of the Council’ but different, combining commercial expertise with a commitment to public service

We will seek out business opportunities with clients who share our values and where our activities are in line with the policies and values of our sole shareholder the London Borough of Hounslow.’

Values

Recycle 360 shares its values with those of the Council as follows:

Innovating – learning from experience

We listen to our customers and staff and explore ideas and discuss problems together to improve services and outcomes. We invest in and apply good practice which develops in any one part of the organisation. We are entirely open-minded about how we deliver services as long as our services meet the needs of our residents in ways we can afford. We support our employees in generating new ideas and in taking the risks necessary to use these ideas to improve services. We never give up trying to find ways around barriers to improving services and the quality of residents’ lives, whether these barriers are in the council or in other organisations.

---

1 Teckal Svius Commune di Viano (1999) established the principle of the Teckal exception which allows a public authority to procure direct from an external company in which it has control similar to that which it exerts over its own departments. EU Directive 2014/24 established that such companies can trade 20% of their activities on top of Council work.
Spending wisely – every penny counts

We continually seek to reduce costs. We invest in prevention and early intervention to improve the quality of residents’ lives (and those of our children, young people and older people in particular) and to reduce costs to the council and our partners in the future. We invest in and apply technology to deliver services. We are entrepreneurial – expert at identifying and exploiting opportunities for generating new income.

Many talents – one aim

All our staff consider themselves to be focussed on improving the quality of life of our customer. We strive to find better ways of working which result in improvements for the Authority and its residents. We work with courtesy and respect at all times, and encourage and support our staff to apply their skills, experience and enthusiasm to areas of work beyond their ‘day job’. We expect staff to take responsibility for their continual professional development and will support staff to do this, and we co-ordinate the thinking on the overall development of our business as a place to work and learn.

Listening – responding

We listen to our customer feedback in support of developing our business. We recognise that we will hear a range of responses to questions and issues from the Authority and its residents, and our job is to consider all these but in the end be honest and clear about what we are and are not going to do and why. We listen to our employees through a wide range of channels and are committed to making changes which improve our employees’ ability to do their jobs and their own job satisfaction. We welcome complaints and comments from anyone and respond to these properly and learn directly from them.

We will also:

- Contribute to the delivery of a clean, green borough
- Be an organisation that will work to improve the services delivered to LBH residents and to work in a transparent and efficient way
- Demonstrate our entrepreneurial qualities – expert at identifying and exploiting opportunities to generate new revenue streams
- Support our staff in generating new ideas and in taking risks to find better ways of delivering our services
- Encourage and support our staff to take responsibility for their continued personal and professional development
- Encourage staff across the whole business to treat each other with respect and courtesy at all times and to extend this to all of our customers
- Continuously monitor and review our performance across the business with a view to making our business more efficient and cost effective balanced against the needs of our customers
- Strive to make the Lampton 360 brand one in which all staff can take pride
2.0 The drivers for change

There are a number of fundamental drivers for change which have been considered in plotting a direction for Lampton 360 and its group of companies:

- The international economy is a catalyst for reshaping how we work and live
- Reduced Government funding continues, with little appetite for ring fencing services in the way that Health and Defence are protected
- Some services are unsustainable unless delivered across larger populations or geographies
- Attempts by Local Authorities to collaborate have been patchy
- The Private sector is often viewed with suspicion
- Limited financial resources will need to be allocated to areas of highest risk and to essential services. E.g. Waste, Housing, Highway Services and Social Care
- Without new money, the stark reality is that non-statutory services will need to be significantly reduced or stopped altogether
- Continued downsizing makes it harder for Local Authorities to retain and attract skilled staff.
- Local Authority Terms and Conditions at more junior levels are expensive

3.0 Description of the Recycle 360 business

What are the key objectives for the business?

- To provide high quality recycling and waste collection services for its customers cost effectively and efficiently
- To develop the commercial waste business that is successful in generating revenue growth up to the Teckal limit
- To ensure that the company’s financial targets are achieved
- To fully meet customer needs and to encourage and support its customers in reducing residual waste generation and to maximise recycling opportunities
- To deliver services in a way that will help reduce the carbon impact of the company's business activities
- To provide an efficient and cost effective sorting and processing service to LBH of its recyclables collected and to prepare them for onward sale and transportation to the re-processor markets
- To exploit and take advantage of opportunities that will arise from a new state of the art recycling depot that is capable of 24 hour operation
- To recruit and retain an enthusiastic staff that are committed to delivering services to the highest standards and to provide opportunities for personal and professional development
- To compete successfully for other local authority contracts as they come to market
What services will Recycle 360 be able to provide?

Household recycling and residual waste collections form the core business of Recycle 360 and is intended to commence operations on 31 October 2016. This service will include house to house collections as well as servicing both converted and purpose built flats; provision of bulky waste collections; and servicing of 'bring recycling sites'.

Recycle 360 will provide materials sorting and preparation for transport into the supply chain for the re-use and recycling of resources collected from households. Primarily the focus will be on dealing with recyclables collected from within LBH with an eye on offering the service more broadly to take up any slack in the service. It should be noted that at the time of preparing this plan, it remains unclear as to the costs that Recycle 360 will be required to pick up in respect of the commercial lease. It is understood that the Council will issue a Full Repair and Insurance lease. That being the case, Recycle 360 will have to insure the buildings and to allow for reactive maintenance costs. Discussions in respect of the costs are ongoing and it is anticipated that the position will be clearer as the depot nears completion.

It is intended to offer a Commercial Recycling and Waste collection service to LBH some 12-24 months post 31 October 2016. This service will be designed to capture recyclables as well as remove residual waste from businesses within the LBH administrative area and beyond.

Recycle 360 are also interested in providing some other services that are currently provided through the Council’s Waste and Recycling Commissioning team. These may include the following:

- The maintenance of the collection infrastructure will be provided to ensure that customers have the correct container solutions in accordance with the policies of LBH. This will include stock ordering and control, removal and distribution as well as ongoing maintenance e.g. wheel repairs etc.
- Education and awareness raising campaigns aligned to Council policies in respect of recycling activities and waste minimisation.

Which organisations are the target audience?

London Borough of Hounslow and its residents

Local businesses in and around Hounslow and then extending to the sub-region e.g. ranging from small local corner shop type businesses through to major retailers such as Marks and Spencer.

Other waste collection organisations, particularly other neighbouring local authorities
Geographically, where will services be targeted?

The core business of Recycle 360 will be delivered within the administrative area of the Borough. In the near future this will include some commercial waste activity for business and retail outlets within LB Hounslow. Commercial waste activity will potentially extend into targeted areas where they are easily accessible for our operations and will be able to create additional financial surplus. Areas such as Slough, Windsor, Staines, Egham and Park Royal all provide potential target markets for commercial waste activities.

4.0 Household recycling and waste service

The household recycling and waste collection is the core business of the contractual arrangement with LBH. The service provides a weekly collection of recyclable materials presented in boxes and coloured sacks as well as wheeled containers. The service also provides a weekly collection of residual waste i.e. that which cannot be presently recycled as well as a weekly collection of food waste from 23 or 25 litre caddies. This service is provided to c 98,000 households of which c 72,000 are low rise properties with the remainder being flats above shops, smaller blocks of flats as well as high rise developments.

The service will be delivered to align with the following documents that were approved by the LBH Cabinet on 26 April 2016:

- LBH Specification for Waste and Recycling Collection Services – Appendix 3
- Service Level Agreement
- A suite of key performance indicators

The Council has placed a requirement on Recycle 360 that during the early months of the contract, the residual waste service is delivered fortnightly with the aim of forcing residents to recycle more. The implementation of this efficiency improvement i.e. reduced cost and an increase in recycling performance is described in more detail in section 10.0 of this plan.

In order to ensure that Recycle 360 is in a position to ‘lift and shift’ the existing contract from Sita in readiness for the planned commencement date of 31 October 2016, a mobilisation plan has been prepared and is shown at appendix 1. Supporting this is a Risk Register, a representation of which is shown at appendix 2. Further information about the mobilisation of the service is given in section 5.0 of this plan.

The Risk Register will be reviewed on a week by week basis and adjustments made as required to reflect increasing or decreasing risk and impact. This will enable Recycle 360 to respond proactively to any changes in circumstance. A formal quarterly update will be produced and circulated to members of the Lampton 360 Board for information.
To give the Council a high level of confidence that Recycle 360 will be able to provide this core service, Recycle 360 has noted and planned its responses to the details contained within the LBH Specification for the Waste and Recycling collection service that was approved by to the Council's Cabinet on the 26 April 2016. These responses are tabled below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification Item</th>
<th>Recycle 360 Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>No response required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The services s.2.1</td>
<td>Clear about the range of services to be provided and allowances made for staffing and vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract period and extension s.2.2</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations to contract s.2.3</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service changes s.2.4</td>
<td>Noted – service changes planned for late Jan 2017 in respect of frequency change for the residual waste service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Provisions s.2.5.1</td>
<td>Start times noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zonal working s.2.5.2</td>
<td>Existing Zonal structure to be retained prior to any adjustments to be made in respect of the residual waste service frequency changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same day collections s.2.5.3</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Holidays s.2.5.4</td>
<td>Noted – Review of Bank Holiday collection arrangements to be carried out to suggest, where practical, less service disruption and potential cost reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas/New Year period s.2.5.5</td>
<td>Noted – arrangements to be agreed jointly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic restrictions/Red routes s.2.5.6</td>
<td>Noted – a normal day to day function for a waste contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking s.2.5.7</td>
<td>Noted – a normal day to day issue for waste contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street works s.2.5.8</td>
<td>Noted – normal operational adjustment for a waste contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension of service s.2.5.9</td>
<td>Noted – normal operational adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick up and return of wheeled bins and boxes s.2.5.10</td>
<td>Noted – expected service standards to which operational staff are expected to adhere to – to be incorporated into the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt collections s.2.5.11</td>
<td>Noted – a standard variation to a core collection containment issue and allowed for within operational planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted collections s.2.5.12</td>
<td>Number of assisted collections noted and usual operational tolerances adjusted so that the service can be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted access s.2.5.13</td>
<td>Noted – a smaller RCV has been tendered for by LBH to help the operational delivery to affected properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient collection/Quality Standards s.2.5.14</td>
<td>Noted – expected service standards to which operational staff are expected to adhere to – to be incorporated into the staff training packs and training day prior to contract commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeled bin repairs s.2.5.15</td>
<td>Noted – more detailed information from LBH required to sufficiently plan the operational response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/ICT s.2.5.16</td>
<td>Noted – this is an additional requirement over and above the existing service. LBH are purchasing the equipment, both hardware and software – this is to be incorporated into the operational staff training pack and training day prior to commencement of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of waste s.2.5.17</td>
<td>Noted – collection rounds to be planned to be operationally efficient based around the ‘normal’ disposal facilities – standard operational planning requirement for any waste contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles s.2.5.18</td>
<td>Noted – New vehicles have been tendered for by LBH to deliver the services. The specification is assumed to match that detail which was specified within the tender documents prepared by LBH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depot s.2.5.19</td>
<td>Noted – Plan ‘B’ still unclear if the new depot is not operationally ready for day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance s.2.5.20</td>
<td>Noted – SLA not yet defined nor agreed – LBH to draft and to discuss with Recycle 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and other household waste premises s.2.5.21</td>
<td>Noted – No clear indication from LBH as to how it will pay Recyle 360 for collecting additional properties above the contract base on day 1 through an annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household dry recycling materials service – low rise homes s.2.6</td>
<td>Noted – operational staff to be advised as part of their training packs and at the training day prior to commencement of the contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household dry recycling materials service s.2.7</td>
<td>Noted – operational staff to be advised as part of their training packs and at the training day prior to commencement of the contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food waste – Low rise collection service s.2.8</td>
<td>Noted – this is part of the current collection service and is already scheduled. The additional costs of providing the compostable food waste bags has not yet been calculated as LBH has not, as yet, provided estimated quantities of bags to be distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food waste – High Rise s.2.9</td>
<td>Noted – as above item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual household waste – low rise s.2.10</td>
<td>Noted – this section describes what is already known in the provision of a weekly service then changing to a fortnightly service towards the latter part of January 2016 – Costs estimated by Recyle 360 reflect this service change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual household waste – High rise s.2.11</td>
<td>Noted – It has been assumed by Recyle 360 that this service will continue to be provided on a weekly or more frequent basis as instructed by LBH. More detailed information re: collection frequencies and number of bins to be collected is awaited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats above shops s.2.12</td>
<td>Noted – quantities to be provided in order to ensure that the service is correctly provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bring Bank Service s.2.13</td>
<td>Noted – LBH to provide a list of sites and the material volumes before a final schedule for collection can be provided and a detailed cost of providing the service is calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or replacement containers and delivery s.2.14</td>
<td>Noted – LBH to provide quantities in order for prices to be worked up. Recycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bulky household waste collection service (Tidy Town) s.2.15</td>
<td>360 expect this service to be charged for outside of the core service of household collections. Noted – LBH to provide quantities in order for prices to be worked up. Recycle 360 expect this service to be charged for outside of the core service of household collections. Financial provision has been made to provide sufficient resource to meet current demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Household Garden Waste Collection Service s.2.16</td>
<td>Noted – LBH to provide number and addresses so that this service can be charged for separately due to its changing demands. Financial provision has been made to provide up to 2 garden waste collection rounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Commercial Waste collection service s.2.17</td>
<td>Noted – Section 6.0 of the Recycle 360 Business Plan refers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of Materials Handling Facility s.2.18</td>
<td>Noted – no pricing has been carried out as yet for this service. LBH and Recycle 360 are awaiting the outcome of a procurement for a design lay-out and provision of conveyors and baling plant – once determined, we will understand more fully the processing capabilities of the facility and allocate resources accordingly. This is unlikely to be time critical for the commencement of the collection service arrangements given the complexities of developing the site at WIM for the new depot facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operational Requirements – Matters Relating to all services s.3</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Statement s.3.1</td>
<td>Noted – this is a standard requirement for any waste contractor – this work will be undertaken by Recycle 360 over the coming weeks and will incorporate safe working and attention to the quality standards required by LBH in the Specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints s.3.2</td>
<td>Noted – work in progress to understand the current flow of enquiries resulting in work notices issued/service rectifications/lost or damaged containers etc. and to design a clear and simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Supervision s.3.3</td>
<td>Noted – Recycle 360 will transfer all current Sita management and supervisory posts on 31 October and review these once the service is operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control System s.3.4</td>
<td>Noted – Recycle 360 is fully intending to meet the required ISO 9000 series of standards as required by the Specification – prices for this development, design and accreditation have not yet been factored into the Recycle 360 cost base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety s.3.5</td>
<td>Noted – Recycle 360 will be generating Risk Assessments for each aspect of its operation supported by Safe Working Method Statements. These will be reviewed annually and new ones prepared prior to implementing, for example, a new collection vehicle type, and change to service. All operational staff to be provided with PPE suitable for the operational requirements of their roles with supervisory checks being carried out prior to any operative commencing work. Failure of any operative to comply fully with safe working practices and the wearing of all PPE will be subject to disciplinary action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Injury/Damage to Property s.3.6</td>
<td>Noted – this is standard practice for any waste contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training s.3.7</td>
<td>The Specification has no detail about this aspect currently. However, Recycle 360 will be conducting a full training and induction day for all staff on 8 October 2016. Existing training records from staff currently employed by Sita will be examined and copies made to enable the development of individual training plans to be carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeships s.3.8</td>
<td>LBH has placed no requirements on Recycle 360 to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management and Service Improvement s.4</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Service level Agreement that was approved by Cabinet at its meeting of 26 April 2016 provides the basis of contractual relationship into which both the Council and Recycle 360 can reasonably work. Having reviewed the document, it appears a sensible approach to formalising any agreement between both parties.

The final document that was approved by Cabinet on 26 April 2016 was that of a suite of key performance indicators (KPI’s). They are typical of any suite of KPI’s required by most Councils across England although one of the key measures that Recycle 360 would like to enter into further discussions about is that of the measurement used for missed collections of household waste, recyclable materials, food waste collections, garden waste and Commercial waste. It is currently represented in an outdated and negative way i.e. the number missed per 100,000 collections made. Recycle 360 would prefer to emphasise the positive outcomes of its performance by representing the number of successful collections made by service in percentage achieved on each collection cycle. That would help the Councils politicians to focus on the positive performance delivered by its own wholly owned company as opposed to dwelling on what will be in reality, a very small negative representation of the service provided. Recycle 360 will work towards reducing any negative or poor performance to ensure that the residents of the London Borough of Hounslow receive a high quality of service on a consistent basis.

At the time of preparing this Business Plan, work is ongoing between Recycle 360 and Council officers to finalise a number of Service Level Agreements. These SLA’s cover such elements as vehicle maintenance, Human Resources e.g. payroll, absence administration, Occupational Health referrals, financial support and ICT support. Given that this work remains in progress, there is likely to be some minor revision to the overall contract sum. The approach taken by Recycle 360 to arrive at an approximate contract value has been to make the assumption that all of the existing Sita workforce and its existing work schedules/outputs will be transferred into Recycle 360. The contract sum has been calculated based upon the TUPE data received to date with the application of the London Living Wage applied to those staff whose hourly rate falls below that value currently. A commercial hire value has been applied to all of the collection vehicles until such time as a full
Service Level Agreement is drafted between LBH and Recycle 360 therefore the costs attributed to date may vary up or down.

In order to finalise detailed costs, work is ongoing to determine the precise levels of fluctuating work volumes. This will assist Recycle 360 to more accurately estimate the costs of providing such services as Bulky Waste collections and Garden Waste collections.

5.0 Mobilisation of the Service

As referred to in section 4.0 of this document, a mobilisation plan has been prepared and is shown at Appendix 1. This plan has superseded the original plan shown in earlier drafts of this Business Plan and details the key activities in ensuring that Recycle 360 are ready for Day 1. There is a lot of detail within the mobilisation plan covering, amongst other things: staff training/induction; development of training packs after having defined the training needs; uniform distribution; creation of round folders; completion of risk assessments and safe systems of working etc. All of this leads into Day 1.

What will it look like on day 1?

The first day of the service to be delivered by Recycle 360 is being planned to ensure that the only visible changes that customers will see will be new collection vehicles and livery on the road and a workforce in different and new uniforms. It is the intention that the collection days and the services received by customers is largely unchanged so that it is a seamless handover.

Behind the scenes, the new vehicle fleet will have been checked over, staff will have been trained, new back office systems in place and despite the difficulties posed by the delay to the depot works at Southall Lane, the vehicles will start and finish their working day from the site whilst utilising temporary welfare and office facilities. The key administrative and managerial functions will continue to be provided from Bridge Road depot until the new depot is ready to occupy fully.

The supervisory and management staff will be undertaking spot checks on collection crews, supporting them in the use of the new in-cab technology, ensuring that service standards are being met and that safe working practices are being adhered to.

The administrative staff will be handling any service requests from the Council as well as passing any other service related issues direct through to the collection crews linking the back office functions to the in-cab technology.

Providing that there are no vehicle breakdowns, there will be sufficient spare vehicles available to maintain the service, and that all staff turn up for work, then we will be expecting a day of reasonable comfort having achieved the day’s collection targets and looking forward to subsequent days and months.
The service running through to the end of the 2016-17 financial year will see the first Christmas collection provided by Recycle 360. The schedule has been planned by Council officers and was approved by the Council’s Cabinet at its meeting of the 26 April 2016. Recycle 360 will work alongside the Council’s communications team to ensure that the collection arrangements over that period are well publicised to ensure the minimum of disruption to the service.

**New Collection Vehicles**

The Council has purchased a brand new fleet of vehicles to enable Recycle 360 to operate the service. These vehicles will be provided to Recycle 360 via a full commercial hire and maintenance lease that will be detailed and signed off in the form of a Service level Agreement.

The new fleet comprises of collection vehicles that will be able to access the tightest of streets in the Borough equipped with bin lifting equipment to handle wheeled bins ranging from the standard Council issue of 140 litre capacity through to 1100 litre wheeled bins used in communal developments. The new fleet of recycling vehicles are innovative in their design and allow the collection staff to collect increased tonnages of material as well as a broader range of materials than the current fleet used by Sita Suez. Food waste and plastics can be collected on these vehicles and the design is such that each of the material types can be off-loaded in a way that is conducive to the planned materials handling and preparation operation. Again, access to even the tightest streets across the Borough will not be a problem due to the narrow body design. All of the vehicle fleet will carry the branding of both the Council and that of Lampton 360 although the designs are still being worked up at the time of preparing this business plan.

**New ICT**

Each collection vehicle will be fitted with new in-cab technology that will enable real time information about service matters to be relayed into the back office environment. The devices that will be fitted into the collection vehicles use touch screen commands similar to that experienced by users of modern smart phone devices. This results in easier transactions for the driver of the vehicle. The system is to be supplied by Bartec UK who are well recognised in this field of work with many local authority Direct Service providers as well as many of the well know private sector companies as customers.

The benefits of the selected system can be summarised as follows:

- Simplified administration e.g. assisted collections can be stored on the crew task list giving address and location details
- Greater visibility of service operations e.g. vehicle safety checks are recorded
- Increased health and safety compliance e.g. staff have to check in that they are wearing company compliant PPE
• Reduction in missed bin/box collections e.g. difficult or regular properties missed will flag up as the crew enter the road
• Task lists can be revised by the back office team to ensure that a new service request can be met where the collection crew has available capacity
• Assists in increasing participation in recycling by providing information back to the Council about customers that regularly contaminate thereby enabling Council officers and Recycle 360 to target their education campaigns
• Helps to reduce costs by getting even more collections completed first time
• Provides a detailed record by property of any service issues to help target support to that customer
• Provides a record of the collection infrastructure on site by property e.e. identifies if containers are missing/damaged enabling staff to arrange a new delivery/replacement
• The in-cab hardware is touch screen operated and after some training can be readily used by collection staff
• Eliminates paper work that can be lost by the collection staff in a fast paced environment

The ICT equipment has been purchased by the Council following a procurement exercise and will be leased to Recycle 360 within the relevant SLA.

**Service Quality**

Recycle 360 is an organisation that strives to get things right first time to eliminate errors and thereby control costs whilst delivering a high quality service to customers. The Council’s service specification is very clear as to the quality of service that is required. The references to quality of service have been identified by Recycle 360 and will become a key element of the training for all staff both operational and back-office.

Aspects of the service that will require Recycle 360 to adhere to are listed below:

• Returning containers i.e. wheeled bins or boxes to the point of presentation ensuring that footpaths and driveways are not obstructed
• Replacing lids where applicable e.g. recycling boxes
• Clearing of any spilled recyclable product or waste
• Carrying out Assisted collections as per the Council’s instructions i.e. collecting from the agreed collection point and returning the container/containers to the original point of presentation
• Recording and reporting the details of properties where waste is presented in a contaminated condition e.g. garden waste in the black wheeled bin; contamination of recyclable products; presentation of excess waste beyond the wheeled bin provision
• Recording and reporting the details of any property where the containers are not presented or presented at the agreed collection point e.g. the curtilage of the property
• Getting collections right first time to eliminate the need to return to deal with a missed collection
• Staff behaviours when dealing with customers i.e. remaining courteous and capturing the content of any service complaint and reporting back to the office of Recycle 360 to address in the way agreed by the Council
• Staff behaviours when dealing with any customer contact within the back-office environment

Each of the above elements will be captured for the purposes of staff training prior to commencement of the service. New starters will go through exactly the same training process as those who attend the Induction day on 8 October 2016.

Many of the service aspects identified above are measured by the suite of KPI’s that the Council has prepared and it is the intention of Recycle 360 to continually improve its performance over the life of the contractual arrangement.

Health and Safety

Health and Safety in the work place is a matter that Recycle 360 take very seriously given the nature of recycling and waste collection and handling services.

Recycle 360 will be adopting the Council’s Health and Safety Policy which will underpin our approach. Beneath this will be a series of service specific Risk Assessments and Safe Working Practice statements.

Risk Assessments will identify the potential risks to operational staff as well as any third parties e.g. pedestrians and assess the likelihood of each risk factor and the potential seriousness of each of these factors. The identified risks will be weighted and scored and mitigations put in place within the Safe Working Practice statements.

The Risk Assessments and Safe Working Practice statements will cover the following services:

• Residual waste collection – emptying of wheeled bins; collection of sacks;
• Recycling collections – emptying of boxes; collection of food waste; collection of sacks;
• Working around collection vehicles – this will include vehicle familiarisation and safety checks; assisting the driver to reverse safely; use of appropriate visual and sonic warning devices;
• Garden waste collections – emptying of wheeled bins; collection of sacks;
• Bulky waste collections – manual handling i.e. safe lifting including use of sack barrows; tail lift use; securing of loads;
• Fork lift truck operations – understanding load carrying capacity; awareness of working in a busy vehicle and people environment; use of appropriate visual and sonic warning devices;
• Mechanical shovel operations – understanding load carrying capacities; awareness of working in a busy vehicle and people environment; use of appropriate visual and sonic warning devices;
• Baling operations – understanding the conveyor and baling systems; safety checks; emergency stop activation; cleaning of the baling presses and conveyor mechanisms;
• Loading of vehicles with recyclable materials – shovel loading; fork lift loading of bales onto trailers;
• All staff will undertake manual handling training to cover each service operation

The above suite of Risk Assessments and Safe Working Practice statements are still being developed some of which will not be fully prepared until the arrival of the new collection vehicle fleet.

In addition, a recent requirement of the Health and Safety Executive is that Collection Round Risk Assessments are carried out. This piece of work essentially details, turn by turn, road by road, the type of work to be undertaken e.g. double or single sided collection, where to use a member of the collection team to direct the vehicle when reversing and to stop pedestrians from walking behind the vehicle whilst it is manoeuvring, where there are schools, roundabouts and other potential hazards. Wherever possible, reversing the collection vehicle is to be avoided.

Once the full suite of Risk Assessments and Safe Working Practice statements is completed, they will be passed to the Lampton 360 Health and Safety advisor for signing off prior to being submitted to the Council’s specialist commissioning team for their views.

**Induction Day and PPE**

In order to prepare staff for day 1, 2 induction days are being planned for 5 and 12 October 2016 in the afternoon after completion of the Sita-Suez shifts. The induction days are intended to cover the following:

• Introduction to Lampton 360
• Health and Safety instruction – covering manual handling/vehicle familiarisation/safe working practices e.g. single side of the road working, helping the driver to reverse
• Issue of PPE packs
• Observing the service quality requirements of the Council

The purpose of the sessions will be to ensure that all transferring staff will be familiar with who Lampton 360 are and the people within the company. How
the company will be with its people and when they will be paid. The day will focus on health and safety which is of great importance in such an operation and to ensure that all operational staff are familiar with the new fleet of collection vehicles that they will be using.

To ensure that all operational staff are protected as far as is reasonably practicable, on completion of the Health and Safety element of their training, staff will receive a pack of that includes the Safe Working Practice statements as well as receiving their personalised issue of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). Each pack will be sized individually and named ready for day 1 of the new service. This PPE issue will comprise good quality, fit for purpose clothing and protective hand and footwear that fully meets the standards required for recycling and waste collection/handling operations. The quality of this PPE issue is an improvement on the current PPE supplied by Sita-Suez. The procurement of this PPE is underway at the time of writing this Business Plan.

A further critical element of the induction day is that of our expectations of the staff in meeting the quality standards required for the services to be provided. The standards required by the Council are contained within the service specification provided by the Council and will be highlighted to staff in a separate document. An additional aspect of the quality training module will be that of how to behave when confronted by different types of contact with customers whilst out on the road.

**TUPE Transfer**

The staff currently employed by Sita-Suez are being transferred into Lampton 360 under the TUPE regulations. The transfer is being managed by Lampton 360 using, by agreement, the Council’s HR team. There has been a series of meetings held between Lampton 360 and Sita-Suez HR staff to discuss the details around the transfer.

There are a number of issues currently being addressed and these are being maintained on an Issues Log. One of the key changes to transferring staff will be the introduction of the London Living Wage which will see a significant salary uplift for many of the staff. Another will be that Lampton 360 will be providing a pension scheme that will be comparable to the Local Government Pension Scheme with an employer contribution of 6%. Potential pension service providers are being sought by the Council’s HR team.

To formalise the transfer, what is known as a ‘Measures Letter’ was sent to Sita-Suez on 16 August 2016 which detailed any changes to existing terms and conditions of employment that will take effect from day 1 or further down the line post consultation with workforce representatives and trade unions. The key change is that of the introduction of the London Living Wage from day 1. There are 2 planned welcome meetings to be held at 0600 hours on 22 and 24 August where transferring staff will be welcomed into Lampton 360, an
update as to where Recycle 360 are in relation to operational readiness and to take any questions arising.

Suffice to say, the process of transferring a whole workforce of some 160 people is not always straightforward but, as the process was started early in the current year, we are currently well placed to execute the transfer by the deadline of 29 October 2016.

6.0 Resourcing the business

Wragge and Co and PWC have advised a group structure for Lampton 360, which is the most tax efficient structure in order to deliver services with Recycle 360, Property Maintenance FM 360 and Property 360 each being established as separate companies under Lampton 360 as the holding company. There will also be a need for Development 360 to be established with a separate LLP (Limited Liability Partnership). This allows risks to be better managed and trading functions to be independent from each other. Making each business stream responsible for its own income and expenditure, and surplus that it is able to create. It also protects each trading entity from intragroup losses should they occur.

Recycle 360 will, initially, adopt the management and operational structure currently in place within Sita, the contractor, as part of the initial transfer of staff into the business in readiness for the 31 October 2016 start date. The whole transfer is still subject to ongoing discussions with meetings having been held with Sita to date as well as finalising the details of the transfer.

A constant review of the effectiveness of the staff structure will be undertaken by the Recycle 360 Managing Director supported by the Contract Manager who will be transferred into Recycle 360. Currently, Recycle 360 is making the assumption that the Sita Suez know their business and that the existing staffing structure operates as it needs to in order to maintain the existing service prior to making any changes.

The structure that will be in place from day 1 is shown below:
There are likely to be some adjustments made to the functions undertaken by Recycle 360 which are dependent upon the outcome of an internal re-structuring within LBH Commissioning and Contract Management teams. Such functions that may transfer are illustrated below and highlighted in black:
The costs associated with moving those activities into Recycle 360 are assumed to be the same on the date of transfer as they are currently to comply with the TUPE transfer regulations. Further work will need to be undertaken to define precisely which activities and staff will transfer into Recycle 360 once the new LBH structure has been settled and is operational. Once within the Recycle 360 environment, processes will be reviewed to explore more efficient ways of managing these activities thereby reducing costs across the business.

7.0 Materials Handling Facility Operation

LBH has asked that Recycle 360 give consideration to running the materials handling facility operation. The aim of this operation is to receive both mixed and source separated recyclable materials and to prepare it for onward transport into the recycling resources market. This will mean baling some of the products namely card, steel cans, aluminium cans and mixed plastics. Additionally, food waste will be deposited into containers for onward transport to Transport Avenue where it will be bulked before being shipped off to an anaerobic digestion facility.

At the time of preparing this plan, the internal design and handling capacities of baling equipment are incomplete. It is the intention to build business and operational resilience into the operation by having 2 balers supplied via an output based procurement which is being managed by LBH. Once the appropriate design, workflow of products and baling times are fully understood, Recycle 360 will be in a position to determine its operational staffing requirement as well as the associated costs of operating plant for shovelling loose materials into vehicles for onward transportation e.g. newspapers, fork lift trucks to empty food waste pods on the collection vehicles as well as to load completed bales onto waiting trailers ready for onward transportation to the re-processors.

The proposal is for Recycle 360 to operate on an ‘at cost’ basis for the first 12 months to establish clearly the operational practices and resource requirement to provide this service efficiently. This will also provide opportunity to understand how much more recyclable materials will be delivered through the collection process once the fortnightly collection of residual waste has embedded with the resultant migration of additional recyclable materials being squeezed out of the residual waste stream.

There may be further commercial opportunities that Recycle 360 can exploit such as the enablement of spare capacity to be opened up to the market place by attracting other sources of segregated recyclable materials to use the site for a fee per tonne of material. Until the core operation has been running for say 6 months, material flows will be better understood and will reveal when and where spare operational capacity exists.
Since this Business Plan was first discussed by the Board of Lampton 360 at its meeting of the 26 April 2016, there has been a set back to the plans to have a fully operational Materials Handling Facility in place at the new depot site in Southall Lane. Due to a major issue with the original construction contractor resulting in a termination of the contract, discussions are well underway for the Council to work alongside a new delivery partner for the construction of the Materials Handling Facility, offices and vehicle workshop area. It is anticipated that the worst case scenario for completion and handover will be in the region of 6-9 months from 31 October 2016.

This delay has resulted in the collection vehicles having to be diverted to Space Waye for the reception of recyclable materials until the new depot is completed and handed over to Recycle 360.

8.0 The potential movement of LBH functions into Recycle 360

Recycle 360 has identified that there are some functions that are undertaken by LBH through its Commissioning and Contracts management team which could be transferred into the Recycle 360 business. These are as follows:

- Stock management/ordering and delivery
- Education and awareness raising
- Performance management and KPI reporting

Stock Management

LBH currently are responsible for the capital purchase of stocks for new projects e.g. the wheeled bin roll out for garden waste. They are also responsible for the revenue purchases of spare and replacement stocks of recycling boxes, sacks, wheeled bins, food waste caddies and bio-degradable liners.

In order to ensure that residents receive their replacement containers within a reasonable time of having reported a damaged or lost container, Recycle 360 believe that efficiencies can be obtained by managing this function within the operational environment. The revenue costs associated with this service could be lifted from LBH into Recycle 360 and then potential efficiency opportunities explored. More work needs to be undertaken to understand the current LBH obligations with delivery companies and the basis upon which they have made their assumptions around container replacement volumes along with a review of existing Council policies in this area of activity.

Education and Awareness Raising

LBH currently provide some educational support via communications campaigns but have not recently been able to allocate time to support schools and other focus groups educational support needs. However, within the LBH business case to support the major planned service changes, budgetary provision of up to a maximum of £4 per household per annum has been allocated for this purpose. This would result in a revenue expenditure of...
c£392k per annum for LBH moving forward. Further investigation and thought should be given as to how and when Recycle 360 might be better placed to deliver educational and awareness raising across the borough.

Performance Management and KPI reporting

In the longer term, Recycle 360 intends to seek accreditation for its systems and processes to meet ISO 9002 standards. To this end, it would be sensible to examine what performance measurement is currently undertaken by LBH in order to report KPI’s and other performance data to the Council. By bringing part of this activity into Recycle 360, it is possible to avoid duplication of effort by Recycle 360 ensuring that it has a robust performance management system in place coupled with transparent and accurate KPI reporting disciplines. This would effectively result in a self-monitoring contractual arrangement that is externally audited and will meet the Council’s service reporting requirements.

Next Steps

Given that this service area of the Council is currently in the throes of a re-structuring exercise, it is advisable to allow the new structure to settle down prior to exercising any further change immediately prior to the commencement of the core contractual operation for household recycling and waste collections. This will have the added benefit of enabling Recycle 360 to focus on getting its core service delivery offer operating efficiently and effectively without incurring additional pressures thereby protecting the integrity of LBH’s reputation for good service delivery.

9.0 Commercial waste service

LBH do not currently have any commercial waste collection contracts as this had been fully out-sourced in the past. With the exception of schools, a new business portfolio will have to be created. The intention is for this is to be done by London Business Waste and Recycling (LBWR) on behalf of LBH through a formal arrangement which is yet to be signed off. This business relationship was approved by the Council’s Cabinet at its 15 December 2015 meeting. The initial estimates from LBWR suggest that c.360 new customers will be generated in the first 12 months of operation (see table 2 below). This poses too great a financial risk to a new entrant into the market place as there are several key factors that affect the financial viability of the business. Those factors are:

- Residual waste disposal charges of c£115 per tonne
- Mixed recyclable waste treatment/handling fees of c£20-30 per tonne
- Little or no established customer base with a clear understanding as to what materials are be collected by volume and weight
- High start-up costs for vehicles and manpower
- Customers that are expensive to service e.g. where they require a daily collection of waste presented in pre-paid sacks. This type of customer if there are a large number, can create significant collection round imbalances where the collection vehicle has to cover larger distances to collect waste when the schedules are based principally on a geographically based service leading to inefficiencies and therefore increased cost.

Some initial financial modelling work was undertaken by Recycle 360 that revealed a high risk of operating at significant financial loss. It is therefore the intention that Recycle 360 do not enter the commercial waste market until LBH and LBWR have developed a viable business.

Once the relationship between LBH and LBWR is established, the collection service will, initially, be undertaken by a third party for a period of 12 months or more. The third party is already an active competitor within the commercial waste and recycling collection market. A review will be undertaken into growth forecasts and actual customers and revenues generated at 9-10 months to identify whether or not it is a viable proposition for Recycle 360 to enter the market at the end of year 1 or later. As these contracts will be owned by LBH, they may reserve the right to award the work to its own wholly owned company, in this case, Recycle 360. This process of building a stable and viable business portfolio may take up to 2 years before Recycle 360 is able to take its first steps into the Commercial waste and recycling collection service.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIs</th>
<th>YR 1</th>
<th>YR 2</th>
<th>YR 3</th>
<th>YR 4</th>
<th>YR 5</th>
<th>YR 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Allocated to SPV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Customer Contracts</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Revenue per Contract</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Growth</td>
<td>87,750</td>
<td>633,750</td>
<td>748,500</td>
<td>720,000</td>
<td>720,000</td>
<td>720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Growth/sales person</td>
<td>20,250</td>
<td>211,250</td>
<td>249,500</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>87,750</td>
<td>721,500</td>
<td>1,470,000</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
<td>2,910,000</td>
<td>3,630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-tax profits</td>
<td>(53,886)</td>
<td>(27,825)</td>
<td>105,782</td>
<td>266,183</td>
<td>427,334</td>
<td>588,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparing for entry into the Commercial Waste and Recycling market - Market analysis: size, trends, growth, and appetite

Based on the available data from sources such as DEFRA, ONS and market knowledge, it is estimated that London business spends in excess of £500m per annum on waste and recycling collection, treatment and disposal. When this market is analysed and divided across the London Boroughs, it is estimated for example that Westminster City Council’s market is worth in the region of £35-£40m p.a. When considering the potential value of the market place in LB Hounslow, reasonable estimates suggest it could be in the region of £10m p.a.
Competition across the capital is rife with major players such as Biffa, Veolia and Suez (SITA) holding many contracts ranging from their preferred target markets of larger multi-site clients through to smaller SME’s which are usually sub-contracted to smaller commercial waste collection companies.

The local authority provided commercial waste collection services across the capital varies with 25 of the London Boroughs providing such services. Westminster City Council achieves the largest turnover of c. £14m p.a. whilst others such as LB Camden, LB Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea achieve turnover of c. £5-7m p.a. It is not beyond the realms of possibility for Recycle 360 to achieve a turnover value of c. £1.5m p.a. However, this depends very much on the types of customer that are passed to us by LBH as generally, they will be smaller “High Street” type customers that are expensive to service and as a consequence, realise lower levels of profit.

For Recycle 360 to generate more substantial profits, it will need to compete for the larger multi-site clients both within LBH and beyond.

The Competition

**Competing based on sound ethical and public sector values**

In the first 18 months Lampton 360 will provide the majority of its services directly back to the Council, but as a Teckal company, it will have the ability to trade services to a maximum 20% of its activities outside the Council.

Over the next 12-18 months, alongside the market analysis, competitor analysis will also be undertaken, making comparisons with companies and organisations supplying similar services or alternative services to our selected markets and target clients. It will include:

- Those offering the same services to the same clients in West London and M4 corridor
- How they compare in size, financially and head count
- Whether they are growing, steady state or shrinking
- The strength of their brand and reputation
- The opportunities and risks that competitors present to Recycle 360
- How we can take advantage of the opportunities and mitigate the risks

Fundamentally, alongside excellent service and value for money, Recycle 360 will offer an alternative service based on sound ethics and a care for employees, with commercial realities grounded in public service ethos, knowledge and experience.

At an appropriate point in time, the Company will then seek to develop new business, moving into growth.
10.0 Implementing Efficiency Improvements

Once the core service has been transferred into Recycle 360 the first major task is to implement a fortnightly collection service for the residual waste as determined by the Council at its Cabinet meeting on 15 December 2015. The aims of this service change are to increase recycling performance by simplifying the recycling collection service by providing a box to replace sacks for plastics and to reduce the overall cost of the recycling and waste collection service.

The first stage of this work will be to re-schedule the collection rounds with the minimum of disruption to collection days for residents. This will be done by making use of route optimisation software which is being purchased by LBH for Recycle 360 use. This work is estimated to take up to 2 months to complete given the sheer volume of adjustments such software will require as well as input from collection staff to refine the collection rounds.

In designing the collection rounds there will very likely be some variations to collection days across the services offered to residents due to the complexities of balancing all collection rounds i.e. recycling collections and garden waste services. These will be kept to a minimum but there is a risk that some services will be on different days.

This initial efficiency change will result in a cost reduction in the region of £700k p.a. However, this saving will not be achieved in full during year 1 as much will depend upon how well the recycling collection rounds are balanced. This is because there is no real understanding at this stage as to how much recyclable material by weight will migrate from residual waste into the recycling stream as a result of imposing a fortnightly residual waste collection service on residents. Additionally, the costs of any redundancies have not been factored in as we do not know which staff will be directly affected at this stage.

The above work will be carried out with the involvement of several key service areas of LBH namely, LBH Waste Client, Customer Services and Communications. In order to create the best chance of a successful implementation of service change, a well-planned and managed communications strategy is essential. This is particularly the case where there are likely to be changes to collection days.

If, as anticipated, the new depot is not fully operational until the end of January 2016, there may be a delay in implementing the above planned service improvements and efficiency measures. Recycle 360 is working alongside Council officers to develop an implementation plan for the service improvements as well as building in any contingencies that may be necessary. However, remaining optimistic, the intention is to roll out the new recycling boxes on a phased basis. The boxes are intended to eliminate the need for plastic sacks for the containment of plastics recyclables and to make the service easier for customers to use. The plan is for the full phasing in of
this change to last 6 weeks before making the change to the fortnightly collection of residual waste from wheeled bins. This would leave a fortnight until the Easter Holidays to allow the service to start to embed before the disruption caused by the Good Friday and Easter Monday holidays. Should the planned start date of 30 January 2017 not be achievable due to the depot not being finished then the programme will be deferred until after Easter to ensure that the service changes can be delivered as smoothly as possible with the minimum of disruption.

A further initiative that will see a reduction in operational cost is that of potentially moving to a 4 day working week for the household recycling and waste collection service. The aim will be to simplify Bank Holiday collection arrangements for the residents of LB Hounslow as well as to make some savings in enhanced payments for catching up the work as a consequence of working over a weekend to get collections back on track. This work will need careful examination prior to making a case to the Council as it will have an impact on collection days for a sizeable number of households across the borough. It is not anticipated that this service change will be explored fully during the first 12 months of operation in order to allow the earlier efficiency changes to settle down.

11.0 Financial Position

The first year contract price is currently £8.23m which comprises operational and direct overheads in the sum of £6.86m plus indirect overheads, contingency and margin in the sum of £1.37m. This is based on a detailed costing model using best estimates of material volumes, household numbers, resource requirements and workforce productivity. Key points to note:

- Material volumes are based on Waste Data Flow submissions but there are a number of queries to be resolved. In particular, there is uncertainty over garden waste material volumes as the service became chargeable in April 2016.
- Household numbers are assumed to be 100,000 based on the service specification produced by the Council. However, there is uncertainty about the number of assisted collections, number of containers by type/number of container locations/frequency of collections from high rise flats as well as the number of flats above shops and the method/frequency of collection required.
- The model assumes that the new collection vehicles will be delivered before the start date of the contract. LBH has been advised that some of these will be delayed and that suitable replacements will need to be brought in until the remainder of the fleet are delivered. This may have an impact on the charges levied to Recycle 360 if hire fees are more expensive than the assumed weekly vehicle hire with maintenance rate of £1000 per week per vehicle.
- There remains uncertainty over the date on which the new depot will be available and the start date of alternate weekly collection (AWC) for low
rise residual waste. The model assumes an opening and start date of 1 April 2017. If this is delayed further, approximately £82k of additional operating costs per month will be incurred. These costs comprise the continued resourcing of a weekly residual waste collection service from low-rise households.

- Workforce productivity assumptions are based on information provided by Sita and industry norms. However, there remains some uncertainty and further work is required to finalise them.
- Indirect overheads comprise a margin of 10% of operational costs and direct overheads and a contingency of 10%. The contingency is intended to cover Group recharges of Council Service Level Agreement costs and any other indirect overheads incurred by the company. These costs have not yet been calculated. The contingency is also intended to reduce the impact of the uncertainty of some costing assumptions and, in particular, the need to hire vehicles if the parts of the new fleet are not delivered by the contract start date.

Table 3 below provides the costs of the core services and also Year 2 costs for reference. The Year 2 costs assume that the depot and AWC service are in place for the whole year. The recycling rate is assumed to increase from 33% to 34%. The indirect overheads are calculated as a 10% margin and 5% contingency.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECYCLE 360</th>
<th>Column1</th>
<th>Column2</th>
<th>Column3</th>
<th>Column4</th>
<th>Column5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASTE AND RECYCLING CONTRACT PRICE CALCULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST YEAR COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 2016 to March 2017</td>
<td>April 2017 to October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Residual</td>
<td>£908,799</td>
<td>£1,017,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Recycling</td>
<td>£1,411,532</td>
<td>£1,663,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>£42,377</td>
<td>£65,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Overheads</td>
<td>£375,278</td>
<td>£1,373,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the costs of various Service Level Agreements (SLA’s) still to be agreed, the above numbers will be subject to revision. The contingency assumption should cover the costs and potentially be able to be reduced. It is anticipated that the full range of SLA’s will be fully costed during September this year. Given that the service being provided by Recycle 360 will, once the depot, Materials Handling Facility and changes to the collection service will be very different to that which the current contractor provides, Council officers are of the view that Recycle 360 should charge the Council on an ‘at cost’ basis for the first year of operation. This approach will allow for transparency of all costs in providing the services and enable the Council to prepare a more accurate budget for the provision of the new services and meets with the Council’s budget timetable for the financial year 2018-19.

It is proposed that the monthly contract sum be paid in advance as Recycle 360 has no working capital of its own. Reconciliation of the account can take place at the end of year 1 when Council officers are reviewing the full costs of the service and setting the new budget for 2018-19.

During the spring/summer, the Council appointed a company, RSM, to assess the Recycle 360 Business Plan with a view to ensuring that the approach being taken was sufficiently robust to deliver the services required by the Council. Overall, their view was that Recycle 360 could provide the services but there were 6 recommendations that they made that Recycle 360 would need to respond to. They were all based around matters financial and the issues and responses are shown at appendix 4. The key area was around the modelling of sensitivity analysis on the costs of providing the service. Recycle 360 has developed a model that is fully capable of providing such analysis but is unable to do so until further information is provided by LBH colleagues as described earlier in this section.

Other recommendations around commercial waste were made by RSM but they appear to have failed to recognise that this Business Plan does not recommend that Recycle 360 enter the world of commercial collections until year 2 once a viable business has been developed by LBH and LBWR as explained in section 10.0 of this Business Plan. This represents a sound business approach in that Recycle 360 can focus on working with the Council to ensure that the statutory service, including the planned revisions to that service, and the new Materials Handling Facility can be brought on-line without other commercial distractions.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the larger areas of expenditure are as close as we are likely to be at this time and are unlikely to vary very much.
The vehicle rental figures may be revised either way dependent upon the final SLA. Staff costs may increase once the matter of redundancies is agreed and the appropriate policy put in place. Other smaller SLA’s still need to be agreed and a firm cost attached so that the final sum can be more certain. Council officers are of the view that the first year of operation should be charged back to the Council on an ‘at cost’ basis to enable a better understanding of the financial costs of the operation to then enable more accurate budget profiling. That approach would appear sensible given that, at this stage, there is still no absolute clarity around all of the costs.

12.0 Risks

Recycle 360 consistent with the other Lampton 360 businesses, is using a risk register to manage potential and actual risks to the getting to day 1. The risk register is shown at appendix 2 and uses a scoring matrix based on probability and impact ranging from 1-5 with 1 being low to 5 being high. The risk register highlights the risks across 5 areas, namely: Finance/External/Operational/Strategic/Governance.

The vast majority of risks are under the control of Recycle 360 but it should be noted that there is a significant risk that Recycle 360 may not achieve its KPI targets through no fault of its own. This is because LBH are yet to plan a clear communications strategy, develop and sign off a suite of clearly defined recycling and waste policies, a sound means of educational support to residents – especially where those residents are either transient and/or do not have English as their first language to ensure that residents do their bit to help Recycle 360 when it collects their recyclable and waste materials. Failure of LBH to deliver on those areas will have a neutral or detrimental impact on the recycling performance of Recycle 360 no matter how well the collection service is provided. Similarly, LBH remain unable to provide clear information about the services to be offered to flats above shops and how they want the service to be provided. This similarly applies to high-rise blocks where the number and type of bins, how many bin locations per site, the frequency of collection by site and the materials to be collected by site, is not fully known. In the absence of clear and accurate information, service failures may occur in the form of missed collection reports which will impact directly on some of the KPI’s. (O10 in the Risk Register).

It should be noted that there is a delay to the delivery of some of the new vehicles which LBH is addressing. Dependent upon the quality of any replacement vehicles in the interim, there may be delays to service delivery or other failures if, for example, vehicles break down frequently. (O11 in the Risk Register).

The re-development of Space Waye is welcomed but LBH staff will need to exercise a high degree of quality checks to ensure that the collected recyclable materials collected are not contaminated by other users of the facility. Failure to exercise such management control could lead to a reduction in the overall recycling performance through no fault of Recycle 360. Once the new depot is fully functioning, the operational risks will lie with Recycle 360 to
ensure that there is no contamination of material prior to processing and onward sale. (O12 in the Risk Register)

13.0 Looking to the Future

Recycle 360 as a part of the Lampton 360 group of companies has opportunities to grow its business once the core functions of the work for LBH are operating efficiently and cost effectively. A potential route for further examination is that of the creation of Joint Venture Companies with other Local Authorities to supply their recycling and waste collection services. The benefits of doing this are threefold:

- No requirement to undertake an expensive service procurement
- The workforce, irrespective of employer can be transferred across under TUPE regulations
- Shared profits

A well-developed example of this approach is the Norse group of companies which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Norfolk County Council. They have been operating for some 20 plus years and have a number of Joint Venture arrangements with other public service organisations including the Norfolk Waste Partnership.

14.0 Conclusions

The approach outlined in this Business Plan is clear in that it is essential that Recycle 360 are able to lift the existing household recycling and waste collection service from Sita-Suez and to deliver it from day 1 without major disruption. Running in parallel will be the work around designing the revised collection schedules to fit the requirements of a fortnightly collection of residual waste. This will mean working very closely with LBH to ensure that the communications plan is well designed and explains to residents the rationale behind the change and how it will affect them. Recycle 360 and LBH will benefit by having built confidence in each other to deliver a key statutory service before entering new markets. This approach will decrease the risks to the financial viability of Recycle 360.

Once the depot is fully commissioned, Recycle 360 will be operating the Materials Handling Facility dealing with an estimated throughput of some 25,500 tonnes of recyclable materials and preparing them for onward transport into the re-processing market.

With those 2 key services operating effectively it will be appropriate for Recycle 360 to examine more closely those functions currently carried out by LBH that may be better provided for through the service at operational level. Three key areas of activity have been identified in section 8.0 of the plan namely, stock ordering, management and distribution of containers for recyclables and waste, education and awareness raising and performance management and KPI reporting.
There are warnings to heed in respect of the potential risks to the achievement of some KPI’s within the contract. There are clear dependencies upon LBH to undertake some robust work with residents to maximise the chances of success with the delivery of an operationally sound collection service provided by Recycle 360.

Entry into the commercial recycling and waste collection market-place is planned for towards the end of year 2 of the arrangement between LBH and LBWR when the business that is generated is a viable one for Recycle 360. This will allow for business growth over the following 8 years and will provide opportunities to explore where best to locate intended business activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Understanding Operational Implications of the Sector Shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Execute the Operational Implications of the Sector Shift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECYCLE 360 OPERATIONAL MOBILIZATION PLAN V1**
### Recycle 360 Service RAG Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Programme Area</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Purchase of PPE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Procurement exercise completed and sizes currently being collated. Distribution plan in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>New service offer unable to be delivered from day 1 resulting in LBH not achieving their savings targets</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Potential for an increase in costs arising from interim solutions for depot and tipping of recyclable materials at an alternative site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Programme Area</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Migration of recycling material from residual stream greater than anticipated – more staff required to operate vehs and less spare veh capacity in the service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>ICT systems to support operational needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>Hardware/software not installed in vehs by mid November</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4</td>
<td>Risk of service failure ON day 1 if required by client to make TUPE’d workforce use untold mix of new vehicles, new MHF arrangements, new IT with interim depot facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5</td>
<td>Risk of service failure AFTER day 1 if required by client to move to all new vehicles and ICT for all staff at the same time.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6</td>
<td>Staff failure to report to new L360 employer on day 1.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7</td>
<td>Risk to recycling waste collection as Southall lane site not ready.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O9</td>
<td>PPE not available from day 1 based on risk assessment’s findings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O10</td>
<td>Failure to meet KPIs due to ineffective LBH communication/educational support/enforcement strategy and clear waste and recycling policies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O11</td>
<td>Delay to the delivery of some collection vehicles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O12</td>
<td>Failure of LBH to control risk of contamination to delivered materials for recycling by third party users of the re-configured Space Waye site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 Property growth requires additional resource to deliver services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Continuous dialogue with LBH but agreed an annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 Schedule Finalisation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Planned to be completed by 16 Sept 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 Failure to deliver the service to meet the specification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Service designed to reflect the specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5 Lack of clear boundaries between client and provider</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Clarify roles and responsibilities for all key functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6 Reputational risk if customer access process is unclear and inadequate scripts in call centre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Map procedures and design scripts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1 Adoption of LBH policies and procedures in respect of sickness absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 Back office systems eg sickness monitoring/dealing with service requests-complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3 Payroll not set up or trialled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 Staff Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5 Staff induction day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6 H+S Risk Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 Risk assessments not carried out, approved and implemented prior to commencing activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 H+S Safe Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G9 Sign off agreed SLA's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G10 Review Staff Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G11 Fail to identify training needs and train employees in critical activities/equipment in time (includes induction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closed Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Purchase of vehs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Purchase of route optimisation software plus training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1 Depot not ready for full operational use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8 Operation Licences to be in place for temporary site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 Vehicles fail to arrive in time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.4 Service changes
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2.7 Household Dry Recycling Materials Service - High-rise homes
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2.10 Residual Household Waste - Low-rise homes
2.11 Residual Household Waste - High-rise homes
2.12 Flats above shops
2.13 The Bring Bank Service
2.14 New or replacement containers and delivery
2.15 The Bulky Household Waste Collection Service (Tidy Town)
2.16 The Household Garden waste collection service
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3. GENERAL OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS – MATTERS RELATING TO ALL SERVICES
3.1 Method Statement
3.2 Complaints
3.3 Management and Supervision
3.4 Quality control system
3.5 Health and Safety
3.6 Third Party Injury/Damage to Property
3.7 Training
3.8 Apprenticeships

4. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND SERVICE IMPROVEMENT
4.1 Information and Reports

5. EMERGENCY SERVICES

6. PUBLICITY, EDUCATION AND AWARENESS

7. FINANCIAL MATTERS
1. INTRODUCTION

This document defines the services that are to be carried out, the standards that the Contractor is required to attain and the roles and responsibilities of the Council and the Contractor.

This document should be read in conjunction with the Conditions of Contract.

2. THE SERVICES

2.1 Service Areas
The London Borough of Hounslow is a Waste Collection Authority under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Contractor will be responsible for discharging these duties on behalf of the Council.

The Waste and Recycling Collection Service Specification includes the following:-

1) Collection of dry recyclable materials from low-rise and high-rise homes

2) Collection of Household Food Waste from low-rise and high-rise homes

3) Collection of Residual Household Waste from low-rise and high-rise homes

4) Collection of Waste and Recycling from flats above shops

5) Collection of Waste and Recycling from schools, local businesses and charities (chargeable service)

6) Collection of dry recyclables from the Bring Bank Service including On-Street Recycling

7) Collection of Household Garden Waste from low-rise homes (chargeable service)

8) Collection of Bulky Household Waste (chargeable service)

9) Delivery of new and replacement wheeled bins and containers

10) Operation of Materials Handling Facility at Southall Lane Waste Depot

The Council’s aim is to achieve 50% recycling in 2019/20.
2.2 Contract Period and Extension of Contract Period
This Contract will remain in force for ten years from the Commencement Date.

The Council will have the option to extend the Contract Period for a further period or periods of up to ten years by written notice up to the date twelve months prior to the end of the Contract Period. The length of any extension will be determined by the Council, in discussion with the Contractor.

The Contractor must make appropriate hand-over arrangements in the mobilisation period between the award of the Contract and the Commencement Date to make sure that Contract Standards are maintained.

2.3 Variations to the Contract
Variations to the Contract may be required from time to time to take account of experience, and/or changes in circumstance. These variations may include changes in methods and frequency of working; changes in materials collected; changes in the location of facilities, and to vary the Contract to include the addition of other waste management related services within the Contract. It should be noted that variations to the Contract might have the effect of reducing volumes of work, as well as increasing them and will be subject to negotiation at the appropriate time through the Change Control Procedure.

2.4 Service Changes
The Contractor will also be responsible for implementing a significant change in the Council’s Waste and Recycling Service at the start of the contract and for managing the necessary changes during the change period. I.e.: -

Change the frequency of collection for Residual Household Waste from low-rise homes to fortnightly. This change is to be phased in between mid-January and Mid-March 2017

Food waste will continue to be collected weekly.

2.5 General Provisions

2.5.1 Frequency and Times of Collection
The service shall generally be carried out Monday to Friday with no collections commencing before 0700.

The Services must be carried out in accordance with the requirements for the specific services set out in this specification. I.e. stated frequencies, same day collections, zonal working and maintaining existing collection days for residents, except where minor changes are needed to ensure same day collections.
The Contractor, ensuring that all households in the Borough receive a collection service, shall devise detailed collection routes. When collection routes are proposed to be changed the Council Contract Manager must be consulted and give written confirmation of approval.

2.5.2 Zonal Working
The Council wishes to maintain the practice of zonal working for low-rise properties, and the planned schedules must comply with this requirement. However the Contractor may propose changes to the existing boundaries where route optimisation demonstrates that the current boundaries are inefficient. The council expects that the majority of homes would be unaffected by such boundary changes. Such boundary changes must be agreed, in writing three months prior to the change being introduced. The council would not expect such changes to be undertaken at a frequency of less than twelve months.

2.5.3 Same Day Collections
The Contractor will ensure that collections from individual homes of the different waste and recycling fractions occurs on the same day of the week and in compliance with the schedule set out by the Council.

2.5.4 Bank Holidays
In a week containing a Bank Holiday, no collection will be made on the Bank Holiday and the Contractor shall make collections in the same week but one day later than usual. I.e. at Easter, collections will be suspended for Good Friday with the waste picked up on Easter Saturday.

2.5.5 Christmas/New Year period
Collections over this period will be made in accordance with the schedule set out in [Appendix XX]. This will ensure that collection frequencies are maintained. Over this period the garden waste service will be suspended.

2.5.6 Traffic Restrictions/Red Routes
Where the Contractor’s vehicles are unable to stop (e.g. red routes) – See [Appendix XX], alternative collection arrangements must be devised by the Contractor in consultation with the Council’s Contract Manager. This may, for example, involve the operation of handcarts on the footway, supported from the nearest possible stopping point or the use of sacks that residents may leave out at a designated collection point.

The Contractor should take into account the fact that “No Waiting, Loading and Unloading Restrictions” may be in force or may come into force during the Contract Period on a permanent or temporary basis. The Contractor should make full allowance for the effect of such traffic restrictions on the performance of carrying out the service.

For the purpose of clarity the Council will not accept any responsibility for the payment of fines, Fixed Penalty Notices etc. incurred by the Contractor.
2.5.7 Street Parking
The Contractor should note that a substantial number of carriageways and some footways are used by members of the public for the purpose of parking their vehicles, and that the parking is often on a scale that difficulty may be encountered by the Contractor in carrying out the service.

Nevertheless, it is the responsibility of the Contractor to collect material from all locations to the specified standard using the appropriate labour, vehicles, equipment, and timings as are necessary to complete the service in the appropriate timescale.

It is essential that the Contractor bears in mind the difficulties caused by vehicle parking and the measures necessary to overcome them, when submitting its service delivery proposals.

The Contractor shall do nothing that results in the Council being in contravention of its statutory duties and legal responsibilities in respect of highway safety.

2.5.8 Street Works
When any construction or maintenance work is carried out on a part of any street or housing estate the Contractor will still be required to perform and carry out waste and recycling operations. The Contractor should take account of the fact that this may involve collection or delivery from a greater distance than normal from the vehicle being used or require alternative vehicles to be used.

Where works of any kind are being carried out on a highway, and which in the opinion of the Contractor, impede or prevent normal collections, the Contractor may make temporary changes to the collection route order, subject to immediate notification to, and agreement of the Council Contract Manager.

The Contractor should note that the Council will not make additional payments for the collection of any material that has built up during a modification or suspension of normal collection services.

2.5.9 Suspension of Service
Irrespective of weather conditions the Contractor shall always use reasonable endeavours to proceed diligently with the due performance of the Services in accordance with the requirements of the Specification.

The Contractor shall only be permitted to suspend performance of the whole or part of the Services due to exceptional and severe weather with the prior written approval of the Council Contract Manager, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld. The Contractor does not have any right whatsoever to suspend Services without the approval or without instruction from the Council Contract Manager.
If the services are suspended then the Contractor at their own expense will ensure that any missed collections or service delays are rectified as soon as practicable.

The Council shall not pay to the Contractor any costs, expenses or other direct or indirect loss suffered by the Contractor during any period of exceptional and severe weather when the whole or part of the Services are suspended when the duration of such a period is five days or less.

The Council Contract Manager shall notify the Contractor when he/she considers the period of exceptional and severe weather has ended whereupon the Contractor shall promptly devise a programme of works for the approval of the Council Contract Manager which is designed to execute any of the Services which were not carried out during the period of exceptional and severe weather.

The Council shall not pay the Contractor for any Services not performed during any period when the whole, or part of the Services are suspended for any other reason.

2.5.10 Pick-up and Return of wheeled bins/boxes

The London Borough of Hounslow operates the wheeled bin system for the collection of residual household waste – using 140 litre wheeled bins - and a weekly, kerbside sort system using boxes for the collection of dry recycling waste. All waste must be stored in a wheeled bin/container and only the waste contained within the wheeled bin/container shall be collected (unless otherwise specified). On collection day the bin/boxes will be positioned by residents by or near to the Front Curtilage of low-rise properties.

For the purpose of clarity, collections from the front curtilage shall include the following: -

- The collection point shall be the nearest practical point to leave the bin/containers adjacent to the pavement. In practice, this can be within 0 to 2 metres from the actual boundary.
- The bin/boxes should not be left: -
  - In a gateway;
  - Obstructing a narrow path (i.e. less than 1 metre wide);
  - On a flowerbed
  - On the pavement or public highway
- In these instances the bin/boxes should be positioned: -
  - Back from the gateway;
  - On an adjacent lawn; or
  - Where the path widens.
  (Note: This may mean that the bin/box is collected from the front door area.)
- Where there is a steep slope or steps between the normal storage position for the bin/boxes and the front curtilage the collection
should be made from the normal storage position. (i.e. the collector will be required to move the bin/boxes up/down the steps or slope.

- In purpose-built maisonettes, bin/boxes should normally be collected from the communal area between the maisonettes.

It is important, in all the above examples, that neither the resident nor the refuse collectors obstruct access to the front door with the bin/boxes.

Bins/boxes must always be returned in a way that prevents damage to the bin/boxes or property and they should never be thrown or dropped.

Where a trolley system is in place to enable residents to stack and manoeuvre boxes, the collectors must ensure that returned boxes are stacked on the trolley in the correct order.

Where the bin/box is contained in a bin cupboard, which is visible from the road, the bin/box shall be collected from the bin cupboard, and returned - ensuring that the door is properly closed.

Where individual properties have more than one wheeled bin, the Contractor shall include in his rate for the collection of all the bins at each property (i.e. there shall be no additional payment).

### 2.5.11 Exempt Collections

Approximately 2,000 low-rise homes in the Borough are not able to accommodate the wheeled bin system and in these circumstances, the Council will grant a variation to the usual method of collection and allow the continued use of sacks or other systems for recyclable waste. A list of these properties will be supplied to the Contractor. The Council Contract Manager will notify additions and deletions to this list to the Contractor and reissue the list as appropriate. The Contractor shall include in his general rates for the additional costs associated with this clause.

Sacks shall not be collected from households that have not been granted Exempt or Assisted Collection status.

### 2.5.12 Assisted Collections

Approximately 600 residents in the Borough are not able to cope with the specified collection system and in these circumstances, the Council will grant a variation to the usual method of collection referred to as an Assisted Collection. A list of the current Assisted Collections will be supplied to the Contractor. The Council Contract Manager will notify additions and deletions to this list to the Contractor and reissue the list as appropriate. The Contractor shall include in his general rates for the additional costs associated with this clause.
Sacks shall not be collected from households that have not been granted Exempt or Assisted Collection status.

2.5.13 Restricted Access
A small number of properties in the Borough cannot have their refuse collected by normal sized refuse collection vehicles. These properties are listed in [Appendix XX]. The Contractor shall indicate in his tender how he intends to collect refuse from these properties. The Contractors' general rates shall include for any costs involved in collecting this refuse.

2.5.14 Efficient Collection/ Quality Standards
The Council places a high priority on customer service, customer care, safety, and good customer relations, and to this end the Contractor shall ensure that:

Waste and Recycling is collected in an efficient manner as follows:

a) Collection vehicles must not be driven or parked in such a way that they cause unnecessary or unreasonable obstruction to pedestrian or vehicular movement.

b) Collection vehicles must not mount kerbs or drive over footways, or contravene traffic regulations.

c) Crews must not make unreasonable noise in carrying out the Services.

d) The contractor must use reasonable endeavours to ensure that all material within the wheeled bin is collected. Any materials that are stuck in the bin shall be loosened by the Contractor's operatives, the bin re-lifted and emptied.

e) Crews must report any property where bin/boxes are not presented for collection at the front boundary of the property.

f) Wheeled bins weighing in excess of the bin manufacturers design load shall not be emptied. Crews must report any bin not collected for this reason.

g) Excess refuse shall not be collected. Crews must report any wheeled bin not collected for this reason.

h) Where the wheeled bin lid is not tightly closed, the bin shall be emptied without removing the excess, unless to do so would result in spillage. In these circumstances, the excess should be removed and left tidily in a contained environment, before the bin is emptied. Crews must report any bin not collected for this reason.

i) Where the bins are communal bins the requirements of Clause 2.7 may override this Clause.
j) The Contractor shall leave a notice, at the time of collection, notifying residents of any problems, which have prevented their refuse from being collected. The wording and design of the card shall be agreed by the Council Contract Manager. The Contractor shall include in his rates for all costs associated with this clause.

j) Notwithstanding where residents leave their bin/boxes for collection, crews will return these to the front curtilage of the property, and not on the public footway or on garden walls, or on gardens themselves.

k) Bins/boxes shall not be returned in a position that obstructs a path or driveway.

l) The Contractor must ensure that the correct bin/box is returned to each Location.

m) All gates, doors etc. found closed on entry shall be left closed on completion of the collection.

o) Any spillage shall be immediately cleared and removed from site.

p) Each wheeled bin shall be individually emptied using the mechanical lifting equipment on the Contractors vehicle. Manual emptying of the wheeled bin by skipping into another wheeled bin, removing refuse by hand or manual emptying direct into the vehicle shall be prohibited.

q) On return the lid of the wheeled bin shall be closed and, where appropriate, the bin shall be positioned such that the lid can be opened and waste deposited without residents or traders being required to reposition the bin. This is particularly relevant where bins are returned to bin cupboards, alcoves or compounds.

r) The Contractor's Employees shall not climb walls, fences etc. or walk across private gardens etc. to effect short cuts.

s) "Pulling out" of bins/boxes ahead of the vehicles shall not be allowed without the prior written agreement of the Council Contract Manager.

t) The Contractor’s employees shall at all times exercise care in order to avoid damage to resident’s or trader’s property. All damage shall be reported immediately to the Council Contract Manager. The Contractor shall indemnify the Council against all claims arising out of such damage.

u) The Contractor and his employees shall conduct themselves at all times in a proper manner. They are required to show courtesy and consideration to the general public and to the Council Contract Manager or his/her representatives.
v) The Contractor is responsible for ensuring that waste and recycling is collected on the scheduled day.

In the event of collections not being made because of obstructed access, the Contractor shall walk out all bins/boxes within 100 metres of the collection vehicle.

In the event of access being obstructed due to road works, the Contractor shall make suitable alternative arrangements, as approved by the Council Contract Manager, and shall notify all affected residents on the same day of the details of these arrangements. All costs shall be borne by the Contractor.

In the event of a vehicle breakdown, staff shortage or other problem the Contractor shall employ additional resources, at his own cost, to ensure that all properties are collected by the end of the scheduled working day.

The Contractor shall use the Council’s mobile, web-based data management system in the collection vehicles’ cabs that enable the driver to record any reasons why a bin/container has not been collected on the scheduled day. This is compatible with the councils call centre system and enables data to be collected and used in real time. All uncollected bins/containers, where the crew have not recorded a reason for non-collection, will be recorded as missed bins.

w) Reports received by the Contractor from the council’s contract management system relating to missed or partial collections must be satisfactorily remedied within the following time limits:

- A report received by noon on the scheduled collection day, the collection must be collected by the end of the same day.
- A report received after noon on the scheduled collection day, the collection must be collected by noon on the following day (including Saturdays).

Missed collections will be categorised into two types:
Type A. – Collections that have been missed due to a failure in the Contractor’s control and management system.
Type B. – Collections that have been missed due to factors beyond the Contractor’s control. This will apply only in exceptional circumstances (e.g. icy weather conditions where conditions under-foot would make conditions dangerous for the collectors; Major road-works where bins are not accessible and alternative collections arrangements cannot be made; etc.).

The Council Contract Manager will determine the appropriate category.

Repeated misses will need to be investigated and minimised and an agreed procedure will be in place to rectify these at the earliest
opportunity. (E.g. an electronic flagging system visible to the crew in the cab and/or a requirement to positively confirm that the collection has been made)

The measurement of Key Performance Indicator will be applicable only to Type A missed bins.

The Contractor shall supply in the Tender documents a method statement of how he intends to meet the provisions set out above.

x) Where the Contractor needs to change the approved method of operation to overcome an access or similar problem he shall notify the Council Contract Manager in writing. Variations may include a change in the day of collection or the use of a smaller vehicle. Fourteen days notice shall be given to the Council Contract Manager. No special arrangement shall commence without the written agreement of the Council Contract Manager. Where the Contractor is not providing a regular service at a particular Location the Council Contract Manager may, by written notice, require the Contractor to submit proposals for ensuring that the service is provided as required. Notwithstanding the above, a failure to provide a regular service shall be considered to be a Quality Default. The Contractor shall include in his rates for all costs associated with this clause. No additional payment shall be made.

y) The Contractor shall endeavour to ensure that waste and recycling is collected from each Location at approximately the same time each week. He shall supply each crew and the Council Contract Manager with a list of roads in the order in which they are to be collected. The list shall include approximate collection times. If the order of collection varies and results in collections being made from households at an earlier time than that listed, the Contractor may be required to return to collect from households where the waste and/or recycling had not been presented at the earlier time. The Council Contract Manager shall issue Rectification Notices in respect of each Omission.

The Contractor shall supply in the Tender documents a method statement of how he intends to meet the provisions set out above.

z) From time to time disputes will arise with residents or traders as to whether or not a bin could have been collected or whether it has been collected. In these circumstances the Contractor may be required to return to the property to make a collection and he will be paid at the appropriate rate in the Schedule of Rates.

2.5.15 Wheeled Bin repairs
The Contractor will be expected to include in the contract rates for the cost of carrying out minor repairs to 140 litre and 240 litre wheeled bins to ensure that the bin stock is maintained and the council's assets do not degrade unnecessarily: -
During the course of each day, crews will be expected to:

- Replace bin lid pins where these are missing – to ensure lids work properly and do not become detached from the bin body. Each crew will be expected to carry a supply of lid pins and the appropriate tools to enable them to replace missing pins as and when these are found.
- Fit replacement lids where lids are missing. Each crew will be expected to carry replacement lids on the collection vehicle and to replace up to five lids per day.
- Each repair/replacement shall be recorded on the ICT system
- Report any bin requiring a new wheel or axle using the ICT system
- Report any bin with damage to its lifting lip or body using the ICT system

Repairs to wheels and axles shall be undertaken by the Contractor’s Supervisor within three working days.

The Council Contract Manager will confirm an instruction to the Contractor for the delivery of a new bin using the ICT system within two working days for bins with damaged lips or bodies.

The council will supply lid pins, lids, wheels and axles to the Contractor as requested.

All damage reports for four-wheel bins shall be reported by crews. Repairs and replacement of bins will be organised by the Council Contract Manager. Orders for the collection of damaged bins and provision of replacement bins will be issued to the Contractor and completed within three Working days.

Where the Council’s Contract Manager determines that bins have been damaged due to faulty lifting equipment and/or operator error, the cost of bin repairs, replacement and collection and delivery of new or replacement bins will be recharged to the Contractor

2.5.16 Communications/ICT
The Council will provide an ICT system for recording and tracking all waste and recycling service-related enquiries. The council’s call centre will be responsible for receiving all calls and enquiries from residents, trade customers etc.

The ICT system will include the following features: -

- GPS tracking of vehicles
- In-cab data terminals providing improved data and real-time data to the call centre
- Improved feedback to residents
- Opportunity for call centre to advise residents of issues relating to incorrect use of the system
- Ability for the call centre to issue instructions to collect missed bins direct to crews (when it is clear that bins have been genuinely missed)
• Ability for supervisors to monitor workloads and crew performance using mobile devices
• Ability for “Client” and enforcement officers to access and process this data via mobile devices.
• Improved (more accurate) data to assess performance levels
• Ability to target interventions (e.g. poor areas of recycling)
• Improved response to complaints and queries
• Improved route planning (round optimisation)
• Use of UPRN to ensure that address data is accurate

Data terminals will be provided to the contractor and fitted into the fleet at the Council’s cost. Ongoing repairs, maintenance and replacement/refresh of the terminals shall be at the Contractors expense.

2.5.17 Disposal of Waste
Disposal of all waste shall be at a transfer station nominated by the Council Contract Manager. The Contractor shall include in his rates the cost of transport to and from the said transfer stations. Disposal costs shall be paid by the Council.

Disposal of residual waste and garden waste shall normally be at the Transport Avenue Waste Transfer Station operated by SITA on behalf of the West London Waste Authority.

The normal hours of working at Transport Avenue are:
- Monday to Thursday 08:00 – 16:00
- Friday 08:00 – 15:00
  (16:00 following Bank Holidays)
- Saturday 08:00 – 15:00
  (Following Bank Holidays only)

The Contractor may be required to dispose of waste at one of the alternative sites listed in Appendix E, or other Transfer Station within a 15-mile radius of the Council’s Bridge Road Depot as directed by the Council Contract Manager. No extra payment for additional costs shall be made to the Contractor.

Disposal of source-separated recycling will normally be at the Council’s Southall Lane Waste Depot. The operation of this site shall be the responsibility of the contractor (see Para 2.18). It is anticipated that the site will be operated between 04:00 and 22:00 Monday to Friday.

The Council’s Civic Amenity Site shall not be available for the free deposit of Domestic or Trade Waste. Where the Contractor wishes to deposit waste from a Refuse Collection vehicle at the Civic Amenity Site, for whatever reason, he shall be charged Trade Waste Rates (currently £185.00/Tonne).
The normal hours of working at the council’s Civic Amenity Site are:

- **Monday to Thursday**: 08:00 – 16:00
- **Friday**: 08:00 – 15:00 (16:00 following Bank Holidays)
- **Saturday**: 08:00 – 15:00 (Following Bank Holidays only)

### 2.5.18 Vehicles

**All vehicles shall:**

- Comply with Euro 6 emission requirements
- Use electric bin lifts
- Comply with the London Safer Lorry Initiative
- Be supplied in white.
- Be provided with advertising panel system (Agrippa?) to the side of the refuse collection vehicles
- Have 360° cameras to improve the safety of the crews
- Have air conditioning to the cab
- Have low entry cabs (refuse collection vehicles)
- To display clear wording that the vehicle is working on behalf of the London Borough of Hounslow. The exact location and size of the wording to be agreed

All fuel costs will be recharged to the contractor.

The contractor shall be expected to bring forward proposals to reduce NO\textsubscript{x} AND PM\textsubscript{10} emissions. These could include the use of stop-start technology, hybrid power and electric vehicles.

### 2.5.19 Depot

The Contractor will have the use of the Southall Lane Waste Depot and will be charged a commercial rent for these premises.

### 2.5.20 Vehicle Maintenance

All vehicles will be maintained by Hounslow Fleet, which will be mainly based at Bridge Road depot. The council may bring forward proposals to relocate the vehicle workshops to Southall Lane Waste Depot. Hounslow Fleet will provide a maintenance facility at Southall Lane Waste Depot to cover minor repairs identified at the beginning of the day.

All planned maintenance costs including consumables, MOT etc. will be recharged to the Contractor under the terms of an agreed SLA.

Ad hoc maintenance and accident repairs will be charged separately to the contractor.
2.5.21 New and other household waste premises
All services will be available to all relevant households in the Borough. All new residential developments will be required to participate fully in the various relevant waste and recycling schemes.

The Council’s Contract Manager will inform the Contractor of increases or decreases in the number of premises as early as possible and the contractor shall make arrangements for ensuring that collections are made as soon as possible after notification (i.e. the following week).

For the purpose of this contract the contractor shall assume that there are approximately 100,000 households in the Borough (i.e. the number if individual hereditaments listed by the council’s Council Tax office in January 2015. Approximately 70,000 of these are individual hereditaments. [Figures to be revised once database has been completed]

The number of individual hereditaments will be revised annually – with effect from 1st April – based on the previous return (in January) by the council’s Council Tax office (less the number of properties serviced by communal bins)

The contractor will be paid separately for the collection of communal bins and this will be based on the actual number of communal bins collected.

This applies to all material waste streams

2.6 Household Dry Recycling Materials Service – Low-rise homes
The Contractor shall provide a weekly, kerbside-sort service for the collection of dry recyclable materials.

Materials
The materials to be collected by the kerbside service will be: -

In the red box
Cans (steel and aluminium)
Aerosol cans
Plastic bottles and mixed household plastic packaging (e.g. tubs and pots etc.)
Aluminium foil (including trays etc.)

In the blue box
Paper including newspapers, magazines and yellow pages
Cardboard (including cereal packaging card, and household corrugated cardboard packaging)
Drinks Cartons eg.Tetra Paks

Glass jars and bottles

Adjacent to boxes
In plastic bags
- Small items of Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (mobile phones and household printer cartridges)
- Textiles and shoes
- Batteries - car/domestic
  In separate sealed bottles/containers
- Engine oil
- Kitchen oil

These items to be collected separately and deposited into designated points at the Materials Handling Facility at Southall Lane Waste depot.

**Contamination and excess**
The Contractors operatives should check the boxes for any obvious contamination or inappropriate use. Contamination in the boxes should not be collected and returned to the resident in the collection boxes.

**2.7 Household Dry Recycling Materials Service – High-rise homes**
The Contractor shall provide a weekly dry recycling service to high-rise homes.

**Source separated**

- **In the red/grey bins**
  - Cans (steel and aluminium)
  - Aerosol cans
  - Plastic bottles and mixed household plastic packaging (e.g. tubs and pots etc.)
  - Aluminium foil (including trays etc.)

- **In the blue bin**
  - Paper including newspapers, magazines and yellow pages
  - Cardboard (including cereal packaging card, and household corrugated cardboard packaging)
  - Drinks Cartons eg. Tetra Paks

- **In the green bin**
  - Glass jars and bottles (i.e. mixed colours)

Communal recycling bins are to be collected from and returned to the designated bin cupboards, enclosures or recognised standing areas. The Contractor shall include in his rates for collection and returning the bins to these positions.

Where bin frames are in use the containers and/or frames must be left locked after being emptied.

**Over flow/Contamination**
Suitable recyclable material found adjacent to the recycling bins shall be collected for recycling. The Contractor shall ensure that the area surrounding
the recycling container is left in a safe, clean and tidy condition after each collection.

The contractor shall report dumped rubbish (electronically) to the Council.

Contaminated Bins shall not be cleared by the crew and reported electronically to the council. The Contractor shall return to empty a contaminated bin within 24 hours of being identified by the collection crew or having been notified by the Council Contract Manager. The contaminated waste shall be disposed to landfill via the WLWA site at Transport Avenue.

2.8 Food waste - Low rise Collection Service
The Contractor shall provide a weekly Household Food Waste Collection Service. This can be incorporated with the dry recycling collection system

Material/container
A 23 or 25 litre ‘caddy’ for food waste will be presented and collected alongside the other collections on a weekly basis. Payment will be based on the number of properties collected each week. Where individual properties have more than one caddy, the Contractor shall include in his rate for the collection of the additional caddy at each property.

Compostable food waste bags
The contractor shall include a separate price for the distribution of compostable food waste bags to all low-rise households. It is anticipated that deliveries will be made twice a year and that each household will receive a roll of bags containing 52 bags (equivalent to two bags per household per week. The Contractor’s price shall be for each for delivery of all bags to each household, once every six months

Frequency and time
The service shall generally be carried out Monday to Friday with no collections commencing before 0700. The service shall comprise of a regular weekly collection service carried out 52 times a year collecting on the same day each week except for Bank and Public Holidays and the Christmas/New Year period.

The Contractor will collect Food Waste from households on the same day as the other household collections.

Contamination
If there are items in the caddies that cannot be taken, these caddies should not be collected and this recorded on the ICT system by the driver.

Where this is a repeated issue, the Council will endeavour to contact the resident to provide information etc. so that contamination is controlled
2.9 Food waste – High rise
The Contractor shall provide a weekly food waste collection service from flats.

This is currently a limited service. Residents put collected food waste in a 240 litre wheeled bin. These are usually located adjacent to the existing recycling facilities that are found on estates.

The council intends to expand this service over the course of the contract. The contractor will be notified of these additions as they occur and paid the appropriate rate in the Schedule of Rates.

Compostable Bags
The contractor shall include a separate price for the distribution of compostable food waste bags to all eligible high-rise households. It is anticipated that deliveries will be made twice a year and that each household will receive a roll of bags containing 52 bags (equivalent to two bags per household per week. The Contractor’s price shall be for each for delivery of all bags to each eligible household, once every six months.

2.10 Residual household waste – Low rise
The Household Residual Waste Collection Service shall include the regular alternate week collection of all residual Household Waste as defined in the Environmental Protection Act 1990 including household waste presented from premises listed in Schedule 1 of the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992.

The contractor shall price separately for the provision of a weekly service for a period from the start of the Contract until the reduced frequency is passed in. This is expected to start in mid-January and continue until mid-March 2017.

This service should not collect waste covered by other collection services in this contract e.g. food, dry recycling, bulky household, garden or clinical waste.

The main method of containment will be a 140 litre wheeled bin. Some households will have a larger 240 litre bin. A smaller number may have two bins. All bins will be collected. The contractor will be expected to include in his rates for the collection of these additional /larger bins. Payment will be based on cost per hereditament.

The service will be available to all households in the Borough and be expanded, as appropriate, to any new residential developments that occur during the Contract Period.

The Contractor shall, in the event of a dispute, inform the Council Contract Manager who shall rule as to the correct point of collection. No additional payment shall be made for such variations.

Sacks placed by residents on the public highway shall NOT be collected but recorded on the ICT system by the drivers.
2.11 Residual household waste – High Rise
The Contractor shall provide a weekly collection service to High Rise properties.

This is based on the use of communal bins comprising of 360 Litre, 660 Litre, 1100 Litre wheeled bins or Paladin bins.

Communal bins are to be collected from and returned to the designated bin cupboards, enclosures or recognised standing areas. The Contractor shall include in his rates for collection and returning the bins to these positions.

Where chutes are installed, the Contractor shall be responsible for ensuring the chutes are closed while the bin is being emptied and for ensuring that the bin is replaced under the chute, and the chute reopened, after the collection has been completed.

All excess refuse is to be picked up with each collection. The Contractor shall record this on the ICT system where this occurs. The Contractor shall include in his rates the cost of any additional work associated with complying with this requirement. The Council Contract Manager shall make arrangements for additional storage capacity to be provided where this is practical or additional collections arranged (these would be paid for at the appropriate rate.

A limited number of domestic communal bins require twice weekly collections. These shall be paid at the appropriate out-of-zone rate for Domestic Waste.

Containers must always be returned in a way that prevents damage to the container and/or property.

2.12 Flats above shops
[Currently reviewing service. Different solution for on-street and rear service alley?]

See [Appendix XX] for a list of flats above shops where the contractor will be expected to:
- Deliver purple sacks for residual waste
- Deliver clear sacks for recyclable waste
- Collect sacks separately for recycling or disposal
- Collect twice a week

Timed collections
2.13 The Bring Bank Service (see flats Cl.2.7)
Bring bank facilities continue to be a valuable community resource. However as other recycling services increase the number of locations are expected to fall.
It is proposed to retain the Bring Sites whilst keeping the situation under review in the future. This could lead to a change in the number and/or location of these sites in the future and a change or addition to the materials captured through these sites.

Material/container
The materials to be collected will include:

In the red/grey bins
- Cans (steel and aluminium)
- Aerosol cans
- Plastic bottles and mixed household plastic packaging (e.g. tubs and pots etc.)
- Aluminium foil (including trays etc.)

In the blue bin
- Paper including newspapers, magazines and yellow pages
- Cardboard (including cereal packaging card, and household corrugated cardboard packaging)
- Drinks Cartons eg. Tetra Paks

In the green bin
- Glass jars and bottles (i.e. mixed colours)

Textile Banks
- Textiles and shoes (Collected by LM Barry)

Frequency and time
The Contractor shall empty all containers at a minimum frequency of once a week or more frequently if the site is heavily used. This frequency should ensure that no container is more than 90% full at any time. The Contractor shall provide a detailed programme of work indicating the anticipated collection schedule to achieve this, which must be approved by the Council Contract Manager.

The service is to be carried out avoiding disruption and noise nuisance to surrounding properties.

Notwithstanding the requirement above the Contractor shall empty any container that is full, overflowing, or likely to overflow, as directed by the Council Contract Manager by the end of the Working Day if reported before midday, or by midday the following day if reported after midday (including Saturday morning).

The contractor is responsible for ensuring that collections are made at the appropriate frequency. Access to Bring Sites may sometimes be restricted
due to opening hours, holidays etc. and the Contractor should take this into account when scheduling collections. Additional collections may be required following bank holidays particularly during the Christmas/New Year and Easter period and immediately thereafter, and the Contractor should allow for this in the programme of works.

Should a scheduled collection not take place for whatever reason then the Council Contract Manager must be informed as soon as reasonably possible. This will be recorded as a missed bin. The Contractor shall reschedule a collection to take place within 24 hours of the original programmed collection. No additional payment will be made for such events and the Contractor shall allow for such disruption within the tendered rates.

**Over flow/Contamination**
Suitable recyclable material found adjacent to the recycling container shall be collected for recycling. The Contractor shall ensure that the area surrounding the recycling container is left in a safe, clean and tidy condition after each collection.

The Contractor shall report dumped rubbish (electronically) to the council.

Contaminated Bins shall not be cleared by the crew and reported electronically to the council. The Contractor shall return to empty a contaminated bin within 24 hours of being identified by the collection crew or having been notified by the Council Contract Manager. The contaminated waste shall be disposed at the WLWA site at Transport Avenue.

**On-Street Recycling**
At present the Council have 8 existing paper recycling sites located primarily near stations. The paper is collected from 240 litre wheeled bins stored inside locked bin housing.

The Council would expect these sites to be serviced a minimum of once a week or more frequently to prevent over-flow onto the highway.

2.14 **New or replacement containers and delivery**
The Council will be responsible for the purchase and sale of new, additional and replacement containers.

The Contractor shall deliver replacement containers within three Working Days of receipt of an order from the council.

Where bin/boxes are delivered to new properties, the Contractor will also be expected to deliver appropriate information, provided by the Council, describing the material that can be collected and the collection day. This information shall be delivered through the letterbox of each property.

The Contractor will be expected to provide a dedicated resource to ensure this requirement is met.
2.15 The Bulky Household Waste Collection Service (Tidy Town)
The Contractor shall provide a bulky waste collection service to residents.

The service comprises the collection of bulky household waste from domestic and/or commercial premises. Material will be sorted/segregated to maximise the amount of reuse or recycling from the service.

This service is provided to enable residents within the Borough to dispose of items of Bulky Household Waste, which can be safely handled by two operatives. Items for collection will be left by residents in a defined location which is accessible for the street. E.g. in the front garden of a property.

Frequency and time
The service shall generally be carried out as necessary Monday to Friday with no collections commencing before 07:30.

The Council and the contractor will agree the number of work slots to be made available each day for the provision of the service. Collections will be zoned as far as possible to ensure that collections are carried out as efficiently as possible.

Requests for this service will be made to the Council. The Council will issue an instruction to the Contractor giving the location and details of the waste to be collected. Only the items of bulky household waste detailed on the instruction issued by the Council Contract Manager shall be collected by the Contractor.

Out of zone collections will be allowed – subject to an additional charge to the customer. In general an out-of-zone collection will only be allowed if there are two work slots available.

The Contractor shall ensure that all work booked in for a particular day is completed on the appointed day.

All material collected should be weighed appropriately to allow the generation of separate figures for material reused and recycled and material going to Landfill. This information needs to be reported on a monthly basis.

The collected items will normally be taken to the Space Waye Reuse and Recycling Centre. However this may change during the course of the contract. Provided the place of deposit is no more than 15 miles from Space Waye, no additional payment will be made to the Contractor.

2.16 The Household Garden Waste Collection Service
The Contractor will provide a service to collect garden waste from residents who subscribe to the Council’s garden waste collection service. The Council will provide a list of properties to collect from to the Contractor.
The service will operate once a fortnight throughout the year – except over the Christmas/New Year period when the service will be suspended.

Collections will be made on the alternate week to residual waste collections. Where the service is supplied to properties that do not receive an alternate week residual waste collection, the service will be delivered on the same day as adjacent properties who do receive the alternate week residual waste collection. If this is not clear the Council’s Contract Manager will decide the collection day.

The standard container for this service will be a 240 litre wheeled bin.

Residents who require more than one bin will be able to subscribe to additional bins. The bins will remain the property of the Council.

As an alternative residents may opt to use two 90 litre reusable sacks as an alternative to a single wheeled bin. No additional sacks shall be made available as the council wishes the service to be essentially a wheeled bin service.

The Contractor’s rate for this service will include affixing a new sticker to the Brown wheeled bin each year to confirm that the bin is eligible for collection. Similarly where residents choose the reusable bag service the Contractor’s rates will include the provision and affixing of a suitable tag to the bags’ handles to indicate that the service has been paid for.

Where residents discontinue the service the contractor will be paid to collect brown wheeled bins that are no longer required and to return these to the Southall Lane Waste Depot. This will be paid for at the appropriate rate in the Schedule of Rates.

Christmas Trees
The Contractor shall also provide a service for the free collection of real Christmas trees from all residential properties for a period of three weeks after the end of the Christmas/New Year Holiday period. All trees must be collected for composting. See [Appendix XX].

The council will pay an agreed amount, each year to cover this service.

2.17 The Commercial Waste Collection Service
[Subject to change]
The Commercial Waste Collection Service shall include the regular collection of Commercial Waste, as defined by the Environmental Protection Act 1990, from commercial premises in the borough in order to fulfil the Council’s duty to provide a service to those businesses that request it to be provided by the Council.
This service will also be available to other premises classed as producing household waste including, but not exclusively schools, religious establishments and hospitals.

The service must provide for the separate collections of recyclable waste and residual waste.

The contractor shall supply a separate price for the separate collection of food waste.

The service will be based on wheeled bin where appropriate and/or sacks.

The commercial waste collection service shall be carried out to avoid disruption and noise nuisance.

The service will be provided on the frequency requested by the customer, which may involve collections on each day of the week.

Certain streets – listed in [Appendix XX] will be time-zoned

London Business Waste and Recycling (LBWR) will be responsible for marketing all trade waste and recycling services including managing customer contacts, invoicing and Duty of Care: Waste Transfer notes.

The Contractor shall collect Commercial Waste in a separate vehicle to Household Waste unless the Contractor can demonstrate an alternative method of working, such as on-board weighing, which ensures that accurate tonnage data for commercial waste can be obtained and is fully auditable.

The Council/Contractor will retain all income from these operations.
Where the Contractor retains the income all costs of recycling/ disposal of commercial waste will be recharged to the Contractor.
Where the Council retains the income, the contractor will be paid for the cost of the collection.

All waste and recycling shall be collected in an appropriate waste collection vehicle and transported to the appropriate waste transfer station on the same day as collection.

All containers used for the service will remain the property of the Council. These containers will be clearly marked as London Borough of Hounslow/Lampton360.

2.18 Operation of Materials Handling Facility
The contractor shall price for the operation of the Materials Handling Facility at Southall Lane Waste Depot. The hours of operation are expected to be between 04:00 and 22:00, Main operations will be as follows (but not exclusively): -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04:00 to 09:00</td>
<td>Baling of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 to 15:00</td>
<td>Receipt of materials from collection operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15:00 to 22:00

Receipt of materials from collection operations
Unloading of collection vehicles that have been parked.
Loading of bulk loaders for glass and paper
Loading of curtain-sided vehicles with baled materials

3. GENERAL OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS – MATTERS RELATING TO ALL SERVICES

3.1 Method Statement
The Contractor should provide detailed method statements describing how the Services are to be performed and shall obtain the agreement of the Council Contract Manager before any substantial changes are effected.

All operations shall be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the Council Contract Manager who will make allowance for factors outside the reasonable control of the Contractor but no allowance will be made where the allocation of more time, staffing, equipment or effort or the adoption of another acceptable method of working could achieve the objective.

The Method Statement must be submitted by the Contractor three months prior to the commencement of the Contract. Notwithstanding this requirement to agree the Method Statement, the Contractor shall be entirely responsible for the suitability of the Programme to fulfil its obligations under the Contract.

The Method Statement will as a minimum include details of:

- a detailed Borough-wide plan showing the collection rounds
- the number of crews and teams
- details of all staff including operators, drivers, supervisors, office staff and management
- a management structure to support delivery of the Contract,
- details of continuity arrangements for appropriate staffing levels in particular management and supervisory posts
- details of all vehicles to be used on the Contract
- specification of all plant and equipment to be used
- details of arrangements to cater for any disruption to the normal work programme
- Details of arrangements to deliver containers and any other infrastructure to support the new collection arrangements.

The Contractor shall inform the occupiers of all or any properties receiving all or any of the services under the Contract of any change in the collection day affecting their property. Such notification shall be in a form approved by the Council Contract Manager.
3.2 Complaints
Complaints about the service will generally be investigated by the Council through its standard complaints procedures. This will require liaison with the Contractor. When requested, the Contractor shall commence investigation of a complaint no later than 24 hours from the receipt of the complaint and provide a response within 3 Working Days.

The Contractor is deemed to have provided in its Tender for all such investigations consequent upon the receipt of a complaint whether or not the investigations indicate a fault in the Services or result in the need for remedial action.

The Council’s complaint procedure may require the Contractor to attend a Council Review Panel.

The Contractor shall use the Council’s ICT system to maintain the electronic record of all complaints. This record should be compatible with the Council’s corporate and contract management systems to allow for inspection on-line by the Council Contract Manager at all times.

3.3 Management and Supervision
The Contractor must provide sufficient supervision in order to ensure the Service is being carried out in accordance with the Contract to the satisfaction of the Council Contract Manager. Such supervision must be available during all operational hours the Services are provided.

Section 4 sets out the Performance Management System arrangements for the contract.

3.4 Quality Control System
The Services will be carried out within a quality assured framework, such as I.I.P. and ISO 9002.

During the first twelve months of this Contract, the Contractor will be required to achieve accreditation under ISO14001 in respect of the Services.

The Contractor shall ensure that its staff receive induction training, to ensure a thorough understanding of the Contract Standards, as well as an appreciation of other issues affecting the Contract.

The Contractor shall devise and operate their own routine, representative and validatable quality control system to ensure that all the Contract Standards are being complied with and that the provision of the Services is in a manner which will enhance the public’s perception of the Council.

Should the Contractor at any time not be satisfied with the standard or manner of Service provision, he shall take such remedial steps to rectify any deficiency at once.
3.5 Health and Safety
The Contractor shall also ensure that at all times the Services are carried out in a manner that does not endanger the health or safety of their employees Contractor’s staff should wear the approved protective clothing and identification.

The Contractor must allow for carrying out all operations in a safe and professional manner, including the provision of warning signs etc. where necessary in order to comply with current Health and Safety at Work legislation and relevant Law.

The Contractor shall devise and operate their own routine, representative and validatable Health and Safety control system to ensure that all the Contract Standards are being complied with and that the provision of the Services is in a manner which will enhance the public’s perception of the Council.

Should the Contractor at any time not be satisfied with the standard or manner of Service provision, he shall take such remedial steps to rectify any deficiency at once.

The Council’s Contract Manager shall have the right to suspend immediately any operation of the contractor that is considered to be dangerous. This could be by direct verbal direction to the contractor’s workforce. Such instruction to be confirmed electronically to the Contractor as soon as possible

Reporting of Health and Safety Statistics will be included in the monthly Performance Management Meetings

3.6 Third Party Injury/Damage to Property
The Contractor shall take all necessary precautions when carrying out the Services of this Contract, to avoid causing damage to anything, object or surface including the highway, plant, street furniture, private property, vehicles etc.

Any damage so caused by the Contractor shall be brought to the attention of the Council Contract Manager immediately and shall subsequently be replaced or made good by, and entirely at the expense of, the Contractor.

The Contractor shall also ensure that at all times the Services are carried out in a manner that does not endanger the health or safety of members of the public or employees of the Council. Neither should their operations interrupt the free passage of vehicles and pedestrians.

The Contractor will deal with, and be responsible for all aspects of, any claims made in respect of alleged injury, damage etc., caused by its vehicles or employees and must be fully insured in this respect.
3.7 Training
[To be determined]

3.8 Apprenticeships
[To be determined]

4. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND SERVICE IMPROVEMENT
There are a number of service quality and performance standards set out in this specification and the Contract Terms and Conditions. Performance standards will also be agreed and set out in the annual service plan.

The Contractor will be expected to deliver continuous improvement in services throughout the Contract

4.1 Information and Reports
The Waste ICT system will maintain a database giving details of complaints and service requests relating to the Services. This will allow:

- Management and monitoring of the Services;
- Response to enquiries and complaints;
- Collation of information for a range of performance indicators.

All vehicles are required to display round information when using any weighbridge to allow the council to monitor performance across the borough for the different services

Required weekly
The contractor is to supply a weekly report showing:

- Tonnage data for each delivery of waste or recycling to any transfer station or facility. Each record shall record date, time, tonnage, type of service, round number, and the registration number of the vehicle.

The Contractor shall make available for inspection all weighbridge tickets.

Monthly meetings
A report every 4 weeks or calendar month (as required by the Council Contract Manager) showing details of reported missed collections, including single households and whole streets/rounds.

5. EMERGENCY SERVICES
In the event of an emergency which requires a response from the Council, the Council Contract Manager may suspend the Service in whole or in part and require the Contractor’s resources to be utilised in support of the Council’s response to the emergency situation.

The Council Contract Manager shall have absolute discretion as to what constitutes an emergency and will include an emergency as defined in the Civil Contingencies Act but is not necessarily restricted to such incidents.
In the response to the emergency the Contractor may be required to work under the direction of the Police, other emergency services or other Category 1 responders (as defined by the Civil Contingencies Act).

6. PUBLICITY, EDUCATION AND AWARENESS
The Council will be responsible for producing publicity material and for its printing and distribution. The Contractor will be asked to contribute ideas for the content of any publicity, including advice on best practice elsewhere.

The content of publicity material relating to the services will be discussed with the Contractor prior to printing.

The Contractor shall be responsible for delivery up to three items of information per crew per year.

This could include
- A service leaflet explaining the correct collection day and list of materials etc.,
- Christmas/New Year collection arrangements leaflet or bin hanger

The Contractor shall ensure that all crews have a supply of service leaflets, contraries cards, contamination notices etc.

In addition, the Council may wish the Contractor to be represented at other meetings and events such as Open Days, Council Meetings and Community Events, and this may include the provision of vehicles and waste and recycling facilities. The Contractor should allow for the provisions of this section in their basic tender price.

7. FINANCIAL MATTERS
Invoices for the Services shall be submitted by the Contractor to the Council’s Council Contract Manager in accordance with the Conditions of Contract.

The monthly invoice shall allow for any financial deductions as a result of any default notices issued in accordance with the Conditions of Contract.

The Contract Price shall be reviewed each year of the Contract Period in accordance with the Conditions of Contract.

The method of calculating any increases in the Contract Price shall be –as set out in the Conditions of Contract.
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1. Details of Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to note the review of the Council’s town twinning arrangements and to agree the following:

- That the approaches to town twinning activities as described in paragraph 3.19 of the report be endorsed;
- That the town twinning relationships with Issy-Les-Moulineaux, Ramallah, Lehore and Jalandhar be retained;
- That the town twinning relationship with Leningradsky be terminated; and
- That, having determined to retain town twinning links with Issy-Les-Moulineaux, Ramallah, Lahore and Jalandhar (as above), the Council also resolve that it will not twin with any further towns (or forge town twinning like bonds of friendship but using different terminology).

If the recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit, link to Values</th>
<th>Dates by which they can expect to notice a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals will see a consistent approach to cultural links between the residents of Hounslow and its twin towns which are helpful to enhancing community cohesion and understanding.</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Report Summary**

This report explains the historic role of town twinning between British towns, cities and councils and other similar locations across the world, and the benefits that stem from it. It then reviews the nature of the Council’s own town twinning relationships, looking at each one individually and proposing an approach that will bring consistency and transparency to them, and concludes by proposing an approach to town twinning for the future.

3. **Reason for Decision and Options Considered**

**A History of Town Twinning**

3.1 There is no formal definition of town twinning either within statute or culturally. As a result, the nature of town twinning has changed over time and comes in many forms.

3.2 However, at a basic level, town twinning activities have been focussed on promoting links, better understanding of various cultures and challenging stereotypical images by developing cross-border projects for mutual benefit.

3.3 Although the first recorded British twinning link was established in 1920 between Keighley, West Yorkshire, and Poix du Nord in France, the idea first became more widely accepted after the Second World War in Europe as a way to bring people from different European countries closer together and helping reconciliation after the conflict.

3.4 During the post war period until the early 1970s, town twinning in Britain was predominantly with towns in France and Germany, and occasionally in other European Countries.

3.5 The heyday of European town twinning took place in the 1970s as a result of the Rippon Programme, which was a Government programme established in 1972 to prepare Britain culturally for entry into the European Economic Community (now the European Union) the following year. As a result, town twinning in Britain during the 1970s was characterised by predominantly civic and school exchanges, again mostly with localities in France and Germany.

3.6 It was as part of this phase of national town twinning that Hounslow twinned with its first twin town, Issy-Les-Moulineaux in France in 1982.

3.7 The national town twinning situation changed as the 1980s continued. Until this point there had been some (albeit limited) organisational support for towns to twin provided by the Government and other (sometimes rival) quasi autonomous non-governmental organisations at national level and international level. However, in the 1980s this diminished, and the nature of town twinning also changed to become a general term for intercity co-operation. Councils became more free to determine with
whom they wished to twin and the nature of the twinning and in the absence of “top down” support, initiatives rose from the bottom up from local councils themselves.

3.8 The consequence was that, whilst the number of twinning initiatives increased, the process was also increasingly used by some British local authorities for overtly partisan political reasons, often as a protest against national and international policies. Some councils chose to twin with other British towns and cities, particularly those connected with the mining industry, in order to express support for them in relation to industrial conflict and to antagonise the then Conservative Government. Similarly, some British councils, in response to the foreign policy of America under President Reagan pursued town twinning initiatives for international solidarity such as twinning with towns in Nicaragua or in the Soviet Union.

3.9 The Council twinned with Ramallah in Palestine on 5\textsuperscript{th} July 1988 and with Leningradsky, a suburb of Moscow, the then capital of Soviet Russia, on 16\textsuperscript{th} May 1989.

3.10 The result of this development in the nature of town twinning nationally was a sense amongst the public of town twinning principles being usurped for overtly political reasons, and consequently general support for twinning diminished. Although this phase in the history of town twinning mostly ended in the 1990s when the fall of the Berlin Wall and the demise of Communism gave twinning another boost, public affection for town twinning has never recovered.

3.11 A further driver to town twinning links occurred in the 1990s and continues to this day: many local authorities were motivated to develop links outside of Europe by a desire to cultivate relationships with the country of origin of many of their residents. In multicultural communities with a high proportion of people from a specific region, increasing cultural understanding and general awareness of their country of origin can contribute enormously to social cohesion.

3.12 It was as part of this phase of town twinning that Hounslow twinned with Lahore in Pakistan in 1995 and then with Jalandhar in India in 2015.

3.13 The new century has seen town twinning continue across the country, with an increasingly international reach to the towns involved. However, whilst there is little public hostility to town twinning, there is also little public support or interest. Aware of the financial costs of all aspects of council activity in the era of austerity since 2010, an increasing number of councils are reviewing their town twinning arrangements and in some cases, consequently reducing the number they have.

3.14 Similarly, the Local Government International Bureau Document “Take Your Partners” has observed “Currently, the trend for local authorities considering forming new international links is to move away from formal, long term partnerships such as town twinning, and enter into less binding arrangements. Town twinning links are accompanied by formal charters that have no end date, whereas the new types of partnership tend to be less prescribed and are often endorsed by a friendship agreement or memorandum of understanding. Sometimes the agreements are time limited, and contain a list of objectives to be achieved within a specific time frame.
3.15 However, there is no statutory basis to town twinning at all and the arrangements that have been made by local authorities in the United Kingdom are not underpinned by law but are in fact merely gestures. There is no legal requirement to do anything in relation to town twinning and so it is entirely for councils to determine what, if anything, the relationship should involve - and this of course is likely to change over time. Consequently, it is timely for Hounslow to review its own town twinning arrangements in the context of the current financial climate.

Nature of Town Twinning Activities

3.16 Local authorities sometimes have twinning agreements with towns in one or more countries in order to promote cultural understanding between the communities, which in turn help expand horizons of residents in both areas. This is often underpinned by local people arranging exchange visits between the residents of the twinned towns, often through a locally based town twinning association.

3.17 Twinning projects have typically involved bringing people together with common interests such as sport, art, education and music. Other activities also encourage people to visit places they would otherwise not have seen or had the chance to experience. Other areas include promoting tourism as well as looking at projects to share ideas on wide range issues including democracy, the environment, economic development and cultural diversity.

3.18 Many projects involve clubs, schools and other agencies as well as individuals on work experience and or learning a foreign language. Involvement from local people is key to the success of any twinning arrangement and local town twinning associations are therefore usually set up to help this happen.

3.19 In Hounslow’s case, it has over time developed two approaches to town twinning activities as follows:

- Where a town twinning association exists, it is for that organisation to promote, initiate and support most twinning projects, liaising with both councils as necessary. It has no power to act on Hounslow Council’s behalf and either Authority may reject any or all of its proposals. It would be expected to fund most such projects. The exception to this would be ceremonial visits (eg visits by dignitaries such as the mayor of the twinned town to Hounslow) where a reception may be organised as a formal mayoral event and be paid for out of existing mayoral events budgets. No additional expenditure beyond existing budgets is expected and if, for any reason, there is a need for any other expenditure by Hounslow, this would need to be agreed using the Council’s formal decision making process to ensure full transparency.

- Where a town twinning association does not exist, it is for the two councils to liaise on any projects and where these are agreed, they would need to be subject to the Council’s usual formal decision making process to ensure full transparency including in terms of any costs. An example of such a project could be a schools pupil exchange where both councils would be expected be to be involved in the organisation and help fund it. Once again, the exception to this would be ceremonial visits (eg visits by dignitaries such as the mayor of
the twinned town to Hounslow) where a reception may be organised as a formal mayoral event and be paid for out of existing mayoral events budgets.

3.20 It is proposed that these approaches be endorsed by the Council.

Review of Hounslow’s Twin Towns

3.21 Hounslow is currently twinned with the following places:

- Issy-Les-Moulineaux in France
- Ramallah in Palestine
- Lahore in Pakistan
- Leningradsky District in Russia
- Jalandhar in India

Issy-Les-Moulineaux, France

3.22 Hounslow’s first twin town was Issy-Les-Moulineaux, a suburb of Paris in France.

3.23 The two council’s twinned in 1982 and the relationship has remained active to greater or lesser degrees in the subsequent 34 years.

3.24 As this twinning was the product of one of the earlier phases of town twinning history nationally, the rationale for the relationship was based on the then popularity of twinning with European towns which were similar in size and development. In the case of Hounslow and Issy-Les-Moulineaux, these similarities are very striking, as this comparison based on the town’s Wikipedia entry shows:

- Issy-Les-Moulineaux is a commune (a French Council) in the southwestern suburban area of Paris lying on the left bank of the River Seine. [Hounslow is a British Council in the western suburban area of London sitting on the north bank of the River Thames]
- It is one of Paris entrances and is located 6.6 km (4.1 miles) from Notre-Dame Church, which is considered Kilometre Zero of France. [Hounslow due to its road network and proximity to Heathrow Airport is an important entrance and conduit to the centre of London and its Eastern boundary in Chiswick is 9.9 km (6.1 miles) from the centre of the city]
- Issy-Les-Moulineaux has successfully moved its economy from an old manufacturing base to high value-added service sectors and is at the heart of the Val de Seine business district, the largest cluster of telecommunication and media businesses in France hosting the headquarters of most major French TV networks. [Hounslow is also home to many high value-added companies including telecoms companies such as Sky Television and has several business districts including the Great West Road]

3.25 In terms of town twinning activities, there was for many of the earlier years of the relationship, a Hounslow – Issy-Les-Moulineaux Town Twinning Committee but
this became moribund some years ago. However, until very recently, the two councils operated a successful pupil exchange arrangement in secondary schools. In more recent years, there has been an increase in the number of ceremonial and Mayoral links between the two authorities. For example, in February 2015, representatives of the French commune attended the sponsored dinner in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the formal creation of the Borough in 1965, and in June 2015, Councillors Steve Curran, Amrit Mann and Nisar Malik, as Leader, Deputy Leader and Mayor of Hounslow, visited Monsieur André Santini, the Mayor of Issy-Les-Moulineaux and discussed some possible future cultural projects and exchanges in music and sport.

3.26 It is likely that for the foreseeable future, the two councils will engage in occasional mayoral and ceremonial visits, with a view to developing possible mutual cultural projects which fall within existing council policies.

3.27 As the town twinning relationship with Issy-Les-Moulineaux remains an active and potentially fruitful one, it is proposed that it be retained.

Ramallah, Palestine

3.28 The idea of twinning the London Borough of Hounslow with the Palestinian cities of Ramallah and El Bireh was first suggested by some members of staff and students at St Mary’s College, Twickenham. The college’s student union had developed links with the University of Birzeit, a Higher Education institution in the Ramallah district. The then Hounslow Town Twinning Association (created originally to support the relationship between Hounslow and its original twin town of Issy-Les-Moulineaux) developed the proposal and liaised with the then Leader of the Council, Councillor Dave Wetzel, who visited Ramallah with two additional councillors in June 1988.

3.29 The result was that the then Administration elected to twin with Ramallah and El Bireh and this was formally agreed by Borough Council at its meeting on 5th July 1988. This was followed by a visit by the then Deputy Mayor of Ramallah who was welcomed to the Council meeting on 14th November 1989.

3.30 A specific Hounslow-Ramallah Town Twinning Association was then established and remained active for some years. It was originally called the Hounslow-Ramallah/El Bireh Twinning Association but later became known by its later name (dropping the El Bireh reference). Three council members were appointed to the body on an annual basis.

3.31 In the 1990s, the Hounslow-Ramallah Town Twinning Association became defunct and town twinning projects and initiatives between the two councils ceased. In effect, the town twinning relationship went through a period of dormancy.

3.32 However, the link was revived when the Hounslow-Ramallah Town Twinning Association was re-established and recognised formally by the Council at its meeting on 14th December 2010. Up to four councillors are appointed to this body (as an outside body) annually.
3.33 Since then, the Hounslow-Ramallah Town Twinning Association has been operating and running events but with minimal council involvement. The relationship between Hounslow and Ramallah therefore remains an active one, and in addition to the initiatives promoted by the Association, there has been visit by Mr Musa Hadid, the then Mayor of Ramallah, to the London Borough of Hounslow in September 2013, and a reciprocal visit made by Councillor Nisar Malik, Mayor of Hounslow, to Ramallah Municipality in March of this year. This trip was self financed by the Mayor and so there was no expenditure by the Council.

3.34 At the request of the Ramallah Municipality, during the Mayoral visit in March 2016, the Mayors of both councils formally signed a new memorandum of understanding and declaration of friendship which, due to the lack of time following the formal request prior to the visit, was agreed using the formal council urgency process. The agreed statement read as follows:

“Memorandum of Understanding and Declaration of Friendship
Between The London Borough of Hounslow and Ramallah Municipality

The ties and friendship between the peoples of the London Borough of Hounslow and Ramallah Municipality were formally recognised in a town twinning declaration signed in Hounslow on 5th July 1988 with the intention that the twinning would lead to greater exchanges and understanding between the people of the two communities.

Now therefore in celebrating the long lasting nature of this relationship for more than twenty five years, the London Borough of Hounslow and Ramallah Municipality, represented by their Mayors, by deed of signing this Memorandum of Understanding and Declaration of Friendship below, hereby reaffirm the commitment to preserving and developing the friendship so created for the benefit of all the people of their areas.”

3.35 There were no commitments made during the visit beyond this declaration of friendship.

3.36 As the town twinning relationship with Ramallah remains active, and as it has an active town twinning association, it is proposed that the twinning relationship be retained.

Leningradsky District, Russia

3.37 The proposal to twin with a suburb of Moscow originated from the then Hounslow Town Twinning Association in 1988 at about the same time as the proposals to twin with Ramallah were being developed.

3.38 The Association had been liaising with the British Council and the National Town Twinning Committee (now defunct) and had identified Leningradsky, a suburb of Moscow, as a suitable candidate. This proposal won support from Councillor Wetzel and was duly presented to the Council for consideration.
3.39 The Council eventually twinned with Leningradsky on 16th May 1989 at a special meeting of the Council chaired by the then Mayor, Councillor David Mockeridge. At the meeting, the town twinning document was signed on behalf of then Soviet municipality by Nikolai Nicholaievich, the Leader of that council who was visiting as part of a ceremonial delegation.

3.40 However, there is no evidence that suggests that a Hounslow-Leningradsky town twinning association was ever created and no records to suggest that any further initiatives relating to Leningradsky were implemented after the initial town twinning ceremony.

3.41 The relationship was reported to the Council in November 2006 as having been dormant for a number of years, and there has been no approach from Leningradsky, or anyone purporting to represent it, to the Council since.

3.42 It is widely understood that Leningradsky, whilst still a geographic area of Moscow, was abolished as a municipality in its own right following a reorganisation of Moscow local government districts in 1991. No references to a Leningradsky District existing in Moscow can be found, despite attempts to research them and so, given this and the many years of dormancy, it is proposed that the Council formally terminate this town twinning relationship.

Lahore in Pakistan

3.43 The Council had planned to twin with Lahore in Pakistan and Jalandhar in India in the 1990s. However, at that time it was only possible to proceed with the twinning with Lahore.

3.44 The twinning with Lahore was formally agreed by Council in 1991.

3.45 A Hounslow-Lahore town twinning association was created and oversaw a number of initiatives including a visit by a delegation from the Lahore Cantonment (Council) to the Council in September 1999, and then in January 2004, there was a reciprocal visit by the then Mayor, Councillor Roger Clarke, and a number of councillors. Costs of the trip for the Mayor came from the town twinning association, with other councillors covering their own expenses, so there was no cost to the Borough.

3.45 The nature of the trip can be ascertained by the comments that Councillor Clarke made at the time; “I was overwhelmed by the courtesy and friendship extended to us by the people of Lahore. We visited a primary school and a women’s degree college and, despite the scarcity of resources, could see that staff were doing a remarkable job and children and students were keen to learn. We also visited a hospital and congratulated staff for their dedication and service to the community. I believe that our twinning with Lahore will bring benefits to both communities as officers from both communities are dedicated and motivated people.”

3.46 The town twinning association remained active until at least 2006, but in recent years, the organisation has become moribund.
3.47 However, despite this, the relationship between the two towns has recently been revived in response to direct contact between Councillor Nisar Malik, the Mayor, and representatives at the Cantonment which culminated in a visit by the Mayor to Lahore in early March 2016. This trip was entirely self financed by the Mayor and so did not cost the Council anything.

3.48 As the town twinning relationship with Lahore remains active, it is proposed that it be retained - but that it operate only at a purely ceremonial level, until such time as a recognised Hounslow-Lahore Town Twinning Committee is established.

**Jalandhar in India**

3.49 Members will be aware that the long proposed town twinning relationship with the Jalandhar Municipal Corporation in the Punjab region of India, which had originally been mooted to commence at the same time as the town twinning relationship with Lahore in Pakistan in 1995, was formally agreed at the meeting of the Council in October 2015.

3.50 A Hounslow- Jalandhar town twinning association came into being at the time, although the council was not asked formally to appoint councilors to its membership.

3.51 The Association, in liaison with Mr Sunil Jyoti, the Mayor of the Jalandhar Municipal Corporation, had arranged a visit by Councillor Malik as Hounslow Mayor to Jalandhar in November 2015, although this subsequently had to be cancelled and has, at the time of writing, not been rescheduled. The costs of the trip were to have been borne by the Mayor himself and so there were no expected costs to the Council in doing so.

3.52 As the town twinning relationship with Jalandhar is a new one and is active, and as it has an existing town twinning association, it is proposed that it be retained.

**Future Approach to Town Twinning**

3.53 Further to the proposals already made in this report, it is appropriate to consider an appropriate approach to town twinning for the future.

3.54 The Council needs to consider the benefits of town twinning, which are usually considered to be “soft benefits” (ie of a cultural nature and difficult to quantify accurately). It will also need to bear in the mind the cost to the Council in terms not only of money but also in member and officer time. There is a balance to be struck between these, particularly in the context of difficult financial circumstances and the current age of austerity.

3.55 Currently, even though the Council aims to ensure that it incurs no costs arising from any town twinning initiatives beyond ceremonial and mayoral events (which have an existing budget), there are still resource implications in terms of administrative support. Most initial approaches on town twinning projects or initiatives are first made to the Mayor, as the “first citizen” of the Borough, and so in practice are dealt with by the Members’ Services Team in Democratic Services.
Whilst these are absorbed, there would be concerns that additional town twinning initiatives, particularly relating to the number of councils with which the council might be twinned, would create resource pressures on officer time.

3.56 The Council also needs to be mindful of the concerns expressed online and elsewhere by residents of the borough that resources used to support town twinning matters might be more usefully be diverted elsewhere to council work where the benefits are more obvious.

3.57 The counter view to this however is that town twinning can be a useful additional help in ensuring social and community cohesion in a diverse borough such as Hounslow.

3.58 Consequently, it is suggested that having determined to retain town twinning links with Issy-Les-Moulineaux, Ramallah, Lahore and Jalandhar, the Council also resolve that it will not twin with any further towns (or forge town twinning like bonds of friendship but using different terminology).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To support the proposals</td>
<td>If the Council agrees to the proposals, it will result in enhanced cultural links and mutual understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To not support the proposals</td>
<td>If the Council does not agree to the proposal, the links will continue but in a haphazard and non-consistent way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Key Implications

Implications of the Town Twinning

4.1 There are no legal responsibilities which relate to town twinning agreements as the arrangements are not underpinned by any statute. However, different council have different approaches to the extent of support that it provided by the authority itself to its town twinning arrangements.

4.2 In Hounslow, the practice has developed that after twinning has been agreed by the two councils involved, most further exchanges and events are organised by a dedicated town twinning organization.

4.3 As such, it is part of the proposals of this report that the Council formally confirms that town twinning initiatives should not result in the Council incurring any cost, with the exception of any ceremonial or mayoral visit with such expenses being borne by the mayoral budget for events in the usual way. No specific funding would be required. Where any further funding is required (eg for pupil exchange trips), such decisions be made according to the formal council decision making process to ensure transparency.
4.4 The nature of town twinning agreements is identified as being to foster and develop mutual understanding and respect between the residents of both council areas. There is no commitment to undertake any specific programme of activities by the Council itself with any of its twin towns.

5. Financial Details

a) Financial Impact On The Budget

As stated above, it is part of the proposals of this report that the Council formally confirms that town twinning initiatives should not result in the Council incurring any cost, with the exception of any ceremonial or mayoral visit with such expenses being borne by the mayoral budget for events in the usual way. No specific funding would be required. Where any further funding is required (eg for pupil exchange trips), such decisions be made according to the formal council decision making process to ensure transparency.

b) Comments of the Director of Finance & Corporate Services

This report does not commit the Council to additional expenditure.

6. Legal Details/Comments of the Head of Governance

As set out in the main body of this report, town twinning is not underpinned by any statutory provisions. In addition the wording of the proposed charter of town twinning does not seek to place any specific responsibilities on the Council.

Although there is no stated end date on any town twinning relationship, the Council would be able to terminate any and all of its twinning relationships in the future should it be considered appropriate to do so by the passing of a resolution at Borough Council.

7. Value For Money

There are no value for money implications in this report.

8. Sustainability Impact Appraisal

There are no sustainability issues arising from this report.

9. Risk Management

There are no risks arising from this report.

10. Links to Council Priorities
This report relates to the Council’s priority to create an ambitious council which improves the lives of residents and works in a transparent way.

11. **Equalities, Human Rights and Community Cohesion**

There are no additional implications in relation to equalities, human rights and community cohesion.

12. **Staffing/Workforce and Accommodation implications:**

There are no implications in relation to staffing or accommodation.

13. **Property and Assets**

There are no implications for property or assets.

14. **Any Other Implications**

There are no further implications.

15. **Consultation**

There has been no consultation in relation to the recommendations in this report.

16. **Timetable for Implementation**

If the Council agrees to the recommendations, they will be immediately implemented.

17. **Appendices**

There are no appendices to this report.

18. **Background Information**

There is no background information in relation to this report. However, several public documents have been used for research purposes as follows:

The Local Government International Bureau Document “Take Your Partners”  
http://www.local.gov.uk/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=175d8d6b-49f4-47fa-acb2-a5476d5b84b4&groupId=10180
1. Details of Recommendations

Cabinet will be asked to:
- Note and discuss this report on quarter 1 2016/17 performance data.
- Note the London-wide LAPS performance data for Q4 and year end 2015/16 (retrospective).
- Note the annual Local Government Ombudsman report and statistics for the Council.

If the recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

The report sets out performance for the Council priorities that have already benefited residents and will continue to do so through the quarterly monitoring of specific targets and priorities in the Hounslow Business Plan 2016/17.

2. Report Summary

1. This report deals with quarter one performance data, covering the period April to June 2016. It covers performance for all of the Business Plan performance indicators (BPIs) and milestones (BPMs), under the seven themes of the 2016/17 Business Plan agreed by Cabinet on 19/07/16.

Annex A sets out the performance and other details for each of these measures. It is formatted so that it can be read in black and white if required. A guide to understanding the information contained in the pack is provided at the start of Annex A.
2. This report also includes Action Plans in Annexes B and C setting out how performance will be improved where indicators are currently rated amber or red.

Annex B provides details of Draft Action Plans. Action plans are required where performance has not met the target (amber/red). These action plans have not been approved by the relevant Lead Member. There are 8 draft action plans in quarter one.

Annex C provides details of Approved Action Plans. These action plans have been approved by the relevant Lead Member. There are 9 approved action plans in quarter one. An action plan has not been produced for BPI 84 (budget overspend, RAG-rated red), as mitigation plans are being drawn up to deal with overspend at service-level, which will be reported to Cabinet separately on a monthly basis.

3. This report also includes the London Councils retrospective dashboard showing Hounslow’s performance compared to the London average for the previous quarter (2015/16 quarter four) and at year end 2015/16.

Annex D provides the London Councils benchmarking (Local Authority Performance Solution, LAPS) dashboard, comparing Hounslow with other London authorities for the period January to March 2016.

Annex E provides the London Councils benchmarking (Local Authority Performance Solution, LAPS) time series dashboard, comparing Hounslow with other London authorities at year end 2015/16.

Finally, Annex (F) summarises information on the Local Government Ombudsman review of Stage 4 Complaints about the London Borough of Hounslow for the year 2015/16.

Cabinet is asked to note and discuss the progress made, and consider the Action Plans for improving amber and red performance.

3. Overview of quarter one performance 2016/17

There are 82 local performance indicators in total; 45 have outturns, all of which have been RAG rated (the data required for RAG-rating the remaining 37 indicators has not been released yet). The majority are green, as shown in figure 1.

- **Red** – did not meet their target - 13 indicators (29%)
- **Amber** – close to achieving their target - 6 indicators (13%)
- **Green** – achieved or exceeded their target - 26 indicators (58%)
Figure 1: summary of Red/ Amber/ Green status of 45 indicators that have been measured in Q1 2016/17

Across London (according to London Councils benchmarking of 35 performance indicators for Q4 2015/16 – see dashboard in Annex D) we performed within the middle 50% of other Local Authorities for 22 indicators, within the top 25% for 7 indicators, and within the bottom 25% for 6 indicators (as shown in figure 2). More detail is provided in the section 4.8.

Figure 2: our performance compared to other London Authorities across 35 indicators collected by London Councils

4. Key achievements in Q1 2016/17

This section provides an overview of performance in quarter one under each of the Business Plan themes.

4.1 Keeping you safe

We are still awaiting data on MOPAC crime (BPI 11), Anti-social Behaviour (BPI 12) and reports on Violence against women and girls (BPI 13) from our Partner – The Metropolitan Police Service.

Our annual measure for young people re-offending shows a 1% decrease over the previous year (BPI 17 (R)). Despite this slight improvement, reoffending rate (44.8%) is still below target (40.38%) and above the London (43.2%) and England (37.7%) averages. An approved action plan has been developed to address BPI 17 (see Annex C).
4.2 Bright Futures for our Children

46.3% of child protection conferences took place within 18 days, moving this indicator from amber to red in quarter one (BPI 21 (a) (R)), and lowering our performance by 34% compared to same period in the previous year. A draft action plan has been developed to address BPI 21 (see Annex B).

The number of vulnerable children placed with foster carers increased by 16.7% compared to the previous quarter (BPI 22 (G)); and with 23 of 26 interventions being successful, we had 88.46% success-rate at keeping young people with their families in quarter one (BPI 23 (G)).

4.3 Good Quality Homes and Jobs

The number of households living in B&B accommodation (BPI 31 (G)) fell by 2% compared to the previous quarter. As a result of moving households from B&B into other forms of temporary accommodation, 13% fewer households were in B&B compared to same period in the previous year. We also completed fifty-seven affordable homes (BPI 37 (G)) in quarter one – a 33% improvement compared to the same period in 2015/16.

In quarter one, 55.6% fewer people claimed Job Seekers Allowance in our five wards with the highest proportion of claimants (BPI 32 (G)) – with this reduction being lowest in Heston West (45% decrease) and highest in Hounslow Heath (63% decrease).

4.4 A Cleaner, Greener Borough

We are still awaiting household waste recycling (BPI 41 (a)) and recovery data (BPI 41 (b)) from our Partner - SITA.

We have exceeded our target for the quality of roads and pavements (BPI 44 (G); and increased the number of street lighting units completed by 1.51% compared to the previous quarter (BPI 48 (G)).

We have also remained on track to meet levels of detritus, graffiti, and fly posting (BPI 43 (b-d) (G)) on our streets. However, Level of litter (BPI 43 (a) (A)) on our streets is 5.67% higher than it was in the same period in the previous year. This may be attributed to a notable increase in commercially sourced litter as well as increase in bags put out early/late for waste collection. A draft action plan has been developed to address BPI 43 (a) (see Annex B).

4.5 Active, Healthy Communities

We exceeded our target for quarter one by offering 4,618 health checks to our eligible population – a 96% improvement over the same period in the previous year. We also measure how many health checks are received – this quarter we reached 46.5%, meeting our target (BPI 51 (b) (G)).

4.6 Help & Support for Our Residents Who Need It Most

The rate of younger adults (aged 18-64) entering residential care (BPI 61 (A)) fell by 0.6 per 100,000 population compared to the previous quarter, moving this indicator from red to amber. An approved action plan has been developed to address BPI 61 (see Annex C).

Following a steady fall since the previous year – by 73.2 per 100,000, we have met our target to reduce permanent admissions of older people to residential care homes in quarter one, meaning this indicator is now in green (BPI 62
The number of completed carers’ assessments has increased by 6% compared to the same period in the previous year (BPI 63 (G)); and 35% of people receiving personal care in quarter one had their care packages successfully closed within 28 days (BPI 66 (G)).

We have performed below target (95.2%) for the proportion (85%) of older people still at home 91 days after discharge in quarter four 2015/16 (BPI 64 (R)); have not met our target for increasing the percentage of people receiving personal care who have a positive outcome from the Community Recovery Service (BPI 65 (R)); and have also performed below our target for reducing delayed transfers of care from hospital which are attributable to adult social care (BPI 67 (R)). Approved action plans have been developed to address BPI 64, BPI 65 and BPI 67 (see Annex C).

4.7 An ambitious council which improves the lives of residents & works in a transparent & efficient way

There has been some positive improvements in customer services compared to the same period in the previous year. We met our targets this quarter by collecting 30.78% Council Tax (BPI 85 (G)) and 28.89% Business Rates (BPI 86 (G)), paying 93.50% of our creditors within 30 days (BPI 88 (G)), and spending 5.8% of our total projected capital spend for 2016/17 (BPI 83 (G)). However, due to a single large debt not collected on time, our debt collection within 60 days was slightly (0.15%) below our target of 90% (BPI 87 (A)). Due to this slight variation between performance and target, it was agreed that the development of an action plan should be waived for BPI 87.

The general fund budget was overspent by £8.3 million at the end of the quarter (BPI 84 (R)), service-level mitigation plans are being developed to deal with this, which will be monitored by Cabinet on a monthly basis.

We have rolled out Worksmart to 33.1% of Civic Centre based employees (BPI 81 (G)) and are on track to meet our 50% target by January 2017. However, we did not meet our target for reducing time lost to sickness absence (BPI 79 (R)), and non-permanent staffing which has increased by 4.1% since year-end 2015/16 (BPI 80 (R)). Our most recent Staff Survey (2015) showed that our staff engagement index is 60 (BPI 78 (A)). Approved action plans have been developed to address BPI 78, BPI 79, and BPI 80 (see Annex C).

We exceeded our quarterly target for reducing face to face customer contact (BPI 74 (a)), and for reducing the number of customer complaints received at stage 1, 2, 3, and 4 (BPI 71 (a-d) (G)). The percentage of complaints upheld has also reduced by 13.4% compared to the previous quarter (BPI 72 (G)).

With regards to our stage 4 Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) complaints, the latest annual LGO report showed that our uphold rate in the 2015/16 financial year was 71%. 169 complaints were made to the Ombudsman about The London Borough of Hounslow. 178 decisions were made as a result, out of which 12 (7%) were not upheld and 29 (16%) were upheld. For further information, see annex F.

Although we have made some progress against providing more timely responses to Member enquiries (BPI 73 (c) (A)) and MP enquiries (BPI 73 (d) (A)), our performance in quarter one was below agreed targets.
Targets to reduce the following were also not met in quarter one:

- More timely responses to Complaints (BPI 73 (a) (R))
- More timely responses to Freedom of Information Requests (BPI 73 (b) (R))
- Less customer contact by telephone (BPI 74 (b) (R))
- More customer contact via our website (BPI 74 (c) (R))
- Fewer customer calls abandoned (BPI 75 (R))

Draft action plans have been developed to address these Customer Relations indicators in amber and red (see Annex B).

Our web and digital programme for the council has started with a soft launch of the new council website expected in mid-January 2017. This will provide residents with access to a customer account and improved ability to report, apply, pay and request services. This will also provide the foundation to increase our channel shift from face to face and telephone contact to better value channels (online). This is expected to positively impact on BPI 74 (b) and BPI 74 (c) in quarter four.

4.8 LAPS – London-wide benchmarking Q4 2015/16 dashboard – Annex D

NOTE: This London-wide data is always a quarter behind our local data as it takes time for London Councils to collect and process.

We outperformed the London averages for twenty-two measures and are a ‘higher performing borough’1 for the following:

- Children subject of child protection plan for a 2nd time or more (DB 05)
- Agency workers in children’s social care (DB 07)
- Time taken to process changes to Housing Benefit claims (DB 09)
- Children in need achieving at least Level 4 at KS2 (DB 12)
- 65+ permanent admissions to care homes (DB 19)
- Council Tax collection (DB 32)
- Non Domestic Rates collection (DB 33)

However, on three measures we were ‘quite below average’:

- 18-64 permanent admissions to care homes (DB 18)
- Care leavers aged 19-21, now in education, employment or training (DB 22)
- ‘Other’ planning application determined within 8 weeks (DB 36).

London Councils was unable to make a comparison for one indicator as there was not enough data from other councils:

- School exclusions

4.9 LAPS – London-wide benchmarking year-end 2015/16 dashboard – Annex E

This section summarises findings from the 2015/16 year-end dashboard, recently published by London Councils.

---

1 The LAPS report highlights where Local Authorities are amongst the ‘lower performing 25%’, ‘middle performing 25%’, and ‘higher performing 25%’. It also highlights where performance is ‘quite below average’, ‘significantly below average’, ‘quite above average’, and ‘significantly above average’. The average is calculated across all London Local Authorities that contributed data for a particular indicator.
We outperformed the London averages for 21 measures at year end 2015/16 including the following:
- Robbery, burglary dwelling and car theft rate (DB 02)
- Notifiable crime rate (DB 03)
- Children subject of child protection plan for a 2\textsuperscript{nd} time or more (DB 05)
- Vacancy rate of children's social workers (DB 06)
- Children’s Social workers who are agency workers (DB 07)
- Days taken to process new Housing Benefit claims (DB 09)
- Days taken to process change of circumstances for Housing Benefit (DB 10)
- Pupils achieving Level 4 at KS2 (DB 11)
- Children in need achieving at least Level 4 at KS2 (DB 12)
- Level of young persons not in education, employment or training (DB 15)
- Rate of permanent admissions to care homes (age 65+) (DB 19)
- Clients accessing long term community support (DB 20)
- Carers receiving carer specific services (DB 21)
- Working age people on out of work benefits (DB 23)
- Households in temporary accommodation (DB 24)
- Homeless applications accepted as priority (DB 25)
- Household waste recycling (DB 27)
- Land assessed as having acceptable levels of graffiti (DB 30)
- Land assessed as having acceptable levels of fly-posting (DB 31)
- Council Tax collection (DB 32)
- Non-domestic Rates collection (DB 33)
- Working days lost due to sickness (DB 34)

However, on three measures we were ‘quite below average’:
- 18-64 permanent admissions to care homes (DB 18)
- Care leavers aged 19-21, now in education, employment or training (DB 22)
- ‘Other’ planning application determined within 8 weeks (DB 36). \textbf{Note:} Poor performance in quarter two 2015/16 had a knock on effect on the overall annual performance for DB 36. However, in Q1 2016/17, our performance increased to 90%.

London Councils was unable to produce data for one indicator as there was not enough data from other returning councils:

- School exclusions

5. Key Implications

Not Applicable/ No direct implications.

6. Financial Details

a) Financial Impact on the Budget
b) Financial Background

Not Applicable/ No direct implications.

c) Comments of the Assistant Director Strategic Finance

The costs of delivering service performance targets set out in the 2016/17 Business Plan needs to be met from within approved budgets.

7. Legal
a) Comments of Head of Governance

There are no legal implications arising from this report.

8. Value for Money

Not Applicable/ No direct implications.

9. Sustainability Impact Appraisal

Not Applicable/ No direct implications.

10. Risk Management

Not Applicable/ No direct implications.

11. Links to Council Priorities

This report directly addresses all the Councils priorities through the monitoring and reporting of business plan indicators and milestones. A new business plan for the period to March 2017 has been adopted at July Cabinet, to reflect the new Corporate Plan priorities.

12. Equalities, Human Rights and Community Cohesion

The Council has to take account of its Equalities Duties under the Equality Act 2010, in particular to:

(a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by the Act;
(b) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;
(c) Foster good relations between equalities groups

An initial assessment highlights that equalities may be relevant to two of the Business Plan themes: ‘Bright futures for the borough’s children and young people’ and ‘an active and healthy borough’. The data on attainment levels and take-up of health checks can if disaggregated help to provide further insights to the profile of disadvantage on different equality groups. This information can help effective targeting of actions to reduce disadvantage for particular groups. Further analysis will determine if there are any disproportionate disadvantages requiring more attention.

13. Staffing/Workforce and Accommodation implications:

Not Applicable/ No direct implications.

14. Property and Assets

Not Applicable/ No direct implications.

15. Any Other Implications

Not Applicable/ No direct implications.

16. Consultation
The information in the report has been collated from the council officers responsible for managing the services covered. The council’s partners, the Metropolitan Police, West London Mental Health Trust and Public Health/CCG have been consulted over the information relating to the partnership indicators and milestones the council does not have direct control over.

17. Timetable for Implementation

Not Applicable/ No direct implications.

18. Appendices

Annex A contains full details for each indicator or milestone and a guide to understanding the information and RAG rating applied.
Annex B contains details of draft action plans.
Annex C contains details of approved action plans.
Annex D provides details of Hounslow’s performance against LAPS comparator data for quarter 4 2015/16.
Annex E provides details of Hounslow’s performance against LAPS comparator data for the year 2015/16
Annex F provides information on the Local Government Ombudsman review of Stage 4 Complaints about the London Borough of Hounslow’s for the year 2015/16.

19. Background Information

None.

REPORT ENDS
The Business Plan
2016 - 2017
Pls & Milestones
Annex A
**How to use this pack:**

Annex A covers all Business Plan Indicators (BPIs) and Business Plan Milestones (BPM) under the 7 themes of the Business Plan agreed by Cabinet on 19/07/16. Information includes **Quarter One** (April to June) 2016/17 performance, quarter one/annual targets, and Red/Amber/Green (RAG) status. Supporting narrative is provided to explain the performance and status of each PI and milestone in more detail.

The addition of the letters G/A/R within the quarter one column makes it easier to determine performance.

It also includes the London Area Performance System (LAPS) Dashboard, with comparative performance data against other London local authorities.

The pack can now also be printed in black and white if required. The addition of the letters G/A/R within the quarter one outturn column makes it easier to determine performance.

**Red/Amber/Green ratings**

In this report Business Plan Performance Indicators (BPIs) are assessed as follows:
- **Green (G)** Target met/exceeded.
- **Amber (A)** Performing within an acceptable level of tolerance.
- **Red (R)** Outturn is below target and is not within an acceptable tolerance.

**Business Plan Milestones (BPMs) are assessed as follows:**
- **Green**: On time and within budget
- **Amber**: At risk
- **Red**: Immediate action required

The **Polarity** column tells you if ‘High’ or ‘Low’ numbers (or percentages) mean better performance. Each PI and Milestone has an associated ‘**Threshold**’. This is how we decide the RAG rating. If the threshold is, say 10%, then performance of up to 10% worse than the performance target will be Amber and worse than 10% will be Red. Thresholds vary depending on each indicator.
## Theme 1: KEEPING YOU SAFE

### Pledge 1
The Council has pledged to make Hounslow a safe borough by reducing crime and anti-social behaviour, and tackling drug and alcohol misuse that can lead to crime.

### Quarterly Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BPM 9 | **Cllr Sue Sampson**  
Brendon Walsh  
(Peter Lerner) | Update and refresh the Hounslow Prostitution Strategic Action Plan | Quarterly | Community Safety Partnership | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

### Summary of products delivered during the quarter being reported:
N/A

### Summary of products to be delivered in the next quarter:
Work on the refresh of the Hounslow Prostitution Strategic Action Plan has not yet commenced. This is due to begin in quarter two and be completed by quarter four 2016/17.

### Commentary
See commentary above.

| BPI 10 | **Cllr Sue Sampson**  
Brendon Walsh  
(Peter Lerner) | Increase in reports of hate crime to specialist services via a range of awareness raising activities | Quarterly | Metropolitan Police Service - Hounslow | High | N/A (new indicator) | N/A (2016/17 outturn will be used to set baseline for next financial year) | N/A | Next data available Q2 2016/17 |
**Commentary**

This is a new performance indicator which is still being developed. As a result, no target has been set for 2016/17. 2016/17 outturn will form the baseline for this indicator.

Data will be available from quarter two 2016/17.

| Cllr Sue Sampson | Fewer incidents of burglary, robbery, theft from motor vehicle, theft from person, theft of motor vehicle, violence, criminal damage and drug offences | Quarterly | Metropolitan Police Service - Hounslow | Low | 9,229 | Maintain 2015/16 outturn | 5% | Awaiting verified data from MPS |

**Commentary:**

Note: This following is a tentative commentary, still under review by the MPS.

There has been an increase in reported incidents of the 7 MOPAC crimes with the exception of Theft from a Motor Vehicle, which has seen a slight reduction.

Tranche 1 of SMART WATER (a forensic asset monitoring system) has completed with over 1,400 properties in the Feltham and Chiswick areas being provided packs. Tranche 2 is due to start and will extend coverage to Heston and Osterley.

Proactive operations by the Neighbourhood Police team (NPT) have had some significant results including a 2.7% reduction in personal robbery. There is a planned overhaul of the Borough CCTV including assessment of locations with a view to repositioning some to allow better coverage.

Motor Vehicle Crime (particularly theft of motor vehicle and criminal damage) continue to be a challenge for the police. Many motor vehicle thefts relate to mopeds which are easily taken as they can be lifted and carried or wheeled away. Operation Venice (which focuses upon moped crime) is in place, and a bespoke database of mopeds/motorcycles has been developed to give police knowledge of the vehicles involved in crime and allow greater enforcement.

Criminal Damage offences, particularly of motor vehicle offences is an area that is on the increase and challenging for the police. Increased patrols in areas which have experienced offending of this type is having little effect due to the opportunistic nature of these incidents.

Theft from motor vehicles has gone down partly due to community engagement advising the public to not leave items on display. Increased patrols in hotspots whilst targeting known offenders has a significant impact upon this type of crime.

Drugs performance is showing reductions of 5.6% however, this is not a positive as we are seeking to increase our levels of detecting drug offences. Proactive operations include identifying offenders on CCTV to allow directed/proactive stops. There is also renewed focus to target middle level drug dealers which allow police to identify and target the main orchestrators.
The Metropolitan Police continues to work with private industry to implement methods to design out crime. Enhanced patrols in areas of high footfall and engaging with the public, increasing their awareness of their surroundings and thus preventing them from becoming victims of crime.

| BPI 12 | Cllr Sue Sampson  
| Brendon Walsh (Peter Lerner) | Reduce the risk and harm caused by Anti-social behaviour (ASB) in addition to achieving a reduction in Violence with Injury offences | Quarterly | Metropolitan Police Service - Hounslow | Low | 7,776 reports | 20% reduction on 2015/16 outturn | 10% | Awaiting verified data from MPS |

**Commentary**

**Note:** This following is a tentative commentary, still under review by the MPS.

In respect of ASB - performance is positive with a decrease of 9 offences (-0.4%). This is a significant success as most other Boroughs have experienced increases in incidents of ASB. Partnership working continues to yield success and Hounslow Police have recently appointed a new Licensing Sergeant who has already had success in tackling two licensed premises which have historically attracted higher numbers of ASB incidents. Hounslow Police continue with Operation's Equinox and Kerbsafe, targeting issues of Violence with injury, ASB and high volume crime.

In partnership with Hounslow Council and other Partners, Hounslow Police are in the process of creating a Community MARAC which is anticipated to significantly impact upon ASB incidents by dealing with persistent offenders. This year, there is renewed focus on reducing drugs offending, as research indicates that much of the Violence with injury is linked to drug dealing and the resulting violence.

| BPI 13 | Cllr Sue Sampson  
| Brendon Walsh (Peter Lerner) | Increase reporting of violence against women and girls | Quarterly | Police | High | 3,089 reports / referrals based on data from 2 agencies | 5% increase on 2015/2016 outturn | 25% | Awaiting verified data from MPS |

**Commentary**

Awaiting commentary from MPS.

| BPM 20 | Cllr Sue Sampson  
| Brendon Walsh (Peter Lerner) | More people feeling safe | Quarterly | Community Safety Partnership | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
Summary of products delivered during the quarter being reported:
- Estates Enforcement patrols were extended to 2 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights from April. In Q1 the Estates Enforcement Officers investigated 404 incidents of alleged anti-social behaviour on estates, and identified 22 incidents of criminal activity for further investigation by the police.
- 150th anniversary community events were held in the Heston and Chiswick fire stations, providing local residents with increased awareness of fire safety in the home particularly targeting those considered to be ‘most vulnerable’ in the community.
- The Junior Citizenship Programme engaged with Year 6 students from 30 primary schools across the borough to raise awareness of safety issues prior to their transition to secondary school and to increase engagement with police, fire services, Transport for London, the RNLI, and Council departments.
- Grant funding for a range of schemes for young and older people such as
  - youth clubs, Duke of Edinburgh schemes
  - Early intervention anti-crime workshops to Year 6 students in Hounslow schools.
  - First Aid and skills-based training.
  - Preventing social isolation amongst older people by building social networks including lunch clubs, weekly exercise sessions, lunches & talks
  - Telephone befriending service offered by Age UK
- Commissioning / funding a Hate Crime Outreach and Support Service (brought in-house from 1 June 2016)

Summary of products to be delivered in the next quarter:
None provided.

Commentary
See summary of products delivered during the quarter being reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 14 (a)</td>
<td>Cllr Corinna Smart Brendon Walsh (Imran Choudhury)</td>
<td>Increase proportion of opiate users that successfully complete treatment and do not re-present</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>7.80%</td>
<td>1% (i.e. ≥7.8% green, 6.8% - 7.7% amber, &lt;6.8% red)</td>
<td>Next data release Q3 2016/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary
This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in quarter three 2016/17.
### BPI 14 (b)

| **Cllr Corinna Smart**  
| Brendon Walsh  
| (Imran Choudhury) | Increase proportion of alcohol users in treatment that successfully complete it | Annual | **TBC** | High | 40.20% | 55.00% | 10% (i.e. ≥55.0% green, 45.0% - 55.0% amber, <45.0% red) | Next data release Q3 2016/17 |

**Commentary**
This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in quarter three 2016/17.

**Note:** Next published data would have a time lag of at least 18 months.

### BPI 15 210

| **Cllr Tom Bruce**  
| Alan Adams  
| (Jacqui McShannon) | Fewer young people enter the youth justice system | Annual | **Youth Offending Service** | Low | 119 first time entrants (FTE) | 140 first time entrants (FTE) | 5% | Next data release Q4 2016/17 |

**Commentary**
This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in quarter four 2016/17.

**Note:** Next published data would have a time lag of at least 18 months.

### BPI 16

| **Cllr Sue Sampson**  
| Brendon Walsh  
| (Peter Lerner) | Fewer adults re-offending from the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Cohort | Annual | **London Community Rehabilitation Company** | High | 1. 67% of IOM offenders successfully completed their license or community order  
2. 74% of IOM offenders reduced the number of offences over a 12 month period  
65% of IOM offenders successfully completing their licence or Community Order | 65% | 5% | Next data release Q4 2016/17 |
**Commentary**
This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in quarter four 2016/17.

| BPI 17 | Cllr Tom Bruce  
Alan Adams  
(Jacqui McShannon) | Fewer young people re-offend  
Annual | Youth offending Service (YOS) | Low | 45.8%  
(2012/13) | 40.38% | 0% | 44.8%  
(R)  
(2013/14) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>The reoffending rate (44.8%) is still above the London average (43.2%) and England average (37.7%). The reoffending rate of the out of court disposals population is higher than expected, making this performance indicator red. An action plan has been developed and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> The figures cover the July 2013 to June 2014 cohort using Youth Justice Board methodology; crimes during the whole year determine the cohort, rather than specific segments of the year. Reoffending was monitored the following year and convictions over a further year. Only offences resulting in conviction count.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is an annual indicator so the next available data will be released in quarter 1 2017/18.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BPI 18 | Cllr Amrit Mann  
Brendon Walsh  
(Peter Lerner) | Reduce road traffic accidents  
Annual (January to December, full results released in March/April) | Police | Low | 918  
(Jan - Nov 2015) | 714 | 10% | Next data release Q2 2016/17 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in quarter two 2016/17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BPI 19  
(a) | Cllr Sue Sampson  
Brendon | More people feeling safe: a) during the day  
Biennial | Community Safety Partnership | High | 91%  
(2014/15) | 91% | 2% | Next data release |
### Theme 2: BRIGHTER FUTURES FOR OUR CHILDREN

**Pledge 2**
The Council has pledged to invest in education to provide a better choice of local schools for local children.

#### Quarterly Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr Tom Bruce</td>
<td>Children and young people are kept safe from abuse or neglect</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>81.70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46.3% (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary
We did not meet our target for keeping children and young people safe from abuse and neglect. In Q1, there were 67 Initial Child Protection Conferences, of which 31 were on time. In response to our poor performance, the Intake Team Managers have undertaken a targeted review of the current practice by frontline Assistant Team Managers (ATMs) who are responsible for authorising the outcome of strategy meetings. Any delay in this authorisation is likely to negatively impact on timeliness. The review uncovered variability in how promptly ATMs were authorising strategy meeting outcomes on the Children’s Services database. Immediate action has been taken to address this with ATMs to ensure that expectations concerning prompt authorisation are explicit, and we expect to see significant improvement in ICPC timeliness as a result.
Vulnerable children who need care outside of the home are placed with appropriate foster families. Quarterly

Commentary
Note: This indicator measures the proportion of children who receive an In House foster carer out of those who are housed In-House or with an IFA, in the month in which their initial need arises. Independent fostering agency (IFA) placements was slightly above average in quarter one. 33 children were placed with an In House carer out of a total cohort of 38, making this performance indicator green.

Young people are supported to stay with their families wherever possible. Quarterly

Commentary
Note: This indicator monitors two preventive services:
- Family & Adolescent Assertive Support Team (FAAST)
- Specialist Intensive Support Programme (SISP).
It checks their success in delivering interventions that keep young people with their families by monitoring their subsequent care status. This is achieved by monitoring the proportion of children subject to an intervention who did not come into care, using a snapshot date of one year after the last day of the quarter the intervention ended.

There were 16 SISP children discharged during quarter one 2014/15, of whom 14 were successful (i.e. not in care) as at 30/06/16. There were 10 FAAST children discharged in quarter one of 2015/16, of whom 9 children were not in care at the end of the quarter, providing an overall outturn of 88.46%.
| BPI 21 | **Cllr Tom Bruce**  
Alan Adams  
(Jacqui McShannon) | Children and young people are kept safe from abuse, neglect and sexual exploitation | Annual | **Council** | High | N/A | 20% | 10% | Next data release Q4 2016/17 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in Q4 2016/17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BPI 24 | **Cllr Tom Bruce**  
Alan Adams  
(Michael Marks) | Young people achieve their potential at Key Stage 4 | Annual | **Schools** | High | 65.20% | 67% | 2% | Next data release Q3 2016/17 |
| **Commentary** | This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in Q3 2016/17. | | | | | | | | |
| BPI 24 | **Cllr Tom Bruce**  
Alan Adams  
(Michael Marks) | Young people achieve their potential at Key Stage 4 (Progress 8 target) | Annual | **Schools** | High | N/A | 0.4 | 0.1 | Next data release Q3 2016/17 |
| **Commentary** | This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in Q3 2016/17. | | | | | | | | |
| BPI 25 | **Cllr Corinna Smart**  
Brendon Walsh  
(Imran Choudhury) | Fewer children are obese (Reception) | Annual | **CCG** | Low | 9.90% | 9.6% | 0.30% | Next data release Q4 2016/17 |
| BPI 25 | **Cllr Corinna Smart**  
Brendon Walsh  
(Imran Choudhury) | Fewer children are obese (Year 6) | Annual | **CCG** | Low | 22.60% | 21.8 | 0.80% | Next data release Q4 2016/17 |
**Commentary**

This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in quarter four.

**Note:** next published data would have a time lag of at least 18 months.

From September there will be 2 new programmes in Hounslow. The Health, Exercise, Nutrition, for the Really Young (HENRY) Project has been commissioned to deliver a Childhood Obesity Prevention Programme for 0-5 year olds, working with children centres, health visiting service and primary care. Brentford Football Club Community Sports Trust and Sport Impact will also be delivering a programme to get primary school children and their families more active.

| BPI 26 | Cllr Tom Bruce  
Alan Adams  
(Michael Marks) | Children are ready to start school | Annual | Council | High | 64.5% | 68% | 2% | Next data release Q2 2016/17 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in Q2 2016/17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BPI 27 | Cllr Tom Bruce  
Alan Adams  
(Michael Marks) | There are enough school places for all Hounslow children | Annual | Council | High | 150 | 90 | 0 | Next data release Q2 2016/17 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in Q2 2016/17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme 3: GOOD QUALITY HOMES AND JOBS

**Pledge 3**
The Council has pledged to secure a further 3000 affordable homes in Hounslow between the period 2014/15 and 2017/18 (at a rate of 650 to 850 per year). These will include 400 completed council homes, affordable homes secured on developments granted planning permission, empty homes brought back into use, opportunities created through existing council stock, low cost home ownership initiatives, and innovative partnership arrangements.

**Pledge 4**
The Council has pledged to provide 300 new apprenticeship places for young people and more local skills training.

**Pledge 5**
The Council has pledged to deliver major regeneration for Brentford and Hounslow Town and a master plan to improve Feltham.

### Quarterly Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Cllr Katherine Dunne (Peter Matthew)</td>
<td>Fewer households living in temporary Bed and breakfast (B&amp;B) accommodation</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Quarter 1 = 8%</td>
<td>7.36% (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**
Of 1,018 Households in Temporary Accommodation at the end of June, 75 were accommodated in Bed and Breakfast (7.36%). This performance indicator is currently on track to achieve its target of 2% by the end of the year.

| BPI 32 | Cllr Steve Curran (Liz Meagher) | Less local unemployment (particularly in those areas most affected – Hanworth, Heston West, Bedfont,) | Quarterly | DWP/Jobcentre Plus | High | 29.3% reduction achieved in five most affected wards | 3% reduction in five most affected wards | 10% | 55.6% reduction achieved in five most affected wards (G) |
Commentary
From the end of Quarter 1 2015/16 to the end of Quarter 1 2016/17 there has been a total decrease of 55.6 per cent [520 JSA claimants - a reduction from 935 to 415 JSA claimants] in the five most affected wards. The percentage decrease varied among the individual wards, ranging from the lowest in Heston West (45 per cent decrease) to the highest in Hounslow Heath (63 per cent decrease) over the period.

BPI 37

Cllr Katherine Dunne
Alan Adams
(Peter Matthew)

3000 additional affordable homes secured between 2014- 2018, including 400 council homes
Quarterly
Council
High

Annual outturn: 1,014 affordable units secured
Cumulative Total since the start of the Pledge period (April 2014): 1,723 (of which 161 are Council home completions)

650
Quarter 1 = 50
Quarter 2 = 150
Quarter 3 = 200
Quarter 4 = 250

10%

57 (of which 11 are council home completions).
Cumulative Total: 1780 units (of which 172 are council home completions) (G)

Commentary
We have met our target for this quarter and a further 171 units from the Council’s house building programme are on track to complete in this financial year.

Annual Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 37</td>
<td>Cllr Katherine Dunne, Alan Adams (Peter Matthew)</td>
<td>3000 additional affordable homes secured between 2014-2018, including 400 council homes</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1,014 affordable units secured</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>57 (of which 11 are council home completions). Cumulative Total: 1780 units (of which 172 are council home completions) (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BPI 33 | Cllr Tom Bruce  
Alan Adams (Michael Marks) | More young people will be in education, employment and training | Annual | Connexions | Low | 2.50% | 4.0% | 0.50% | Next data release Q4 2016/17 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in quarter four 2016/17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BPI 34 | Cllr Steve Curran  
Brendon Walsh (Alan Hesketh) | More businesses in the borough (larger businesses from properties registered for business rates) | Annual | Council | High | 7,141 | 7,235 | 30% | Next data release Q3 2016/17 |
| Commentary | This is an annual indicator. Data is published in September/October each year. Next available data will be released in quarter three 2016/17. |
| BPI 38 | Cllr Steve Curran  
Brendon Walsh (Alan Hesketh) | More businesses in the borough (smaller/start-up businesses from business rates, VAT and PAYE records) | Annual | Council | High | 11,860 | 12,000 | 10% | Next data release Q3 2016/17 |
| Commentary | This is an annual indicator. Data is published in September/October each year. Next available data will be released in quarter three 2016/17. |
| BPI 35 | Cllr Steve Curran  
Brendon Walsh (Alan Hesketh) | More local jobs | Annual | Council | High | 140,200 (2014/15) | 141,000 | 10% | Next data release Q3 2016/17 |
### Commentary

This is an annual indicator. Data is published in September/October each year. Next available data will be released in quarter three 2016/17.

| BPI 36 | Cllr Katherine Dunne | Improved tenant satisfaction with housing management services | Annual | Council | High | 83% (2014/15) | 80% | 5% | Next data release Q2 2017/18 |

**Commentary**

**Note:** The data for this indicator will be provided annually, based on a formal sample survey of our tenants and leaseholders. However, we have not run this survey since January 2014, due to our ongoing restructuring (and previously the return of the ALMO, Hounslow Homes). The next satisfaction survey will be conducted in summer 2017, when our new structure has bedded-in, which will provide an overall satisfaction result and a baseline for future improvements.

### Theme 4: A CLEANER, GREENER BOROUGH

**Pledge 6**

The Council has pledged to overhaul bin collection to boost recycling and get streets cleaner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarterly Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI 41 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI 41 (b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Commentary**

Waste data is yet to be received from our Partner - SITA.

Note: The waste section’s resources are currently stretched and priority has been given to the work necessary for the start of the new recycling and waste contract on 31 October. Our waste data return will be completed by the end of September and reported on in Q2 2016/17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 43 (a)</th>
<th>a) Maintain acceptable levels of litter</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Hounslow Highways</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>5.00%</th>
<th>9.00%</th>
<th>9.17% (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 43 (b)</td>
<td>b) Maintain acceptable levels of detritus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
<td>10.5% (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Amrit Mann</td>
<td>Brendon Walsh</td>
<td>Peter Lerner</td>
<td>c) Maintain acceptable levels of graffiti</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Hounslow Highways</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI 43 (c)</td>
<td>d) Maintain acceptable levels of fly posting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.68% (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BPI 43 (d)**

Data for the 4 measures were extracted from the Keep Britain Tidy (KBT) Tranche 1 2016/17 report. Performance of measures for litter and detritus have fallen compared to the 2015/16 outturn. There has been a notable increase in commercially sourced litter as well as increase in bags put out early/late which may have contributed to the level of litter seen on streets that were being surveyed. However, performance for three of four of the KBT measures are still within our corporate targets and permitted threshold, therefore achieving green statuses. An action plan has been developed to address BPI 43 (a). The KBT Tranche 1 report has highlighted a number of operational issues and Hounslow Highways have devised a Cleansing Improvement Plan to increase overall performance across the Project Cleansing Network. Progress and performance of this will be monitored.

**Note:** The KBT figures represent a snapshot of the area on the day of the survey and are undertaken 3 times a year. In addition Hounslow Highways conducts weekly cleansing performance assessments to show performance over the quarter. Current results of these assessments indicate the following levels: Litter-5.23%, Detritus-6.00%, Graffiti-0.29%, Fly-posting-0.09%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 44</td>
<td>Cllr Amrit Mann Brendan Walsh (Peter Lerner)</td>
<td>Improve the quality of roads and pavements (measure - Network Performance Gap (NPG) score)</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
<td>Hounslow Highways</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Milestone 7: 1.21 Milestone 8: 0.87</td>
<td>Contract requirement to meet Milestone targets: therefore use of threshold is not applicable</td>
<td>0.86 (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI 48</td>
<td>Cllr Amrit Mann Brendan Walsh (Peter Lerner)</td>
<td>Complete the street lighting replacement programme, excluding heritage lighting by June 2015</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
<td>Hounslow Highways</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>92.51%</td>
<td>Milestone 7: 94.02 Milestone 8: 96.01</td>
<td>Contract requirement to meet Milestone targets: therefore use of threshold is not applicable</td>
<td>94.02% -Milestone 7 (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

The NPG is reported to the Authority in the Milestone Adjustment Factor (MAF) Report which is submitted biannually in Q1 and Q3. The reported figure in Milestone 7 MAF report (Q1 16/17) has exceeded the Milestone 7 target and have already achieved Milestone 8 (Q3 16/17) target. Therefore Hounslow Highways are well on track and ahead of schedule in improving the quality of roads and pavements within the network.

Milestone 7 has concluded a green status for achieving the contractual target of 94.02% of 15,226 total street lights replaced.

**Note:** Data is reported biannually in line with the Milestone Adjustment Factor (MAF) which is submitted by Hounslow Highways to the Authority in Jan and July to conclude the 6-monthly contractual milestone.

For the purpose of this report, it will be reported in Q1 (Jul) and Q3 (Jan) only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 49</td>
<td><strong>Cllr Amrit Mann</strong> Brendon Walsh (Peter Lerner)</td>
<td>Reduce carbon footprint from landfill</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>minus (-)0.058 tonnes of CO2 eq. per tonne of waste managed</td>
<td>minus (-)0.088 tonnes of CO2 eq. per tonne of waste managed</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Next data release Q2 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>Last financial year was the first time this annual indicator was being monitored and data is provided by our external provider. By year end 2015/16, we were unable to report on this indicator due to a delay in receiving the data. This has still not been received. We expect this figure to be available after this report has been submitted to CLT and will reported to Cabinet in the next quarterly performance report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI 45</td>
<td><strong>Cllr Amrit Mann</strong> Brendon Walsh (Alan Hesketh)</td>
<td>Reduce nitrogen dioxide concentrations</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Cranford 31.4 Chiswick 51.7 Brentford 52.7 Heston 47.8 Hatton Cross 31.1 Feltham 43.3 Gunnersbury Avenue 58.4 (2014/15 outturn)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Next data release Q2 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in quarter two 2016/17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI 47</td>
<td><strong>Cllr Corinna Smart</strong> Brendon Walsh (Imran Choudhury)</td>
<td>Achieve green flag status for all 18 of our key parks by 2018</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Carillion</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>14 Parks to achieve Green Flag Status</td>
<td>16 Parks to achieve Green Flag Status</td>
<td>1 New Park plus existing green Flag Parks</td>
<td>Next data release Q2 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>This is an annual indicator. The next data will be published in quarter 2 2016/17 because the Green Flag judging takes place in the summer with...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
results announced in July/August.

### Biennial Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BPI 46 | Cllr Steve Curran  
Mary Harpley  
(Uttam Gurjal) | More residents satisfied with the borough as a place to live | Biennial | Council | High | 82% (2014/15) | 84% | 74% | Next data release Q3 2016/17 |

**Commentary**

The target is set for 2016/17 and RAG-rating will start in Q3 2016/17 when the next Residents' Survey takes place. Data will be reported every 2 years from the residents' survey, Q3 2014/15 was the first time and the next will be in Q3 2016/17. The most recent comparable local data from a 2008 survey showed that 70% residents were satisfied with Hounslow as a place to live; suggesting performance has improved by 12 percentage points over the last 6 years. LGA benchmarking data (2014) shows Hounslow's current performance is in line with the London average (82%).

### Theme 5: ACTIVE, HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

#### Annual Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT/ Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BPI 51 (a) | Cllr Corinna Smart  
Brendon Walsh  
(Imran Choudhury) | Fewer inactive (not doing at least 30mins of activity per week) residents in the borough | Annual | CSPAN | Low | 26.7% (2014/15) | 25.0% | 10% | Next data release Q3 2016/17 |

**Commentary**

This is an annual indicator. Next available data will be released in quarter three 2016/17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 53</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Foote Mary Harpley (Uttam Gujral)</td>
<td>More residents taking part in community life</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>27% (2014/15)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Next data release Q3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BPI 51 (b) | Cllr Corinna Smart Brendon Walsh (Imran Choudhury) | Increase health checks:  
  i) Number of offers of health checks to 40-74 year olds who haven’t had a check in previous 5 years  
  ii) Number of Completed health checks | Annual | CCG | High | i) 14,419 health checks offered  
  ii) 9,819 health checks completed | i) 11,958 health checks offered  
  ii) 7,892 health checks completed | 10% | | |
| Commentary | In Q1, we have exceeded our targets for Health checks offers and completed health checks. In total, 4,618 people were offered a health check of which 2,151 people attended. Referral pathway to the lifestyle intervention programmes (i.e. One You Hounslow and the new National Diabetes Prevention Programme) are being set up to ensure high risk patients are managed properly. |

| BPI 52 | Cllr Corinna Smart Brendon Walsh (Imran Choudhury) | Fewer residents smoking | Annual | CCG | High | 1,470 quitters | 1,200 quitters | 10% | Q1 data release in Q2 |
| Commentary | Due to the 6-8 weeks treatment outcome period, Q1 data will be reported in September 2016. Last year Stop smoking service exceeded its annual target of 1,450. The service is now commissioned under the new integrated wellbeing service (One You Hounslow) that was launched on the 1st of April 2016. |
Commentary
The target is set for 2016/17 and RAG-rating will start in Q3 2016/17 when the next Residents’ Survey takes place. Data will be reported every 2 years from the residents' survey, Q3 2014/15 was the first time and the next will be in Q3 2016/17. There is a long-term aim to exceed the London average (41%). As we are starting from a low base, and the new VCS contract implemented on 1/4/2015 will need time to bed down before this is achieved, the 2016/17 target has been set at 32%, but we expect to go significantly beyond this over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 54</th>
<th>Cllr Richard Foote</th>
<th>Residents have a greater sense of community/civic pride</th>
<th>Biennial</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>59% (2014/15)</th>
<th>61%</th>
<th>51%</th>
<th>Next data release Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commentary
The target is set for 2016/17 and RAG-rating will start in Q3 2016/17 when the next Residents’ Survey takes place. Data will be reported every 2 years from the residents' survey, Q3 2014/15 was the first time and the next will be in Q3 2016/17. There is no local data available for comparison. Hounslow's 2014/15 performance (59%) is in line with the London average (60%), according to a Cabinet Office survey (2013/14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 6: HELP AND SUPPORT WHEN YOU NEED IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 61</td>
<td>Cllr Kamaljit Kaur</td>
<td>Reducing permanent admissions of younger adults (aged 18-64) to residential and nursing care homes per 100,000 population (ASCOF 2A1)</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12 per 100,000 population</td>
<td>11 per 100,000 population</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11.4 (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commentary

Note: The 10% threshold is based on the number of admissions rather than the rate per 100,000 population.

In the period July 2015 - June 2016, there were 20 permanent admissions (11.4 permanent admissions per 100,000 population) aged 18-64. The Personal Care Framework (PCF) was set up to help prevent the admission of residents into residential and nursing placements by providing support services within the community. We are currently assessing the impact of the PCF on our residential admissions rate by measuring the rate of residential admissions since the PCF started. An action plan has been developed to address this indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 62</th>
<th>Cllr Kamaljit Kaur</th>
<th>Reducing permanent admissions of older people (aged 65+) to residential and nursing care homes per 100,000 population (ASCOF 2A2)</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>355.4 per 100,000 population</th>
<th>350 per 100,000 population</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>302.5 (G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commentary

Note: The 10% threshold is based on the number of admissions rather than the rate per 100,000 population.

In the period July 2015 - June 2016, there were 92 permanent admissions (302.5 permanent admissions per 100,000 population) aged 65+. The Personal Care Framework (PCF) was set up to help prevent the admission of residents into residential and nursing placements by providing support services within the community. We are currently assessing the impact of the PCF on our residential admissions rate by measuring the rate of residential admissions since the PCF started.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 63</th>
<th>Cllr Kamaljit Kaur</th>
<th>More support given to carers</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>1,972 carers assessments</th>
<th>1,576 carers assessments</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>1,612 carers assessments (G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Commentary

A cumulative total of 1,612 carers assessments were completed in the period July 2015 - June 2016; 1544 separate and 68 joint assessments. This indicator remains green.
| BPI 64 | Cllr Kamaljit Kaur  
Alan Adams (Mun-Thong Phung) | Increasing the proportion of older people (aged 65+) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/rehabilitation (ASCOF 2B1) | Quarterly | Council | High | 85% | 85% | 10% | 85% (R) (Q4 15/16 Discharges) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> This performance indicator is reported with a lag of one quarter. Therefore, performance for this indicator is RAG-rated using the 2015/16 target (95.20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the period April 2016 to June 2016, 112 out of 132 people (85%) discharged from hospital into reablement/rehabilitation were still at home 91 days later. An action plan has been developed to address this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **227** | Cllr Kamaljit Kaur  
Alan Adams (Mun-Thong Phung) | The percentage of people receiving personal care who have a positive outcome from the Community Recovery Service. (Those with a decrease in care packages) | Quarterly | Council | High | N/A | 15.0% | 10% | 12% (R) |
| **Commentary** | | | | | | | | | |
| In the period April 2016 to June 2016, there were 20 out of 164 people (12%) whose packages of care were decreased from the first contact to 28 days after discharge. Delaying, reducing and preventing people's support needs as far as possible is a priority for the Prevention Strategy for Adult Services in Hounslow. We will continue to monitor the external contract which is managed by Hounslow Richmond Community Health (HRCH). | | | | | | | | |
### Theme 7: AN AMBITIOUS COUNCIL, DELIVERING QUALITY SERVICES AND VALUE FOR MONEY

#### Quarterly Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead Officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 15/16)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 66</td>
<td><strong>Cllr Kamaljit Kaur</strong>&lt;br&gt; Alan Adams (Mun-Thong Phung)</td>
<td>The percentage of people receiving personal care who have a positive outcome from the Community Recovery Service. (Clients closed after short term provision)</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35% (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI 67</td>
<td><strong>Cllr Kamaljit Kaur</strong>&lt;br&gt; Alan Adams (Mun-Thong Phung)</td>
<td>Delayed transfers of care from hospital which are attributable to adult social care - Rate of delays per 100,000 population (ASCOF 2C2)</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.8 per 100,000 population</td>
<td>2.4 per 100,000 population</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.9 (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: The 10% threshold is based on the number of delays rather than the rate per 100,000 population. In the period July 2015 - June 2016, (an average 12 monthly snapshot), there were 84 total delays (2.9 delays per 100,000 population). Reducing delayed transfers of care is a key priority for the Better Care Fund (BCF) and we will continue to monitor this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **BPI 71 (a)**
  - **Cllr Ed Mayne**
  - Mary Harpley
  - Fewer stage 1 complaints received
  - Quarterly
  - Council
  - Low
  - 1,395
  - 5% less
  - 1340
  - 152 (G)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 71 (b)</th>
<th>(Victoria Lawson)</th>
<th>Fewer stage 2 complaints</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>126</th>
<th>10% less</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>10 (G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 71 (c)</td>
<td>Fewer stage 3 complaints</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15% less</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI 71 (d)</td>
<td>Fewer stage 4 LGO complaints</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>25 decisions made</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

In quarter one, we have seen a reduction in the number of complaints received. The Customer Relations team have been very active in triaging incoming enquiries whilst working closely with the service teams to try and resolve issues at point of contact without the need for further escalation. Also the introduction of corrective action plans has helped reduce the reoccurrence of similar complaints.

With regards to our stage 4 Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) complaints, the latest annual LGO report showed that our uphold rate in the 2015/16 financial year was 71%. 169 complaints were on made to the Ombudsman about The London Borough of Hounslow, out of which only 1 complaint was categorised as ‘Other’; 7 (4%) were about our Corporate and Other Services; 9 (5%) were about our Environment Services; 15 (9%) were about our Adult Care Services; 15 (9%) were about our Education and Children’s Services; 22 (13%) were about planning and development; 24 (14%) were about Highways and Transport; 35 (21%) were about Housing; and 41 (24%) were about Benefits and Tax.

178 decisions were made as a result, out of which 4 (2%) were provided with advice; 7 (4%) were incomplete or invalid; 12 (7%) were not upheld; 29 (16%) were upheld; 40 (23%) were closed after initial queries; and 86 (48%) were referred back to us for local resolution. Resolutions to Upheld complaints included apology, financial redress, reimbursement, debt write-off, Procedure Change and Training of our Staff. For further information, see annex F.

| BPI 72 | Clr Ed Mayne, Mary Harpley (Victoria Lawson) | Less complaints upheld as a percentage of total | Quarterly | Council | Low | 64.90% | 60% | 65% | 51.5% (G) |

**Commentary**

In quarter one, the percentage of complaints upheld have reduced. This can be attributed to services improving across the Council which could also indicate that the Service Corrective Action plans introduced in September 2015 are having a positive impact on service teams taking ownership and avoiding repeat service failures.

| BPI 73 (a) | Clr Ed Mayne, Mary Harpley (Victoria | More timely responses to Complaints | Quarterly | Council | High | N/A | 75% within agreed timeframes | 65% | 59.3% (R) |
**BPI 73 (b)**

More timely responses to Freedom of Information Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>75% within agreed timeframes</th>
<th>65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BPI 73 (c)**

More timely responses to Member enquiries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>75% within agreed timeframes</th>
<th>65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More timely responses to MP enquiries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>75% within agreed timeframes</th>
<th>65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

Although we are close to target for both Member and MP enquiry responses, across the board, we are underperforming on all our response deadlines. In line with the previous quarterly performance report considered by Cabinet on 19th July 2016, there is a significant amount of improvement work being undertaken to review and improve our performance. All processes have been reviewed with recommendations for improvement being implemented. Improving these processes will continue to remain a priority for the customer relations team.

Services are being sent weekly reports of outstanding cases and are also being chased by the Customer Relations Team. Heads of Service have been reminded to include Complaints and FOI's on their team agendas at their weekly/monthly team meetings, and have also been made aware that members of the Customer Relations Team would be very happy to attend these team meetings to discuss any performance concerns. This is to raise the importance of timely responses.

**BPI 74 (a)**

Less face-to-face customer contact (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>45% of total contact</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BPI 74 (b)**

Less customer contact by telephone (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>45% of total contact</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BPI 74 (c)**

More customer contact via our website (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>10% of total contact</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

Our web and digital programme for the council has started with a soft launch of the new council website expected in mid-January 2017. This will provide residents with access to a customer account and improved ability to report, apply, pay and request services. This will also provide the foundation to increase our channel shift from face to face and telephone contact to better value channels (online). This is expected to positively impact on BP1 74 (b)
and BPI 74 (c) in quarter four.

| BPI 75 | Cllr Ed Mayne  
Mary Harpley  
(Victoria Lawson) | Fewer customer calls abandoned (%) | Quarterly | Council | Low | 26% | 25% | 20% | 35% (R) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

**Commentary**
There has been increased demand from the implementation of the garden waste service; which has increased the volume of telephone contact. This may have contributed to an increase in customer contact by telephone. Improving the telephone experience for our residents is an important priority as identified in the customer services strategy and we are exploring a replacement to the telephone system that supports the contact centre to improve the experience for residents.

| BPI 76 | Cllr Ed Mayne  
Mary Harpley  
(Victoria Lawson) | Ensure average waiting time to see a customer services representative is less than 15 mins as per Customer Care Standards | Quarterly | Council | Low | 13 minutes | 15 minutes | 80% | 9:08 (G) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

**Commentary**
This quarter, we have exceeded our target for our customer’s average waiting time to see a customer services representative. Further improvements with our face to face reception service to take advantage of the new website along with self-service options (including online reporting forms) should continue to increase our performance.

| BPI 79 | Cllr Richard Foote  
Mary Harpley  
(John Walsh) | Reduce time lost to sickness absence | Quarterly | Council | Low | 8.62 | Average 7.5 days per employee | 20% | 8.47 days per employee (R) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

**Commentary**
Sickness is measured over a rolling year, taking the average number of employees over the period divided by working days lost to sickness. The public sector sickness average increased to 8.7 days in 2015 (CIPD Absence Report). Hounslow’s average number of days lost per employee has decreased slightly from 8.62 to 8.47 at the end of June 2016. The sickness average across other London Councils (inner and outer) in 2015/16 is just under 8.5 days.

| BPI 80 | Cllr Richard Foote  
Mary Harpley  
(John Walsh) | Levels of non-permanent staffing | Quarterly | Council | Low | 10% | 6% | 5% | 14.1% (R) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
Commentary
The data reflects NPS usage through Comensura at the end of the quarter looking back over the rolling year, this will reflect peaks and troughs throughout the year. Non-permanent staffing is measured as a percentage by taking the full time equivalent number agency workers as against the establishment full time equivalent. The target for 2016/2017 is 6% per directorate across the Council. In 2015/2016 the median across other London Boroughs (inner and Outer) was 15%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 81</th>
<th>Cllr Theo Dennison (John Walsh)</th>
<th>Roll out the Worksmart Programme to 50% of the Civic Centre-based workforce by March 2016</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>N/A (The target time for achieving 50% roll-out has been changed to January 2017 and agreed by Cabinet so there is no relevance for reporting an annual outturn)</th>
<th>WorkSmart programme rolled out to 50% of Civic Centre based employees by Jan 2017</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>33.1% (G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>We are currently on target to roll out to 50% of Civic Centre by Jan 2017. Pilot and Phase 1 complete (approx. 600 staff) and successfully working in a “WorkSmart” way. Feedback based on change readiness survey is positive and all have demonstrated a preference for a “WorkSmart” approach. Work has begun on the refurbishment for phase 2 in the Green Zone of the Lampton Road site. Phase 2 will be completed in Jan 2017 which will account for 50% of the Civic Centre workforce. Note that the projected percentages are based on the establishment numbers recorded by HR, plus an estimated margin to allow for consultants, students and agency workers as these roles are not accounted for on the Establishment list.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 83</th>
<th>Cllr Theo Dennison (Clive Palfreyman)</th>
<th>Capital delivery</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>High/ Low</th>
<th>90.00%</th>
<th>95-105%</th>
<th>Lower threshold &lt;85% Upper threshold &gt;115%</th>
<th>5.8% (G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Q1, £9.4m (5.8%) of the total projected capital spend for 2016/17 (£160m) has been spent. All projects are currently on track and the full projection is expected to be spent by year end.

**Note:** Capital spending is traditionally higher towards the end of the year (third and fourth quarter) when capital projects are more advanced and/or near completion as this is the point when the majority of the invoices are issued by contractors. The targets set for each quarter reflect this historic pattern of spend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 84</th>
<th>Cllr Theo Dennison (Clive Palfreyman)</th>
<th>Budget overspend</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>£8.7million</th>
<th>£0</th>
<th>£5m</th>
<th><strong>£8.3m (R)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>The projected departmental revenue outturn at the end of quarter 1 stands at £8.3m. A specific action plan has not been developed for this performance indicator because detailed mitigation plans are being been developed by services to reduce the overspend. Delivery against these will be monitored by senior management and Cabinet throughout 2016/17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 85</th>
<th>Cllr Theo Dennison (Clive Palfreyman)</th>
<th>Council tax collected to date</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>97.77%</th>
<th>97.20%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th><strong>30.78% (G)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>Due to review of the Single Person Discount (SPD) where a number of accounts lost their entitlement, our Council tax collection is slightly below expected. However, performance for this measure is still within our corporate target and permitted threshold, therefore achieving green status. This quarter's collection rate is consistent with levels collected in previous years. It is anticipated that this target will be met by the end of the financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 86</th>
<th>Cllr Theo Dennison (Clive Palfreyman)</th>
<th>NNDR collected to date</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>99.61%</th>
<th>98.80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th><strong>28.89% (G)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>Due to the removal of retail relief variations in the rateable value on some properties, NNDR collection is slightly below expected. However, performance for this measure is still within our corporate target and permitted threshold, therefore achieving green status. This quarter's collection rate is consistent with levels collected in previous years. It is anticipated that this target will be met by the end of the financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPI 87</th>
<th>Cllr Theo Dennison</th>
<th>Debt collection within 60 days</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>91.20%</th>
<th>90.00%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th><strong>89.85% (A)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Commentary
Due to a single large debt not collected on time, Quarter 1 performance was very slightly below (0.15%) below the target of 90%. Because of the very slight difference between the Q1 outturn and target, on this occasion it was agreed that there will be no need to produce an action plan.
More organised and rigorous debt chasing plans are being implemented to ensure performance continues to improve.

BPI 88

| Cllr Theo Dennison (Clive Palfreyman) | Creditors paid within 30 days | Quarterly | Council | High | 90.20% | 90.00% | 80% | 93.5% (G) |

Commentary
Quarter 1 performance is above the target of 90%. An improvement and modernisation plan is being implemented to maintain high performance in this area.

Biennial Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Freq of Reporting</th>
<th>Partnership/Lead Agency</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn available for 14/15)</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 78</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Foote Mary Harpley (John Walsh)</td>
<td>Maximise levels of staff engagement</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Staff engagement index (53) (2013/14)</td>
<td>65 (2017/18)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60 (A) 2015/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary
This is a newly adopted way to measure our staff engagement. The measure for this performance indicator is now based on our employee engagement index (EEI) which measures the evidence of engagement across the Organisation. Data from our most recent Staff Survey (2015) showed that our overall engagement index is 60. A drill down into our overall engagement score showed the following percentage of staff who gave positive responses to the 6 core questions: Q1=64%, Q3=55%, Q6=72%, Q60= 74%, Q61=83% and Q75=71%. An action plan has been developed to address this indicator.

Note: The data for this performance indicator will be provided biennially, based on The London Borough of Hounslow’s Staff Survey.

The engagement index is derived by calculating the weighting of all positive responses to the 6 core engagement questions included in the staff survey. The core questions include the following: ‘Q1 - I am proud to say that I work for the London Borough of Hounslow’; ‘Q3 - I would recommend the council as an employer’; ‘Q6 - I would recommend the council’s services to residents’; ‘Q60 - I would like to be working for the council in 12 months’ time’; ‘Q61 - I am prepared to go the extra mile for the London Borough of Hounslow’; and ‘Q75 - Overall, I am satisfied with working for the council’.

Note that the EEI is a weighted score, not a percentage. If all employees ‘agree strongly’ with all 6 core questions, then EEI = 100. If all employees ‘agree’ with all 6 core questions, then EEI = 80. If all employees ‘neither agree nor disagree’ with all 6 core questions, then EEI = 60. If all employees
To measure employee engagement, the Employee Engagement Index (EEI) is calculated as follows:

- If all employees 'disagree' with all 6 core questions, then EEI = 40.
- If all employees 'disagree strongly' with all 6 core questions, then EEI = 20.
- If 'no employees express agreement' with any of the 6 core questions, then EEI = 0.

### BPI 91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cllr Steve Curran</th>
<th>More residents satisfied with the council</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>67% (2014/15)</th>
<th>69%</th>
<th>59%</th>
<th>Next data release Q3 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Commentary**

The next data will be reported in Q3 2016/17. The most recent comparable local data from a 2008 survey showed that 41% residents were satisfied with the way the Council runs things, suggesting performance has improved by 26 percentage points over the last 6-years. According to a residents poll (LGA, 2014), Hounslow's performance is in line with the UK average (67%).

### BPI 92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cllr Theo Dennison</th>
<th>More residents recognise the council offers value for money</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>55% (2014/15)</th>
<th>57%</th>
<th>47%</th>
<th>Next data release Q3 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Commentary**

The next data will be reported in Q3 2016/17. The most recent comparable local data from a 2008 survey showed that 27% residents agreed that the Council provides value for money, suggesting performance has improved by 28 percentage points over the last 6 years. According to a residents poll (LGA, 2014), Hounslow's performance (55%) exceeds the UK average (49%).
DRAFT ACTION PLANS

Annex B
### BPI 43 (a) - Maintain acceptable levels of litter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 43 (a)</td>
<td>Cllr Amrit Mann Brendon Walsh (Peter Lerner)</td>
<td>a) Maintain acceptable levels of litter</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9.17% (A)</td>
<td>9.00% (G)</td>
<td>N/A (Next available data will be released in Q4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:

There has been a notable increase in litter sourced from commercial outlets, i.e. 44 sites were noted with commercial waste compared to 32 sites noted for domestic litter in the Tranche 1 survey. Specific wards have been identified by Hounslow Highways that have affected overall litter performance, subject to operational issues such as cover from agency staff.

Additionally, there has been an increase of Waste Placed Out on a non-collection day and spillage left on collection days from collection crews.

This indicator/milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:

Hounslow Highways are undergoing recruitment for permanent staff and implement new resource into revised cleansing routes and its frequencies in July/August and expects performance to return to accepted levels by the next KBT survey which will be reported in Q2 of the QPR. The routes and frequency is an ongoing exercise throughout the duration of the contract and is under constant review to cater for seasonal/external influences that may have an impact on the service.

Hounslow Highways is liaising with Royal Mail at senior level, whom have been highlighted to be the single-largest contributor for commercial source of litter from the KBT survey to ensure a robust action plan is implemented within their business. In conjunction, there will be increased enforcement activities to target litter sourced from other smaller commercial outlets across the borough.
Waste & Recycling team restructure is now in place, officers have been designated into wards and will increase monitoring activities to handle on-going issues around Waste placed out on non-collection days and monitor behavioural performance of crew in order to result in decreased spillage after collection. Recycling Refresh programme will commence 01/01/2017 to update kerbside containers throughout the borough to better contain loose items that are likely to spill, before or after collections. This is an on-going project and there is no end date at present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>1. Continuous review of cleansing routes and frequencies, using Hounslow Highways, LBH and KBT intelligence provided.</td>
<td>01/07/2016</td>
<td>30/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>2. Fresh recruitment drive to recruit permanent staff into the cleansing team.</td>
<td>01/07/2016</td>
<td>30/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>3. Engagement with Royal Mail at senior level, as Post Office related litter found on 37 of 44 sites affected by commercial waste.</td>
<td>01/07/2016</td>
<td>30/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2-Q3 2016/17</td>
<td>4. Increase enforcement activities with intelligence-led areas with litter sourced from commercial outlets</td>
<td>01/07/2016</td>
<td>31/12/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2-Q3 2016/17</td>
<td>5. Increase Waste &amp; Recycling team proactive monitoring to increase education tackling Waste Placed Out on non-collection days.</td>
<td>01/07/2016</td>
<td>31/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>6. As part of the “Recycling Refresh” programme, new kerbside containers will be procured. The containment of recyclables will be improved by replacing recycling sacks with rigid containers, with netted tops for those materials that are mostly likely to spill from the container.</td>
<td>01/01/2017</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BPI 73 (a) - More timely responses to complaints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/ milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 73 (a)</td>
<td>Cllr Ed Mayne (Mary Harpley (Victoria Lawson))</td>
<td>More timely responses to complaints</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>[75% within agreed time frames]</td>
<td>59.3% (R)</td>
<td>65% (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:**

- Service areas are not responding within timeframes and further communication needs to take place with Service Heads to assist in the enforcement the policy/process.
- The Customer Relations team also need to continue to improve in triaging and chasing complaints prior to reaching deadline stages.

**This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:**

- Working closer with Heads of Service to assist with the enforcement of timescales and offering timely assistance should see target met.
- Further opportunities to assist service teams and to share detailed reports of outstanding complaints at CLT, thus raising the importance of the timely handling of complaints within the organisation so to highlight service failures and to use the corrective action plans/process to improve our service overall.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to 'green' we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>1. Implement revised guidance for staff</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>2. Further improve triaging of complaints</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>3. Continue to enforce the completion of corrective action plans to reduce avoidable contact</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BPI 73 (b) - More timely responses to Freedom of Information Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/ milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Performance 16/17 Target</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement Q2 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 73 (b)</td>
<td>Cllr Ed Mayne</td>
<td>More timely responses to Freedom of Information Request</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>75% within agreed time frames</td>
<td>Q1 62.8% (R) Q2 65% (A) Q3 70% (A) Q4 75% (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:**

Further robust measures with regards to chasing and monitoring performance are to be put in place. Service areas are not responding within timeframes and further communication needs to take place with Service Heads to assist in the enforcement of the policy/process.

The Customer Relations team also need to continue to improve in triaging and chasing of FOI’s prior to reaching deadline stage.

**This indicator/milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:**

Although the performance should improve it is unlikely target will be met between Q2-Q3, working closer with Heads of Service to assist with the enforcement of timescales and offering timely assistance should see target met by year end.

Further opportunities to assist service teams and to share detailed reports of outstanding FOI’s at CLT, raising the importance of the timely handling of FOI’s within the organisation to improve our service overall.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>1. The Customer Relations team will use data sources within the public domain to assist in the answering of FOI requests</td>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>2. More stringent chasing of outstanding FOI’s prior to deadlines with service heads</td>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>3. Further develop the open data source page on the new website due Jan/Feb 17</td>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BPI 73 (c) - More timely responses to Member Enquiries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 73 (c)</td>
<td>Cllr Ed Mayne Mary Harpley (Victoria Lawson)</td>
<td>More timely responses to Member Enquiries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>75% within agreed time frames</td>
<td>Q1 65.5% (A) Q2 68% (A) Q3 72% (A) Q4 2017/18 75% (G)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:**

Further robust measures with regards to chasing and monitoring performance are to be put in place. Service areas are not responding within time and further communication needs to take place with Service Heads to assist in the enforcement of the policy/process.

The Customer Relations team also need to continue to improve in triaging and chasing of enquiries prior to reaching deadline stage.

**This indicator/milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:**

Further triaging of requests and better routing of enquiries.

Working closer with Heads of Service to assist with the enforcement of timescales and offering timely assistance should see target met.

Further opportunities to assist service teams and to share detailed reports of outstanding enquiries at CLT, raising the importance of the timely handling of Member Enquiries within the organisation to improve our service overall.

**Actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>1. Continue to push a more robust monitoring and tracking process to encourage a more timely approach to answering member enquiries. Improve routing of enquiries to appropriate staff.</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>2. Encourage Heads of Service to raise outstanding members enquiries at team meetings</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>3. Reporting to CLT to highlight where there are performance failures</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BPI 73 (d) - More timely responses to MP Enquiries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 73 (d)</td>
<td>Cllr Ed Mayne Mary Harpley Victoria Lawson</td>
<td>More timely responses to MP Enquiries</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>75% within agreed time frames</td>
<td>Q1 68.70% (A) Q2 69% (A) Q3 71% (A) Q4 2017/18 75% (G)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:**

Further robust measures with regards to chasing and monitoring performance are to be put in place. Service areas are not responding within time and further communication needs to take place with Service Heads to assist in the enforcement of the policy/process.

The Customer Relations team also need to continue to improve in triaging and chasing of enquiries prior to reaching deadline stage.

This indicator/milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:

Further triaging of requests and better routing of enquiries.

Working closer with Heads of Service to assist with the enforcement of timescales and offering timely assistance should see target met.

Further opportunities to assist service teams and to share detailed reports of outstanding enquiries at CLT, raising the importance of the timely handling of MP Enquiries.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>1. Continue to push a more robust monitoring and tracking process to encourage a more timely approach to answering member enquiries. Improve routing of enquiries to appropriate staff.</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>2. Encourage Heads of Service to raise outstanding members enquiries at team meetings</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>3. Reporting to CLT to highlight where there are performance failures</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BPI 74 (b) - Less customer contact by telephone (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/ milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 74 (b)</td>
<td>Cllr Ed Mayne  Mary Harpley (Victoria Lawson)</td>
<td>Less customer contact by telephone (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>45% of total contact</td>
<td>62% (R)</td>
<td>59% (R)</td>
<td>55% (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:**

In order for the number of telephone calls to reduce we need to provide a sustainable alternative for customers to move away from the use of the telephone to contact us to the web. The Web and Digital Strategy which includes the development of a new website by Jan/Feb 17 will offer self-service and will encourage customers to create their own account in order to transact with us on (eventually) all services. The site will allow options to pay, find, book and apply for services 24/7/265.

**This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:**

Once the new website goes live in Jan/Feb 2017, this will encourage customers to transact with us online and move away from the more traditional routes via the phone and face to face.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>1. Encourage customers to start using online services as they go-live and to sign up to the new customer account via the telephone</td>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>2. Liaise with external agencies to promote our online services and to encourage digital take up to reduce digital exclusion</td>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>3. Encourage the use of digital communication (twitter/emails/online forms)</td>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BPI 74 (c) - More customer contact via our website (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/ milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 74 (c)</td>
<td>Cllr Ed Mayne Mary Harpley (Victoria Lawson)</td>
<td>More customer contact via our website (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>10% of total contact</td>
<td>4% (R)</td>
<td>5% (A)</td>
<td>6% (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:

The new website is due to go live Jan/Feb 17. The new customer portal will allow customers to create their own accounts and transact with us via paying, booking and finding services online. The current site is very restricted on what can be achieved by going 'online'.

### This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:

As the new website goes live, customer services will encourage the sign up of customers via the online account.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>1. Customer Services to provide information on the top enquiries coming into reception and the contact centre to help shape the content and transactional abilities of the website.</td>
<td>July 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>2. Support customers to go online, create customer accounts and to encourage self-service</td>
<td>Oct 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>3. Encourage feedback from customers to continually develop online capabilities so to develop the web as the channel of choice</td>
<td>Oct 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BPI 75 - Fewer customer calls abandoned (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/ milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 75</td>
<td>Cllr Ed Mayne, Mary Harpley (Victoria Lawson)</td>
<td>Fewer customer calls abandoned (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35% (R)</td>
<td>32% (R)</td>
<td>29% (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:
Service failure resulting in large numbers of calls and repeat calls has caused a high abandonment rate. This performance indicator is dependent on BPI 74(b) – Less customer contact by telephone and BPI 74(c) – More customer contact via our website. Once these two BPIs start meeting target so the knock-on effect will be fewer calls coming into the contact centre and so fewer calls abandoned. Resource planning has been poor. This will be addressed ongoing.

### This indicator/milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:
Service failure has resulted in increased volumes to the contact centres. Further collaborative working with services to be involved in the planning stages of services changes should see the target met in Q4.

As the website goes live so more customers will be encouraged to use the website to transact with us and fewer customers will contact us by telephone and hence the call abandoned % will decrease. This with better resource planning and an upgrade to our telephone system to provide more features to help us in managing the queues should see the target met in Q4.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>1. Customers will be encouraged to go online and hence reduce the call volumes so less calls will be abandoned.</td>
<td>Oct 15</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>2. Using technology, upgrading the telephone system to assist in resource planning</td>
<td>Aug 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>3. Proactively plan for service changes to ensure resources are available, preparing for peaks and troughs in service demand, using p/t staff to assist with fluctuations</td>
<td>Sept 16</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPROVED
ACTION PLANS

Annex C
### BPI 17 - Reduce the rate of proven reoffending by young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/ milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 17</td>
<td>Cllr Tom Bruce (Jacqui McShannon)</td>
<td>Reduce the rate of proven reoffending by young people</td>
<td>45.80% (2012/13)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>40.38%</td>
<td>44.80% (R) (2013/14)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:**

The rate of re-offending has reduced compared to the previous outturn but is still slightly above the London average of 43.2%, which continues to rise. Hounslow’s trajectory is expected to fall below 43% by 2017. Outturns are calculated using Youth Justice Board methodology; crimes during the whole year determine the cohort, rather specific segments of the year as previously done. Reoffending is monitored the following year and convictions over a further year. Only offences resulting in conviction count. Therefore the target for this indicator is not based on validated data.

The rate of reoffending in the out of court disposals population is significantly higher than expected, and has led to structural changes for the relevant team. An improvement plan has been developed that includes a mandate for wider use of full assessments and offers of voluntary interventions. However, due to the delay caused by monitoring reoffending and convictions current performance is based on the July 2013 to June 2014 offending cohort – indicative data for the period April 2014 to March 2015 suggests that performance has improved. As a result of this RAG rating in Q1 of 2015/16, this action plan was devised to explain the rating and map performance. This plan still exists and will continue to be implemented. The action plan identifies measurable outcomes that is monitored by the Youth Crime Management Board.

**This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:**

This indicator is an annual target and new figures will not be available until Q1 of next year (2017/18).

**Actions**

The indicator is an annual measure and new figures will not appear until Q1 of 2017/18.
BPI 21 - Ensure that children and young people at risk of abuse or neglect have a timely and comprehensive multi agency plan to protect them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to 'green' we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Q1 – Q4</td>
<td>1. Full assessments to be completed on all young people bailed to return by the police prior to a decision regarding disposal</td>
<td>Sept 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Q1 – Q4</td>
<td>2. 100% of young people receiving a caution or Triage/Diversion from the Criminal Justice System to be offered an intervention on a voluntary basis</td>
<td>Sept 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Q1 – Q4</td>
<td>3. Offending behaviour group work project to progress by achieving level one with Project Oracle, and level 2 within 12 months, providing a uniform measure to demonstrate that programmes are effective, evidence-based and delivered to a consistently high standard</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Q2 – Q4</td>
<td>4. Report performance data relating to this action plan to the Youth Crime Management Board for scrutiny</td>
<td>Sept 2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:

The IRO service is fully staffed with an effective rota and thus is able to deliver timely ICPCs even at times of exceptionally high demand, provided they receive prompt notification of the need to arrange an ICPC. The Intake Team Managers have undertaken a targeted review of the current practice

This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:

There will be immediate improvement from the date the actions listed in this plan were implemented (August 2016). This will result in a partial improvement in the Q2 outturn, and a complete return to target performance from Q3

The indicator is an annual measure and new figures will not appear until Q1 of 2017/18

The IRO service is fully staffed with an effective rota and thus is able to deliver timely ICPCs even at times of exceptionally high demand, provided they receive prompt notification of the need to arrange an ICPC. The Intake Team Managers have undertaken a targeted review of the current practice
by frontline Assistant Team Managers (ATMs) who are responsible for authorising the outcome of strategy meetings on the LCS Children’s database, which in turn provides the IRO service with the necessary notification. Any delay in this authorisation is likely to negatively impact on timeliness. The review uncovered variability in how promptly ATMs were authorising strategy meeting outcomes. Immediate action has been taken to address this with ATMs to ensure that expectations concerning prompt authorisation are explicit, and we expect to see significant improvement in ICPC timeliness as a result.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already started</td>
<td>5. Conduct targeted review of frontline ATM authorisation of strategy meeting outcomes.</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already started</td>
<td>6. Ensure ATM deliver prompt authorisation of strategy meeting outcomes</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BPI 61 - Reducing permanent admissions of younger adults (aged 18-64) to residential and nursing care homes per 100,000 population (ASCOF 2A1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/ milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance Q1</th>
<th>Performance Q2</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement Q3</th>
<th>Performance Q4</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 61</td>
<td>Cllr Kamaljit Kaur Alan Adams (Mun-Thong Phung)</td>
<td>Reducing permanent admissions of younger adults (aged 18-64) to residential and nursing care homes per 100,000 population (ASCOF 2A1)</td>
<td>12 per 100,000 population</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11 per 100,000 population</td>
<td>11.4 (A)</td>
<td>11.2 (A)</td>
<td>11 (G)</td>
<td>11 (G)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:

At an operational level all requests for care home placements are considered by the ASC funding panel. Our performance data since the beginning of this financial year up to the end of June shows the number of residents placed in nursing care has reduced by 2 from 18 to 16 and in the same reporting period the number of residents placed in a residential care home has reduced from 155 to 153 Permanent admissions to our directly provided care. Performance data suggests a decline in the number of people admitted to internal residential homes, but the precise number of people being admitted for a permanent placement is currently being consolidated.

This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:

This measure looks at the number of new admissions into residential and nursing care homes. Although we have seen an increase in the number of admissions, overall the number of people currently in care homes is reducing. We expect to see a modest incremental improvement (a reduction in the rate of new permanent admissions) as we use our Personal Care Framework (PCF) and closely monitor the outcomes of the ASC funding panel. In addition, we have now launched the improved outcome based recovery service, in partnership with Hounslow Richmond Community Healthcare (HRCH). Therefore, we anticipate our Q3 16/17 indicator will reach green.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>1. Co-ordination and targeting of appropriate preventative services.</td>
<td>Apr 15</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>2. Park Lodge and Green Rod, new extra care schemes in Hounslow have recently opened, and each will provide 36 beds for people who need residential care.</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>3. Bridge Wharf Hounslow, a new extra care scheme will be opening in January 2017 and will provide an additional 36 beds for those needing residential care.</td>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2014/15 Onwards</td>
<td>4. Staff are utilising community support to ensure that people are able to remain in the community; They are been creative with care packages, carer support and the voluntary sector to enable people to remain at home.</td>
<td>Nov 2014</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2014/15 Onwards</td>
<td>5. Greater use of Tele Care is being utilised to enable people to remain safely in the community; this should enable people with complex dementias to also remain in their homes.</td>
<td>Dec 2014</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>6. Monthly meetings are taking place with the CIDs teams and the Adults teams to discuss complex cases and ensure that appropriate support is in place to limit need for admission to residential care</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>7. Complex cases are discussed within localities to again ensure that appropriate multi-disciplinary support is in place to keep people in their own homes.</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>8. Every new placement is fully discussed at the funding panel and all other options are considered before the placement is made.</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extended hospital social work team (8-8pm x 7 days per week) are deflecting people from unnecessary hospital admissions by utilizing care packages with the support of the red cross to get people home quickly (ICRS - speedy rehab service and the CRS).

### BPI 64 - Increasing the proportion of older people (aged 65+) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/ rehabilitation (ASCOF 2B1)

| Ref | Lead Member, CLT & Lead officer | Performance Indicator/ milestone | Baseline (Outturn) | Polarity | 15/17 Target | Performance | Expected Trajectory of Improvement | Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable) |
|-----|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
| BPI 64 | Cllr Kamaljit Kaur Alan Adams (Mun-Thong Phung) | Increasing the proportion of older people (aged 65+) who were still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/ rehabilitation (ASCOF 2B1) | 85% | High | 95.2% | 85% (R) (Q4 15/16 Discharges) | N/A | N/A | N/A |

The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:

We have established an improved outcome based Community Recovery Service (CRS) in partnership with HRCH. As this is a new service we have only recently fully developed the mechanisms for performing the 91 day check.

This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:

Based on the refreshed target for 2016/17 (85%) we expect to see on target performance for Q1 16-17 discharges (an increase in the proportion of older people (65+) who are still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/ rehabilitation).

**Actions**
The percentage of people receiving personal care who have a positive outcome from CRS (Those with a decrease in care packages).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>7. Use social care records, checking for packages of care in place at the 91st day</td>
<td>Apr 15</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>8. Write to or telephone clients on the 91st day to identify their location</td>
<td>Oct 15</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>9. Use data from health partners involved in the delivery of reablement / intermediate care which may identify clients who are in receipt of further episodes of care at the 91st day</td>
<td>Oct 15</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>10. Liaise with operational social work staff to identify the 91st day location</td>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>11. Use patient registrations from NHS partner organisations</td>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BPI 65 - The percentage of people receiving personal care who have a positive outcome from CRS (Those with a decrease in care packages).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/ milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 65</td>
<td>Cllr Kamaljit Kaur (Mun-Thong Phung)</td>
<td>The percentage of people receiving personal care who have a positive outcome from CRS. (Those with a decrease in care packages).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12% (R)</td>
<td>13% (R)</td>
<td>14% (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:
We have established an improved outcome based Community Recovery Service in partnership with HRCH. As this is a new service, we are embedding new working practices and are seeing an improvement in the outcomes for

This indicator/milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:
We expect to see an incremental improvement in this indicator reaching Green by Q4 16/17.
those residents who use CRS.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>1. Monitor the external contract</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>2. Embed new working practices</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BPI 67 - Delayed transfers of care from hospital which are attributable to adult social care - Rate of delays per 100,000 population (ASCOF 2C2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/ milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPI 67</td>
<td>Cllr Kamaljit Kaur Alan Adams (Mun-Thong Phung)</td>
<td>Delayed transfers of care from hospital which are attributable to adult social care - Rate of delays per 100,000 population (ASCOF 2C2)</td>
<td>2.8 per 100,000 population</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.4 per 100,000 population</td>
<td>2.9 (R)</td>
<td>2.7 (R)</td>
<td>2.5 (A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:

Reducing delayed transfers of care is a key priority for the Better Care Fund (BCF). We are currently embedding a set of new procedures. This centres on a regular weekly teleconference with all the key decision makers present.

This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:

We expect to see an incremental improvement in this indicator reaching green by Q4 2016.
including, health, social care, and providers (including the voluntary sector).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>1. Detailed analysis is being carried out of current performance, trends, and the causes of delays from national data</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>2. As part of the BCF monthly scheme monitoring, an assessment of current schemes is in place to reduce delays and improve patient flow across the system, and how effective these are.</td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>3. We have recently implemented an emergency 24x7 home care placement service</td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2016/17 Onwards</td>
<td>4. We are monitoring voids in care homes weekly</td>
<td>Apr 2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>5. We continue to maintain excellent working links with our central brokerage and placement services</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>6. We have established a 24hr operation for mental health and for the intensive community recovery service (ICRS) which intervene to minimise mistaken admissions leading to difficult discharges</td>
<td>Apr 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 2015/16 Onwards</td>
<td>7. A complete restructure of the hospital team has recently been made, which has increased the number of Social Workers and Social Worker Assistants from 13.5 to 18. In addition, an extra deputy has been assigned to help manage the hospital team’s workflow.</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BPI 78 - Maximize levels of staff engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</th>
<th>Performance Indicator/milestone</th>
<th>Baseline (Outturn)</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>16/17 Target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Expected Trajectory of Improvement</th>
<th>Explanation if indicator not expected to reach green by Q4 2016/17 (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BPI 78 | Cllr Richard Foote Mary Harpley (John Walsh) | Maximize levels of staff engagement | Staff engagement index (60) (2015/16) | Low | 65 (2017/18) | 60 (A) | N/A | 65 (G) (2017/18) | This is a new measure and data for this performance indicator will be provided biennially. Performance of this indicator could fluctuate depending on how many employees complete the staff survey. 

**Note:** Any improvement to performance will only become evident in 2017/18 when the next Staff Survey is conducted.

### The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’

This is a newly adopted way to measure staff engagement based on positive responses to the six core engagement questions within the staff survey and is within the baseline of 60%. The current round of savings and restructures inevitably has a huge impact on employees and it is expected that this indicator will fluctuate, over time.

### This indicator/milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:

The performance indicator remains at 60% and is within the baseline set. The Employee Assistance Programme is a new welfare initiative that has been made available to employees and offers advice and counselling. If used, this could have a positive impact on the employee’s well-being therefore promoting positivity.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>1. Introduce a new Employee Assistance Programme offering staff individual support across a wide range of issues, both work-related and otherwise.</td>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
<td>Q2 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2016/17</td>
<td>2. Use the Hounslow Management Group as a forum to consider the results from the Staff survey and consider steps for addressing the issues highlighted.</td>
<td>Q3 2016/17</td>
<td>Q3 2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Lead Member, CLT &amp; Lead officer</td>
<td>Performance Indicator/ milestone</td>
<td>Baseline (15/16 Outturn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPI 79</td>
<td>Cllr Richard Foote, Mary Harpley (John Walsh)</td>
<td>Reduce time lost to sickness absence</td>
<td>8.62 days per employee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:**

Although we have recently introduced automated email alerts to managers highlighting whenever members of staff reach the sickness absence trigger, and this has started to show an increase in initiating Management of Absence procedures, it will inevitably take some time for the results of this to take effect.

**This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:**

We have recently introduced automated email alerts to managers highlighting whenever members of staff reach the sickness absence trigger and this has started to show an increase in initiating Management of Absence procedures but it will inevitably take some time for the results of this to take effect. An analysis of the statistics show that there is one Department where sickness absence figures are significantly above the rest of the Council and HR will focus activity on this area within the next three to six months with targeted training and by supporting managers in that area to address high levels of sickness absence.

### Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 – Q3 2016/17</td>
<td>1. An analysis of the statistics show that there is one Department where sickness absence figures are significantly above the rest of the Council and HR will focus activity on this area within the next three to six months with targeted training and by supporting managers in that area to address high levels of sickness absence.</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 – Q4 2016/17</td>
<td>2. We will continue to produce regular reports for managers across the Council whenever employees reach the sickness absence trigger to ensure managers and staff are equally aware when levels of attendance fall to potentially unacceptable levels.</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BPI 80 - Levels of non-permanent staffing

| Ref | Lead Member, CLT & Lead officer | Performance Indicator/ milestone | Baseline (Outturn) | Polarity | 16/17 Target | Performance Q1 | Performance Q2 | Performance Q3 | Performance Q4 | Expected Trajectory of Improvement |
|-----|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| BPI 80 | Cllr Richard Foote, Mary Harpley (John Walsh) | Levels of non-permanent staffing (NPS) | 10% | Low | 6% | 14.1% (R) | 13.6% (R) | 13.1% (R) | 12.6% (R) | |

**The reason this indicator/milestone is not currently performing at ‘green’ is:**

Members have acknowledged that the authority is well above the 6% NPS target, and this reflects very differing results across the divisions who are competing in a competitive employment market, and making use of NPS to protect permanent employees in periods of organisational change. The cabinet have endorsed the view that "permanent is best" but acknowledge that there is often an unavoidable need to use NPS. While it is proposed to retain the 6% target for corporate discipline purposes it is also acknowledged that differing labour market conditions and factors make it more of an aspiration than a realisable objective in at least two divisions: Adult Safeguarding and Children’s Safeguarding. It is expected that NPS percentage levels to fall in all other divisions.

**This indicator/ milestone is expected to improve during Q2 – Q4 2016/17 as follows:**

Work continues to reduce unnecessary reliance on agency workers and the actions below will help towards this. However, restructuring and establishment cleansing will continue to have an effect on the NPS % in the short term.

Equally, as the Council goes through a period of flux, with significant numbers of restructures at any one time, it is inevitably more reliant on temporary staff to protect the jobs of permanent colleagues.

A benchmarking exercise with other London Councils shows that Hounslow is below the median of 15% NPS usage across London Councils for 201/2016. Hounslow is in the fourth quartile of all London Boroughs.
The single target doesn’t reflect the different usage of NPS staff across different Council Departments and a different way of looking at this activity is being considered by cabinet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter during which action will take place</th>
<th>To move performance on this indicator/milestone to ‘green’ we will:</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1. Following major restructures within Hounslow Housing we are now in a position to recruit on permanent contracts.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2016/17 onwards</td>
<td>2. We are introducing a key worker housing scheme to encourage staff to relocate to the Hounslow area by incentivising landlords and paying rent deposits.</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>3. We are exploring options for overseas recruitment to help fill some of our hard to fill posts in CAS – mental health social workers, for example.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL AREA PERFORMANCE SOLUTION (LAPS) INDICATOR SET RETROSPECTIVE DASHBOARD 2015/16 (Q4) Annex D
Hounslow: London Performance Dashboard: 2015-16 - Q4 FINAL

### Risk and vulnerability

**Value**  

| DB 01: | Violation against the person crime rate per 1,000 population (LIS 15) | 27.77 | 26.51 |
| DB 02: | Robbery, dwelling burglary, and theft of a motor vehicle crime rate per 1,000 population (LIS 16) | 14.82 | 16.08 |
| DB 03: | Total notifiable crime rate per 1,000 population (LIS 3) | 82.3 | 87.26 |
| DB 04: | % of Child Protection Plans lasting 2+ years at 31 March and for child protection plans which have ended during the year (N 17) | 4.5 | 3.6 |
| DB 05: | % of children subject of Child Protection Plan for a 2nd time or more within 2 yrs of previous plans and data (N 18) | 7.8 | 11.1 |
| DB 06: | Vacancy Rate of Children’s social workers (FTE) for year ending 30 Sep (N 23) | 20.0 | 25.0 |
| DB 07: | % Children’s Social workers who are agency workers (FTE) for year ending 30 Sept (N 26) | 11.0 | 25.0 |
| DB 08: | % of adults with a learning disability who live in their own home or with their family (ASCOF 1G) | 69.3 | 69.7 |
| DB 09: | Housing Benefit number of days to process new claims (LIS 181a) | 189.5 | 23.2 |
| DB 10: | Housing Benefit number of days to process change of circumstances (LIS 181b) | 6.9 | 9.6 |

### Improving life chances

**Value**  

| DB 11: | Percentage of pupils achieving level 4 or above in both Reading, Writing and Maths at Key Stage 2 (3.2) | 86 | 84 |
| DB 12: | % of children in need (CN) achieving at least level 4 at KS2 in reading, writing & maths (N 1a) | 65.0 | 55.0 |
| DB 13: | % of children in need (CN) who achieve 5+ A*-C grades at GCSE including Eng & maths (N 1b) | 55.5 | 4.0 |
| DB 14: | % of school-aged children in need permanently excluded from school (N 3a) | 2.5 | 3.1 |
| DB 15: | Percentage of children receiving self-directed support (ASCOF 1C(1a)) | 80.5 | 84.4 |
| DB 16: | % of clients using social care who receive self-directed support (ASCOF 1C(2a)) | 25.0 | 24.6 |
| DB 17: | % of clients using social care who are receiving direct payments (ASCOF 1C(2a)) | 21.0 | 24.6 |
| DB 18: | rate aged 65+ permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes, per 100,000 population (ASCOF 2A(1)) | 12.6 | 8.1 |
| DB 19: | rate aged 65+ permanent admissions to residential and nursing care homes, per 100,000 population (ASCOF 2A(2)) | 362.1 | 445.4 |
| DB 20: | Care orders (Aged 18+) accessing long term community support, per 100,000 population 18+ (Teasc 1) | 1072 | 1208 |
| DB 21: | Care orders (nurcery for someone aged 18+) receiving care specific services, per 100,000 population aged 18+ (Teasc 2) | 553 | 523 |
| DB 22: | % of relevant care leavers aged 19-21, in education, employment or training (LIS 157c)** | 39.8 | 59.1 |
| DB 23: | Percentage of working age people on out of work benefits (N 152) | 7.3 | 8.2 |
| DB 24: | Number of households living in temporary accommodation (N 156)** | 1011 | 1818 |

### Quality of the environment

**Value**  

| DB 25: | Number of homeless applications accepted as being in priority need (LIS 157)** | 542 | 588 |

### Interest to the public

**Value**  

| DB 26: | Number of sculptures per household of residual household waste collected (N 191)** | 611 | 537 |
| DB 27: | Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting (NI 192) | 37.1 | 32.8 |
| DB 28: | Percentage of land assessed as having unacceptable levels of litter (N 196a) | 5.50 | 4.09 |
| DB 29: | Percentage of land assessed as having unacceptable levels of dereliction (N 196b) | 5.17 | 4.95 |
| DB 30: | Percentage of land assessed as having unacceptable levels of graffiti (N 196c) | 0.07 | 2.36 |
| DB 31: | Percentage of land assessed as having unacceptable levels of fly-posting (N 196d)** | 0.67 | 1.44 |

### More recent survey

**Value**  

| DB 32: | Percentage of Council Tax collected (BVPv 9) | 97.8 | 96.6 |
| DB 33: | Percentage of non-domestic rates collected (BVPv 10) | 99.6 | 99.4 |
| DB 34: | Number of working days per FTE lost due to sickness absence (excluding school staff) (BVPv 12) | 6.1 | 7.4 |
| DB 35: | Percentage of minor planning applications determined within 8 weeks (N 157b) | 72.0 | 78.4 |
| DB 36: | Percentage of ‘other’ planning applications determined within 8 weeks (N 157c) | 73.0 | 82.3 |

---

**Guidance notes**

a. The diamond represents performance for your chosen borough. To the right of the black bar represents better than average performance, to the left represents lower than average performance.

b. Lower than average performance does not necessarily imply poor performance, and vice versa.

c. ** denotes that there are fewer than 16 returns for that indicator.

d. Please note that the national comparator measure is the latest available, it does not necessarily relate to the same time period as borough data.

e. (a) denotes that for data presourced by London Councils, the borough submitted their own data instead.

Blue font indicates a presourced data item from an existing data publication.
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Quality of the environment

### DB 26: Number of kilograms per household of residual household waste collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DB 27: % of household waste sent for reuse, recycling and composting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>34.56</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>34.47</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td>33.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>34.56</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>34.47</td>
<td>36.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DB 28: % of land assessed as having unacceptable levels of litter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DB 29: % of land assessed as having unacceptable levels of detritus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DB 30: % of land assessed as having unacceptable levels of graffiti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DB 31: % of land assessed as having unacceptable levels of fly-posting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Interest to the public

### DB 32: % of Council Tax collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DB 33: % of non domestic rates collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DB 34: Number of working days per FTE lost due to sickness absence (excluding school staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rolling year: Jul 13 to Jun 14</th>
<th>Rolling year: Oct 13 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Rolling year: Jan 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Rolling year: Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Rolling year: Jul 14 to Jun 15</th>
<th>Rolling year: Oct 14 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Rolling year: Jan 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Rolling year: Apr 15 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DB 35: % of minor planning applications determined within 8 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DB 36: % of ‘other’ planning applications determined within 8 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Sep 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Dec 14</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 14 to Mar 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Sep 15</th>
<th>Year to Date Apr 15 to Dec 15</th>
<th>Full Year Apr 14 to Mar 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN (LGO) REVIEW OF LBH STAGE 4 COMPLAINTS 2015/16 Annex F
21 July 2016

By email

Mary Harpley
Chief Executive
London Borough of Hounslow

Dear Mary Harpley,

Annual Review letter 2016

I write to you with our annual summary of statistics on the complaints made to the Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) about your authority for the year ended 31 March 2016.

The enclosed tables present the number of complaints and enquiries received and the decisions we made about your authority during the period. I hope that this information will prove helpful in assessing your authority’s performance in handling complaints.

Last year we provided information on the number of complaints upheld and not upheld for the first time. In response to council feedback, this year we are providing additional information to focus the statistics more on the outcome from complaints rather than just the amounts received.

We provide a breakdown of the upheld investigations to show how they were remedied. This includes the number of cases where our recommendations remedied the fault and the number of cases where we decided your authority had offered a satisfactory remedy during the local complaints process. In these latter cases we provide reassurance that your authority had satisfactorily attempted to resolve the complaint before the person came to us. In addition, we provide a compliance rate for implementing our recommendations to remedy a fault.

I want to emphasise that these statistics comprise the data we hold, and may not necessarily align with the data your authority holds. For example, our numbers include enquiries from people we signpost back to the authority, but who may never contact you.

In line with usual practice, we are publishing our annual data for all authorities on our website, alongside an annual review of local government complaints. The aim of this is to be transparent and provide information that aids the scrutiny of local services.

During the year we published a report about your Council. This was about the way the Council dealt with a homeless application. The Council failed to provide accommodation while it made enquiries about the complainant’s circumstances. It then took too long to review its decision that she was not in priority need and failed to follow the correct process for carrying out the review. Overall it took the Council 62 weeks to reach a final decision about the complainant’s circumstances when the law and guidance says it should take approximately 15 weeks. The Council also failed to respond to complaints about what happened.
We recommended the Council apologise to the complainant and pay her £1,450 to acknowledge the stress and anxiety she suffered. We also recommended it provide training to staff about homeless legislation and the Council’s homeless policies as well as dealing with complaints.

The Council has complied with our recommendations, with the final part of the training scheduled for June 2016.

**Effective accountability for devolved authorities**

Local government is going through perhaps some of the biggest changes since the LGO was set up more than 40 years ago. The creation of combined authorities and an increase in the number of elected mayors will hugely affect the way local services are held to account. We have already started working with the early combined authorities to help develop principles for effective and accessible complaints systems.

We have also reviewed how we structure our casework teams to provide insight across the emerging combined authority structures. Responding to council feedback, this included reconfirming the Assistant Ombudsman responsible for relationship management with each authority, which we recently communicated to Link Officers through distribution of our manual for working with the LGO.

**Supporting local scrutiny**

Our corporate strategy is based upon the twin pillars of remedying injustice and improving local public services. The numbers in our annual report demonstrate that we continue to improve the quality of our service in achieving swift redress.

To measure our progress against the objective to improve local services, in March we issued a survey to all councils. I was encouraged to find that 98% of respondents believed that our investigations have had an impact on improving local public services. I am confident that the continued publication of our decisions (alongside an improved facility to browse for them on our website), focus reports on key themes and the data in these annual review letters is helping the sector to learn from its mistakes and support better services for citizens.

The survey also demonstrated a significant proportion of councils are sharing the information we provide with elected members and scrutiny committees. I welcome this approach, and want to take this opportunity to encourage others to do so.

**Complaint handling training**

We recently refreshed our Effective Complaint Handling courses for local authorities and introduced a new course for independent care providers. We trained over 700 people last year and feedback shows a 96% increase in the number of participants who felt confident in dealing with complaints following the course. To find out more, visit [www.lgo.org.uk/training](http://www.lgo.org.uk/training).
Ombudsman reform

You will no doubt be aware that the government has announced the intention to produce draft legislation for the creation of a single ombudsman for public services in England. This is something we support, as it will provide the public with a clearer route to redress in an increasingly complex environment of public service delivery.

We will continue to support government in the realisation of the public service ombudsman, and are advising on the importance of maintaining our 40 years plus experience of working with local government and our understanding its unique accountability structures.

This will also be the last time I write with your annual review. My seven-year term of office as Local Government Ombudsman comes to an end in January 2017. The LGO has gone through extensive change since I took up post in 2010, becoming a much leaner and more focused organisation, and I am confident that it is well prepared for the challenges ahead.

Yours sincerely

Dr Jane Martin
Local Government Ombudsman
Chair, Commission for Local Administration in England
Complaints and enquiries received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Care Services</th>
<th>Benefits and Tax</th>
<th>Corporate and Other Services</th>
<th>Education and Children’s Services</th>
<th>Environment Services</th>
<th>Highways and Transport</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Planning and Development</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decisions made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incomplete or Invalid</th>
<th>Advice Given</th>
<th>Referred back for Local Resolution</th>
<th>Closed After Initial Enquiries</th>
<th>Not Upheld</th>
<th>Upheld</th>
<th>Uphold Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

Our uphold rate is calculated in relation to the total number of detailed investigations.
The number of remedied complaints may not equal the number of upheld complaints. This is because, while we may uphold a complaint because we find fault, we may not always find grounds to say that fault caused injustice that ought to be remedied.
The compliance rate is the proportion of remedied complaints where our recommendations are believed to have been implemented.
1.1 Cabinet members are asked to note the following:

a) Revenue Outturn Position;
   - A net overspend of £7.0m is currently projected on departmental and corporate General Fund budgets. Successful delivery of mitigation activity will reduce this to an underspend of £1.1m (4.1);
   - Projected funding shortfall for Dedicated Schools Grant is £2.2m (4.2);
   - Projected overspend of £1.0m on the Housing Revenue Account (4.3);
   - 32.01% of 2016/17 approved revenue savings are currently delayed and 6.46% are currently at risk of not being achieved in the current financial year (4.5);

b) Projected Capital Programme Spend for 2016/17 is £160.3m in 2016/17 (as detailed in Appendix C);

c) Summary of bad debts totalling £0.36m awaiting approval to be written off (8.2).

d) An update of the Annual Procurement Plan and waivers granted in the period between January 2016 to August 2016 (as detailed in Appendix H and I);

e) An update on the Council’s performance against the key corporate financial indicators (10.1).

1.2 Cabinet members are asked to note and approve the following recommendations with regards to Treasury Management Strategy:
a) To note the update on the Council’s Treasury Management activity against approved strategy (6.1);
b) To approve the recommendation to invest Highways Maintenance PFI reserve funds in the Legal & General Short Dated Corporate Bond Index Fund, for the duration of the PFI contract, enabling drawdown as and when required (as detailed in Appendix G);
c) To delegate to the Director of Finance and Corporate Services any changes to the fund to be invested in, for the duration of the PFI contract, as long as any such Fund remains of investment grade (BBB or above) (as detailed in Appendix G).

1.3 Cabinet members are asked to make available for draw down upon request from Lampton 360 Limited the remaining £600k of loan facility agreed by Council on 15th September 2015 as part of the Medium Term Financial Strategy report (7.2).

### If the recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit, link to Values</th>
<th>Dates by which they can expect to notice a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council will manage its cost pressures to ensure that costs are managed within the approved budget.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 REPORT SUMMARY

2.1 This report provides an update on:

a) 2016/17 Projected Revenue Outturn Position at the end of Period 4 (July 2016) for;
   
   - General Fund of £197.3m which represents an overspend against revised budget on departmental revenue spend. This variance ranges from £4.9m to £13.0m depending on the successful implementation of mitigation strategies. There is a projected £6.0m underspend against revised budget on corporate budgets which will reduce the overspend range between -£1.1m to £7.0m.
   - Housing Revenue Account (HRA) with an overspend of £1.0m against 2016/17 deficit budget of £12.76m;
   - Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding gap of £2.2m funded from one-off DSG reserves.
   - 2016/17 Savings update.
   - Budget virements processed in this period.

b) The capital programme budget at the end of June 2016 is £299.9m. Out of which £160.3m is projected to be spent in 2016/17 and the remaining £139.6m is set to be spent over the next three years. As at the end of June 2016 the actual spend on the capital projects was £10.8m, this represents 7% of the 2016/17 projected spend. The actual spend in quarter 1 is consistent with the relatively low spend for the same period in 2015/16 of 9%.

d) Summary of write offs awaiting approval.


f) An update on the Council’s performance against the key corporate financial indicators.

3 **KEY IMPLICATIONS**

3.1 This report also includes the recommendations relating to;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Recommendation Ref</th>
<th>Report Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment of Highways Maintenance PFI reserve funds for the duration of the PFI contract, enabling drawdown as and when required.</td>
<td>1.2(b) and 1.2(c)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining loan payment draw down for Lampton 360 Limited.</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 **REVENUE BUDGET**

4.1 **General Fund**

4.1.1 The table 1 below provides a summary of each directorate’s performance against the Council’s approved 2016/17 revenue budget and is based on department’s projections of their anticipated outturn for the year. Appendix A provides further detail by department and service division area.

4.1.2 The projected revenue outturn anticipates a significant overspend on departmental revenue spend and a £6.0m underspend on corporate budgets.

4.1.3 Mitigation reports have been prepared for each service area overspending by more than £100k. Where mitigation plans are robust, these have built into current projected figures. If all mitigation plans are successfully implemented the variance would change as shown. Appendix B outlines the updated mitigation plans.
Table 1: 2016/17 General Fund Projected Outturn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>(a) Original Budget</th>
<th>(b) Revised Budget</th>
<th>(c) Projected Outturn</th>
<th>(d) (c)-(b) Variance</th>
<th>(e) Mitigation proposals</th>
<th>(f) (d)-(e) Adjusted Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration, Economic Development &amp; Environment</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s, Housing and Adult Services</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>107.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Service Spend</strong></td>
<td><strong>180.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>184.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>197.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Items (including Treasury Management)</td>
<td>-180.2</td>
<td>-184.2</td>
<td>-190.2</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)

4.2.1 The projected shortfall in 2016/17 indicates unfunded DSG pressures of £3.2m before application of clawback from unfilled Special Education Need (SEN) places (£1.0m) and one-off approved DSG reserves. Appendix A outlines detail by DSG service areas.

4.2.2 Previously DSG pressures have been funded from one-off reserves. The available DSG reserves in 2016/17 are currently committed against unfunded pressures carried forward from previous years. Therefore, any additional pressures which cannot be met from existing resources will need to be funded from the Council’s General Fund.

4.2.3 There is still some uncertainty around the level of actual DSG pressures in 2016/17 due to;

- not being able to identify the actual number of eligible early year places which will need to be funded;
- seven twelfths of the early years DSG allocation being based on the number of filled eligible places on roll in early years provision at January 2017 census;
- the budgets for SEN being demand led and volatile making it difficult to accurately project costs and the level of clawbacks expected from vacant/unfilled places.

4.2.4 The other key financial issue relates to the implementation of a new National Funding Formula from 1 April 2017. Details of the actual funding formula and its impact at a local level are not yet known making it difficult to predict the budget pressure for 2017/18 onwards.

4.2.5 Schools Forum and council officers are working together to establish savings, cost reductions and changes to service delivery to mitigate the financial risk but the current regulations limit decisions with regards to DSG funding cuts and as a result increase the risk for funding pressures to be drawn into the Council’s General Fund.

4.3 Housing Revenue Account (HRA)

4.3.1 Appendix A provides summary detail of the projected HRA overspend of £1.0m by service area.

4.4 Significant Budget Variances

4.4.1 The budget pressures impacting on each area are set out in the table below alongside other key budget variances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Budget Pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>The Chief Executive’s directorate is projecting an overspend of £1.15m this is mainly due to the following pressures:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                     | • ICT is projecting an overspend of £1.3m mainly due to;  
  o continued costs of maintaining legacy systems that were not replaced as part of the ICT Strategy;  
  o increased maintenance costs;  
  o running costs relating to new systems implemented as part of the ICT Strategy e.g. BOX and Salesforce; and  
  o increased costs of running mobile devices.  
• £0.68m overspend is being reported on the Chief Executive’s division due to unallocated savings for 2016/17.                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Children’s, Housing and Adult Services’ | The Children’s, Housing and Adults’ directorate is projecting an overall overspend of £10.0m for the year. This is mainly due to the following budget pressures:                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|                                     | • £4.3m overspend in Housing is mainly due to overspend on Temporary Accommodation. Mitigation measures are being implemented, as approved in the April Cabinet report to control overspend.                                                                                                               |
|                                     | • £1.8m in Education and Early Intervention division, which relates to an increase in cost of delivering Home to School Transport attributable to an increase in the number of pupils and routes.                                                                                                                                            |
|                                     | • £1.3m in the Specialist Services on Looked After Children (LAC) placements in 16/17 compared to £0.5m overspend in 15/16. £0.8m increase mainly due to £0.6m asylum overspend previously funded from reserve (but reserve no longer exists) and £0.2m placements overspend (however this is in the context of £0.55m MTFS budget reduction so in real terms there has been a £0.35m reduction in spend since 15/16 and this £0.2m is the red rated shortfall in 16/17 MTFS savings). |
|                                     | • Adult Social Care and Joint Commissioning is reporting a net overspend of £0.7m. This is a result of £1.2m overspend on residential and nursing placements being partially funded by £0.5m Better Care Fund.                                                                                                                  |
|                                     | • £0.5m overspend is being reported on the Director division due to unallocated vacancy factor savings from 15/16 and 16/17.                                                                                                      |
| Regeneration, Economic Development & Environment | The Regeneration, Economic Development & Environment (REDe) is projecting an overall overspend of £1.9m at the end of period 4                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|                                     | a) REDe Management division is currently projecting an overspend of £0.2m in 16/17. This is owing to the existing budget pressures related to unachieved printer savings and the centralised vacancy factor.                                                                                                                                                                 |
|                                     | b) Public Health and Leisure are projected to overspend by £0.1m due to increased costs relating to VFM audit of Libraries contract.                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|                                     | c) The £0.2m overspend on Strategic Planning, Regeneration and Economic is driven by overspends in Corporate Property related to |
agency staffing. Work is underway to mitigate these overspends going forward through employment of permanent staffing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Items</th>
<th>There is a projected underspend of £6m within corporate items budgets. This is mainly attributable to an underspend of the corporate inflation and contingency budgets as well as an early delivery of savings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)</td>
<td>At the end of period 4 the projected DSG funding shortfall was £2.2m after taking into account £1.0m of estimated clawback funding relating to unfilled Special Education Need (SEN) places. The funding pressures across the DSG include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nil inflationary increase (DSG allocation frozen at 2010/11 levels);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demographic pressures relating to SEN and Early Years;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early Years DSG Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Early Years DSG block is funded on January places resulting in a overspend in year against the eligible places required to be funded;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o on average there is a funding shortfall of £0.58 per hour in the funding received through the Early Years DSG block and what the Council currently pays for actual places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High Needs DSG Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the increase in projected SEN demand, especially children with complex needs requiring more intensive support;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the increase in High Needs DSG grant of £0.2m reflecting increase in post-16 does not fully cover the increased costs and demand relating to number of children (0-25 year old) with SEN in borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Revenue Account (HRA)</td>
<td>At period 4 the projected position for the HRA is a deficit of £13.8m, compared to a budgeted deficit of £12.8m. The key variances contributing to this projected overspend of £1m are set out below:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                 | • £99k overspend within repairs and maintenance due to the impact of pay protection for operatives moving to “single status”.
|                 | • £100k underspend within general management as a result of a number of vacant posts following restructuring exercises. |
|                 | • £540k overspend in sheltered housing, made up of two significant factors; |
|                 | o £240k costs of decant payments associated with the sheltered housing refurbishment programme. |
|                 | o £300k increased cost of repairs on sheltered housing stock. |
|                 | • £470k lower income on service charges for District Heating fuel consumption, following changes to the billing arrangements. This will be reviewed for 2017/18. |

4.5 **Savings Update**

4.5.1 The 2016/17 saving figures have been included in the monitoring above and can be summarised as follows:
Table 3: 2016/17 Savings Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Total saving for year</th>
<th>Saving on track</th>
<th>Saving delayed</th>
<th>Saving at risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Savings</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.98%</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.88%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.13%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2 The main savings currently reported as being delayed include:

- £0.35m - Reduce the demand for high cost placements for children in care by supporting children and young people to remain in their families
- £0.40m - Restructures across services in the Transformation; Customer Relations, Communications and Engagement and Business Development divisions in CED
- £0.42m - Early Intervention and Family Support
- £0.54m - Parking Charges
- £0.80m - Waste Collection

4.5.3 The main savings reported at the end of the current period which are at risk in not being delivered in year include:

- £0.20m - Reduce the demand for high cost placements for children in care by supporting children and young people to remain in their families
- £0.25m - Reorganisations within reduced legal services
- £0.30m - Restructures across services in the Transformation; Customer Relations, Communications and Engagement and Business Development divisions in CED
- £0.30m - Regulatory Services and Enforcement
- £0.33m - Delaying recruitment across Children’s and Adult Services department
- £0.70m - Preventative Strategies - Learning Disabilities

4.5.4 A failure to deliver on these targets will require alternative savings to be found and delivered to maintain the current savings target. No contingency is put in place to support non-delivery.

4.6 Virements

4.6.1 The budget virements approved and processed this month are reflected within the budgets for each service directorate. The virements processed in period 4 related to:

- Inflation Funding: as detailed in the month 3 cabinet report, £2.6m was allocated for pay related inflationary costs and £1.4m for contractual uplifts
- Reorganisation of Supply Chain and Finance Strategy and Accounting

5 CAPITAL PROGRAMME

5.1 The capital programme for 2016/17 to 2020/21 as at Quarter 1 totals £299.9m. This is funded from various sources such as borrowing, capital receipts, Council’s reserves as well as external grants such as DFE Basic Needs, TFL allocation or partnership and
section 106, GLA grants and HRA reserves. The allocated budgets are profiled over four years to reflect the timing of spend and delivery of the schemes.

5.2 As at end of June 2016 services forecast to spend £160.33m. Appendix C provides an overview of delivery of the capital programme against the approved capital budget by department and division, whilst Appendix D provides further detail on key areas of the capital programme.

5.3 **Section 106 (S106)**

5.4 The table below shows the overall position for S106 income as at end July 2016. There is currently a total balance of £42.5m in S106 funding for capital and revenue projects. The unallocated money will be taken forward for formal allocation as responsible officers begin to implement the agreements. Officers have undertaken detailed work on reconciling available S106 in the past few months.

Table 4: Section 106 Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total S106 Balance</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Capital Budget</th>
<th>Unallocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Services and Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration, Economic Development and Environment</td>
<td>37.26</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>18.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Of the £21.6m allocated, £8.7m is recognised within the capital programme. The remaining £20.9m is awaiting allocation to the following areas:

- Transport will have receive £6.8m to be allocated in September 2016 following Single Member Decision for a variety of Traffic & Transport projects including the public transport access in the vicinity of Chiswick Business Park.

- Health and Social Care will receive £1.6m to be allocated in August/September 2016 following Single Member Decision for Health related projects which includes Additional Extra Care Housing and Heston Health Centre.

- £8.0m will be allocated to the Affordable Housing provision. Discussions are now in progress for this.

- Approximately £1.0m is allocated twice a year to “The Community Wish List” group projects. This is a meeting where community organisations, council members and area forums suggest projects in their locality which is needed to mitigate the impact of development in their area. The consultation is currently underway and the Single Member Decision will be approved in December 2016.

- Employment and Training will be allocated approximately £1.0m over the next 2 to 4 months.
• The final balance of approximately £2.5m will be distributed amongst various projects which contain detailed legal agreements, defining how exactly the money can be spent.

5.6 The Planning Policy team are also investigating stalled projects across the Council, in particular unallocated resources that can be used for schools expansion programme and liaising with relevant service areas to determine if monies attached to such projects could be released and allocated to priority projects.

6 TREASURY MANAGEMENT

6.1 Appendix E provides a detailed summary of the Council’s Treasury Management activity, borrowing and investments compared to budget at the end of 31 July 2016 and highlights the following:

• Activity is in line with the Strategy agreed by Borough Council on 23 February 2016;
• There are currently no areas of concern regarding security or liquidity of investments;
• Short-term investments at 31 July 2016 were £223.09m;
• External investment income to 31 July 2016 was £0.6m compared to a profiled budget of £0.4m, primarily due to higher levels of lending than anticipated;
• In line with the Strategy no new long-term borrowing has been undertaken and long term external borrowing is currently £194.1m;
• The prudential indicators were not breached;
• The weighted average rate of return on the temporary investment portfolio at 30 June 2016 was 0.82%, compared to the local authority average of 0.72%.

6.2 Investment of Highways Maintenance PFI Reserve Funds

6.2.1 The Council commenced a 25 year contract with Vinci Ringway to deliver highways related services from January 2013. This contract is part funded by a grant from the Department of Transport and part funded from the Council's own budget. The financing provides for the setting aside of earmarked funds at the beginning of the contract to help fund future commitments. As at 31st March 2016 the PFI earmarked funds balance stood at £10m. The report is recommending for the Council to invest these funds in an earmarked fund to generate higher rates of interest than those available on our daily cash flow management. Appendix G provides the business case to support the recommendation of investing the PFI funds.

7 LAMPTON 360 LOAN FACILITY

7.1 Lampton 360 Limited is now going through its final phase of set up to deliver;

• waste collection services through Recycle 360,
• planned and major repairs to the authorities housing stock through Facilities Management 360, and
• begin purchasing and developing residential property through Property 360.

7.2 The last loan approval for Lampton 360 was agreed by Single Member Decision on 24th June 2016 which stipulated that further instalments will be subject to approval of the Business Plans by the Cabinet in its capacity as the Boards Shareholder. The
business plans for the subsidiaries have now been approved by Cabinet and therefore this report requests the remaining loan facility of £600k is made available to drawdown as required by the company.

8 BAD DEBT

8.1 The Council does not write off historic debts until it has exhausted every possible option to recover any monies owed. A number of methods are used for debt recovery, which include data matching with other local authorities and private companies, internal tracing and external tracing through the use of external tracing agents.

8.2 As permitted under current Regulations the Director of Finance and Corporate Services is authorised to approve individual write offs up to the value of £10,000. As at the end of period 4, there were £360k of bad debts relating to the following areas are awaiting authorisation to be written-off.

Table 5: Bad Debts Awaiting Authorisation to be written-off

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax</td>
<td>£190,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Benefit</td>
<td>£28,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates (NNDR)</td>
<td>£136,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA Rent</td>
<td>£4,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>£120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£360,281</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 These are largely due to uncollectable old debts (often exceeding 12 months old), deceased, non-traceable and bankruptcy cases.

9 ANNUAL PROCUREMENT PLAN 2016/17

9.1 Members agreed in June 2013 to formalise an Annual Procurement Plan (APP) to afford them the opportunity to have sight of contracting activity at a much earlier stage in the process and to decide where the decision to either commence a Procurement and/or award a contract should reside.

9.2 Appendix H provides a progress update for the APP broken down by Directorate and completion status.

9.3 As permitted under the Regulations the Chief Executive or Director Finance and Corporate Services is authorised to grant waivers to the regulations in certain circumstances. A summary of all the Waivers granted since the last report (January to August 2016) can be seen in Appendix I.

10 KEY CORPORATE FINANCIAL INDICATORS

10.1 A number of key corporate financial indicators have been identified to assess and monitor the council’s performance and these are detailed in Appendix J. Of the six indicators, four are green, one is amber and one is red. The red and amber ratings are:
• The red rating relates to the projected net departmental revenue overspend of £2.4m. Further details are provided in Appendix A and paragraphs 4.1 and 4.4;

• The amber rating relates to business rates (NNDR) collected to date. The indicator is currently 0.62% below its year-to-date target of 38.31%. It is anticipated that the target will be met by the end of the year.

11 COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR, FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES
11.1 The Director’s comments are included within the body of this report.

12 LEGAL DETAILS / COMMENTS OF HEAD OF GOVERNANCE.
12.1 The details in the report have been noted.

13 VALUE FOR MONEY
13.1 There is no value for money implications.

14 SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT APPRAISAL
14.1 A sustainability impact appraisal is not necessary.

15 RISK MANAGEMENT
15.1 The council must ensure that costs are kept within the approved balanced budget. To manage this risk, the council reviews its performance and position on a regular basis and reports on its performance on a monthly basis. Key financial risks are reported in the Council’s corporate risk register.

16 LINKS TO COUNCIL PRIORITIES
16.1 Monthly reporting of the financial position of the council is an important part of running the council in a transparent and efficient way.

17 EQUALITIES, HUMAN RIGHTS AND COMMUNITY COHESION
17.1 The Cabinet members are not being asked to make any decisions with implications in relation to equalities, human rights and community cohesion.

18 STAFFING/WORKFORCE AND ACCOMODATION IMPLICATIONS
18.1 With regards to the financial monitoring Cabinet members are not being asked to make any decisions with implications in relation to staffing/workforce and accommodation.

19 PROPERTY AND ASSETS
19.1 The Cabinet members are not being asked to make any decisions with implications in relation to property and assets.

20 ANY OTHER IMPLICATIONS
20.1 There are no further implications.

21 CONSULTATIONS

21.1 No consultation is required for this report.

22 TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

22.1 The timetable for implementation is with immediate effect.

23 APPENDICES

- Appendix A - Detailed Revenue Outturn Position
- Appendix B - Revenue Mitigation Plans
- Appendix C - Capital Programme Outturn Position
- Appendix D - Major Capital Projects
- Appendix E - Treasury Management
- Appendix F - Confidential Treasury Management
- Appendix G - Investment of Highways Maintenance PFI Reserve Funds
- Appendix H - Annual Procurement Plan (APP)
- Appendix I - Waivers
- Appendix J - Performance against the Key Corporate Financial Indicators

24 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

24.1 None applicable.
# CHIEF EXECUTIVE
## BUDGET MONITORING STATEMENT
### July 2016 (Period 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Approved Net Budget</th>
<th>Revised Net Budget</th>
<th>Spend to Date</th>
<th>Projected Outturn</th>
<th>Outturn Variance</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(1,008)</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>Overspend due to unallocated savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relations, Communication and Engag</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>Projected underspend due to part year vacancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Corporate Services</td>
<td>15,466</td>
<td>15,813</td>
<td>(16,486)</td>
<td>15,195</td>
<td>(618)</td>
<td>Projected underspend due to part year vacancies and underspend on Housing Benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Projected overspend due to salaries underspend of £37k offset by unachievable income of £103k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>5,525</td>
<td>5,698</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>6,789</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>Projected overspend of £1m includes £1.3m overspend on ICT. The budget pressures across ICT are mainly due to a) continued costs of maintaining legacy systems that were not replaced as part of the ICT Strategy; b) increased maintenance costs; and c) running costs relating to new systems implemented as part of the ICT Strategy e.g. BOX and Salesforce; and d) increased costs of running mobile devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>9,348</td>
<td>9,583</td>
<td>4,682</td>
<td>9,610</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Overspend due to unallocated savings and salaries overspend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,480</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,346</strong></td>
<td><strong>(9,532)</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,492</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,146</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN PROJECTED VARIANCES SINCE PREVIOUS MONITORING REPORT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Variance</th>
<th>Projected Variance (latest)</th>
<th>Projected Variance (last month)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Main Reasons for the Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>(688)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relations, Communication and Engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Corporate Services</td>
<td>(270)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Development</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>673</strong></td>
<td>(673)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Safety, Environment and regulatory services
- **Approved Net Budget**: £37,569
- **Revised Net Budget**: £37,849
- **Spend to Date**: £590
- **Projected Outturn**: £39,149
- **Outturn**: £1,300
- **Variance**: £0
- **Notes**: Overspend due to vacancy factor saving and printer recharge budget pressure. Work underway to establish how vacancy factor saving will be achieved, not expected to affect REDe bottom line.

### Management
- **Approved Net Budget**: £380
- **Revised Net Budget**: £354
- **Spend to Date**: £196
- **Projected Outturn**: £575
- **Outturn**: £221
- **Variance**: £0
- **Notes**: Ongoing overspend.

### Public Health and Leisure
- **Approved Net Budget**: £17,086
- **Revised Net Budget**: £17,108
- **Spend to Date**: £3,415
- **Projected Outturn**: £17,231
- **Outturn**: £122
- **Variance**: £0
- **Notes**: Ongoing overspend.

### Strategic Planning, Regeneration and Economic Delivery
- **Approved Net Budget**: (£1,687)
- **Revised Net Budget**: (£1,569)
- **Spend to Date**: £1,296
- **Projected Outturn**: (£1,340)
- **Outturn**: £229
- **Variance**: £0
- **Notes**: Ongoing overspend.

### Total
- **Approved Net Budget**: £53,348
- **Revised Net Budget**: £53,742
- **Spend to Date**: £5,497
- **Projected Outturn**: £55,615
- **Outturn**: £1,873
- **Variance**: £0

---

**REGENERATION, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT**

**BUDGET MONITORING STATEMENT**

**July 2016 (Period 4)**
## Significant Changes in Projected Variances Since Previous Monitoring Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Variance</th>
<th>Projected Variance (latest) £'000</th>
<th>Projected Variance (last month) £'000</th>
<th>Change £'000</th>
<th>Main Reasons for the Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety, Environment and regulatory services</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>(1,300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>(278)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health and Leisure</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning, Regeneration and Economic Delivery</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,716</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,716)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CHILDREN'S AND ADULTS' SERVICES

**BUDGET MONITORING STATEMENT**

**July 2016 (Period 4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Approved Net Budget £'000</th>
<th>Revised Net Budget £'000</th>
<th>Spend to Date £'000</th>
<th>Outturn £'000</th>
<th>Outturn Variance £'000</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>(278)</td>
<td>(273)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention Services</td>
<td>15,591</td>
<td>16,038</td>
<td>10,353</td>
<td>18,101</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>£1.8m overspend relates to SEN Transport which relates to increased costs as a result of increasing SEN pupil numbers. £0.3m DSG overspend on Early Years block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools - Non Delegated &amp; Delegated</td>
<td>(356)</td>
<td>(329)</td>
<td>36,666</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>£1.1m DSG overspend on High Needs block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Safeguarding &amp; Specialist Services</td>
<td>24,864</td>
<td>25,271</td>
<td>7,323</td>
<td>26,532</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>Projected £1.3m overspend for 16/17 compared to £0.5m overspend in 15/16. £0.8m increase mainly due to £550k asylum overspend previously funded from reserve (but reserve no longer exists) and £200k increase in placements overspend (however this is in the context of a further £0.55m budget reduction so actually a further £350k reduction in spend since 15/16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Social Care</td>
<td>42,404</td>
<td>43,763</td>
<td>16,606</td>
<td>44,963</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>£1.2m overspend on placements; predominantly residential and nursing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td>7,886</td>
<td>8,335</td>
<td>(211)</td>
<td>7,835</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>£0.5m BCF is being used to support the overspend on Adults placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4,214</td>
<td>4,359</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>4,388</td>
<td>Projected £4.3m overspend is mainly due to overspend on Temporary Accommodation. Mitigation measures are being implemented, as approved in the April Cabinet report to control overspend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94,326</td>
<td>97,163</td>
<td>77,351</td>
<td>107,160</td>
<td>9,996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN PROJECTED VARIANCES SINCE PREVIOUS MONITORING REPORT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Variance</th>
<th>Projected Variance (latest) £'000</th>
<th>Projected Variance (last month) £'000</th>
<th>Change £'000</th>
<th>Main Reasons for the Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>(503)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention Services</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>(2,063)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools - Non Delegated &amp; Delegated</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>(1,082)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Safeguarding &amp; Specialist Services</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>(1,261)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Social Care</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>(1,200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,109</td>
<td>(6,109)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Approved Net Budget</th>
<th>Revised Net Budget</th>
<th>Spend to Date</th>
<th>Projected Outturn</th>
<th>Outturn Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Change</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td>15,003</td>
<td>15,003</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>15,102</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Management</td>
<td>13,221</td>
<td>13,221</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>13,121</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>12,415</td>
<td>12,415</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>12,955</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Items of Expenditure</td>
<td>27,049</td>
<td>27,049</td>
<td>6,762</td>
<td>27,049</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(68,400)</td>
<td>(68,400)</td>
<td>(22,672)</td>
<td>(68,400)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11,409)</td>
<td>(11,409)</td>
<td>(3,125)</td>
<td>(10,938)</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,835</td>
<td>27,835</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,835</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,763</td>
<td>12,763</td>
<td>(8,875)</td>
<td>13,773</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN PROJECTED VARIANCES SINCE PREVIOUS MONITORING REPORT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Variance</th>
<th>Projected Variance (latest)</th>
<th>Projected Variance (last month)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Main Reasons for the Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td>£'000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance (Mgt Fee)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Projected overspend is due to the impact of pay protection for operatives moving to single status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision &amp; Management (Mgt Fee)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The projected overspend is within Sheltered Housing and arises as a result of: £240k as estimated cost of decant payments associated with the sheltered refurbishment programme, and approximately £300k of extra repairs costs on sheltered units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH Client costs</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Items of Expenditure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Rental Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Contribution Towards Expenditure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reduction in District Heating income due to change in billing arrangements. A review of billing arrangements is required to ensure compliance with heat metering and billing legislation and to ensure recovery of fuel costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions To/From Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Approved Net Budget '000</th>
<th>Revised Net Budget '000</th>
<th>Spend to Date '000</th>
<th>Projected Outturn Outturn '000</th>
<th>Variance '000</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools Block:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated to Schools</td>
<td>98,436</td>
<td>98,436</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>98,436</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Expenditure</td>
<td>73,618</td>
<td>73,618</td>
<td>21,824</td>
<td>73,618</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Licenses</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>3,937</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Recoupment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Block</td>
<td>15,139</td>
<td>15,139</td>
<td>3,616</td>
<td>15,266</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Needs Block</td>
<td>39,624</td>
<td>39,627</td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>39,867</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Overspend £0.24m of which £0.16m is funded from one-off budgeted drawing from reserves (£1.9m). The overspend is mainly due to the Early Years DSG block funding not fully covering the actual cost of the Council in meeting its statutory duty to fund free childcare (15 hours weekly) eligible places for disadvantaged 2 year olds and all 3-4 year olds in the borough.

Projected Overspend £3m before application of clawback from unfilled Special Education Need (SEN) places of £1.0m and £1.7m funded from one-off budgeted drawing from reserves (£1.9m). The overspend is mainly due to the High Needs DSG grant not fully covering the increased costs and demand relating to number of children (0-25 year old) with SEN in borough, especially children with complex needs requiring more intensive support.

### NQT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Variance</th>
<th>Projected Variance (latest) '000</th>
<th>Projected Variance (last month) '000</th>
<th>Change '000</th>
<th>Main Reasons for the Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegated to Schools</td>
<td>98,436</td>
<td>(98,436)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Expenditure</td>
<td>73,618</td>
<td>(73,618)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Licenses</td>
<td>3,937</td>
<td>(3,937)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Recoupment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Years Block</td>
<td>15,266</td>
<td>(15,266)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Needs Block</td>
<td>39,867</td>
<td>(39,867)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQT</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG Income</td>
<td>(228,938)</td>
<td>(228,938)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to/from reserve</td>
<td>(1,900)</td>
<td>(1,900)</td>
<td>(2,237)</td>
<td>(337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(58,393)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN PROJECTED VARIANCES SINCE PREVIOUS MONITORING REPORT:

- **Schools Block:**
  - Delegated to Schools: Change from (98,436) to 98,436.
  - Central Expenditure: Change from (73,618) to 73,618.
  - Copyright Licenses: Change from (3,937) to 3,937.
  - Academy Recoupment: Change from 0 to 0.
  - Early Years Block: Change from (15,266) to 15,266.
  - High Needs Block: Change from (39,867) to 39,867.
  - NQT: Change from 51 to 51.
  - DSG Income: Change from (228,938) to 228,938.
  - Contribution to/from reserve: Change from (1,900) to (2,237).

- **Total:** Change from (0) to (58,393).
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Finance Mitigation Strategy 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref: Service</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Accommodation</td>
<td>CHAS</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service leadership

Cabinet lead  Cllr Dunne  
Director       Alan Adams  
Service Lead  Peter Matthew

Financial Pressure. (As is)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget (£000)</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Projected Outturn (£000)</td>
<td>5,747</td>
<td>5,735</td>
<td>5,485</td>
<td>5,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (£000)</td>
<td>4,273</td>
<td>4,273</td>
<td>4,273</td>
<td>4,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings allocated (£000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

Hounslow, similar to other London authorities continues to experience significant rise in the number of households in severe housing need and homeless. The trend shows an increase of over 64% over the past three years. Coupled with this, is the severe shortage of affordable private rented homes which is required to breach the gap in the steady reduction in the supply of social housing. The trend is set to increase due to changes in national policy and welfare reform. The financial impact is reflected in the growing deficit in TA costs which is the unavoidable consequence of this imbalance between rising homelessness and supply shortages.

- **Drivers for Overspend**

  - **Rise in the number of homeless households** approaching the service for assistance.

  - **Increase in the number of evictions**: as result of more private landlords demanding higher rents - on average 4% more per year, refusing to accept or retain housing benefit tenants, and taking a tough line with tenants in rent arrears. Such evictions now account for approximately 40% of all our homeless cases.

  - **Social factors and loss of home** due to domestic violence, relationship breakdowns, releases from institutions, parental and relative eviction. Together these factors account for 46.5% of all our homeless cases.

  - **Changes in the local housing allowance and housing benefit caps**, as consequence of which we estimate that approximately 500 of the 6,800 private sector tenants in Hounslow that claim Housing Benefit will struggle to pay their rent. This is set to rise significantly with further planned reductions in the benefit cap from 26k to 23k in 2016. We expect the reduction will particularly impact families in 2 bedrooms and above accommodation in the borough.
• **Growing unaffordability of housing** due to the longer term effects of the recession, which has reduced incomes and increased the costs of living. Coupled with benefit caps, spare room subsidy and the lowering of local housing allowance, these have combined to make private renting less affordable, and to rising rent arrears.

• **Temporary Accommodation Grant.** This has been frozen since April 2011, whilst the cut of acquiring private sector property has increased every year, as stated above rents are rising by an average of 4% every year.

• **Increase in the incentive payment** to landlords due to difficulty in procuring the required number of private rented properties in the borough at affordable prices for full discharge of duty.

• **Local housing allowance and Welfare Reform.** Unemployed large homeless households affected by the benefit cap are increasing.

• **The introduction of Universal Credit (UC) across the borough has reduced accessibility to a steady supply of homes. Landlords are reluctant to grant tenancies to universal credit claimants due to delays in the processing of claims.**

• **Over Heated Housing Market.** Has led to a Greater numbers of evictions as more private landlords demand higher rents nearer to the market rents (which are rising at about 4% per year), are less prepared to accept or retain housing benefit tenants. Approximately 40% of homeless cases are now as a result of evictions from private sector accommodation.

• **Impact of recent case law** - New guidelines have been set for determining the priority need status of individuals. This has led to an increase in annual acceptance rates of up to 8 to 10%.

• **Competition from Central London boroughs** paying higher incentives to landlords in outer London borough.

Describe the service delivery under pressure and what the cost drivers are that are creating the financial pressure. What policy/Service/Demographic changes have resulted in the current financial issue? Is this pressure expected to continue and what is the projected ongoing pressure?

Summarise any relevant policy considerations.

Provide relevant comparisons/benchmarking where applicable against other similar services.

**Mitigation Strategy - Details**

In October 2015, Cabinet approved a Homelessness Management Plan which, sets out the following range of actions to better manage increases in severe housing need and homelessness and temporary accommodation. The following actions agreed are currently in place:
• The number of households accepted for emergency accommodation has been reduced to an average of 8 per month, and total acceptances has reduced to less than 60 percent and stabilising the rise in TA numbers.

• Number of households in bed and breakfast placements has reduced from a stagnant annual of 335 (2013) to less than 60, whilst ensuring that no families are kept in B&B for no more than 6 weeks;

• Households are being supported to remain in their own homes through tenancy sustainment and better use of Discretionary Housing Payments; and

It is recognised that our actions cannot, reduce the flow of homelessness approaches or the total amount of households requiring temporary accommodation in view of the issues relating to current demand and supply pressures explained above, it is estimated that homelessness acceptances are likely to increase to over 700 by 2017/18 with corresponding increases in temporary accommodation and costs.

The following additional steps needed to balance increasing needs for, and available supply of affordable properties for discharging duty into the private rented sector and for use as temporary accommodation were agreed by Cabinet in May 2016.

1. **Maintaining our focus on preventative actions to avoid households becoming homeless in the first place.**

   • make best use of existing resources in encouraging current social tenants to downsize;
   • facilitate proactive homeless prevention in giving homeless households a private rented offer thereby avoiding temporary accommodation; and
   • better understand the financial position of existing tenants to see who would be suitable for shared ownership.

2. **Revision of the Allocation Policy**

   • Move from a choice based to a preference based, direct offer approach to allocating permanent housing to enable ease of discharging into suitable private rental accommodation.

   • Review and inclusion of the current “Placement Protocol” with the Allocation Policy to enable the appropriate placement of homeless applicants outside of the borough.

3. **Increasing the availability of ‘suitable private rented’ properties.**

   • Ensure adequate supplies of private rented properties to enable the discharge of housing duty or for use as temporary accommodation for emergency cases
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- Approval was granted for Lampton 360 to take forward plans for:
  - building 274 new private rented sector units to be offered at market rent, including 41 between 2016 and 2018; and
  - purchasing 175 private rented sector units for to be offered at subsidised rent, including 150 between 2016 and 2018.

4. Increasing the availability of ‘social rent’ and affordable properties.

I. We plan to increase the supply of social rented homes by delivering through the Council’s house building programme, and through our partnership working with Lampton 360 and Registered Providers. Majority of homes will be for social rent with a small proportion for shared ownership. Illustrated in Table 1.1 is a breakdown of the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Intermediate (Rent/Shared Ownership)</th>
<th>Sheltered / Supported</th>
<th>Social Rent†</th>
<th>Private Rent (L360)</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Optimising the use of the Council’s existing housing stock

- Reduce void turnaround time & increase the supply of Council properties available for permanent lettings from approximately 10 to 15 per week.
- Claiming down on tenancy fraud. 44 properties were reclaimed in December 2015 which we expect to increase to 85 per year.
- Incentivising tenants who are under-occupying units to downsize to smaller units we expect to free up and reallocate a greater number of larger homes from under occupying households - from 50 to 110 units annually.
- Incentivising suitable council tenants to take up new shared ownership and other “intermediate market” products.

III. Temporary conversion/use of vacant council buildings for TA

With the above measures in place, it is estimated that an additional 500 social rent units per year would approximately double the current number of properties available to house homeless households in TA and those on the housing register. This would potentially reduce the total number of households in TA by approximate 250 per year.
Highlight the mitigation strategy to be implemented. Detail each strand of the programme of work and the timeframes for its implementation. Detail the Service/KPI/Volume changes expected to be delivered by the mitigation strategy. Complete the two tables below with detailed SMART objectives expected from the mitigation strategy.

### Projected Financial Performance. (To be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016/17 Projection</th>
<th>2017/18 Projection</th>
<th>2018/19 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget (£000)</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Projected Outturn (£000)</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>4,061</td>
<td>3,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (£000)</td>
<td>3,561</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>2,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Impact of the Mitigation Strategy (£000)</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>2,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Performance Changes. To be completed as applicable to the mitigation strategy and service.

#### Bed and Breakfast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator/KPI/ Demand levels</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015/16 Performance Average</th>
<th>QTR1 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR2 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR3 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR4 16/17 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Levels (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost(if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Performance target. (Add additional rows as required)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator/KPI/Demand levels</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015/16 Performance Average</th>
<th>QTR1 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR2 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR3 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR4 16/17 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Levels (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Performance target. (Add additional rows as required)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PSL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator/KPI/Demand levels</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015/16 Performance Average</th>
<th>QTR1 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR2 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR3 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR4 16/17 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Levels (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Performance target. (Add additional rows as required)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Incentive Payments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator/KPI/Demand levels</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015/16 Performance Average</th>
<th>QTR1 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR2 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR3 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR4 16/17 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Levels (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Performance target. (Add additional rows as required)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lampton 360 Purchase - 50 properties in 2016/17**

**Prevention Strategies**
# Finance Mitigation Strategy 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref: Service</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAS</td>
<td>Children’s Safeguarding and Specialist Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Service leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet lead</td>
<td>Cllr Tom Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Anne Fitz-Patrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Lead</td>
<td>Bob Spencer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Financial Pressure. (As is)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget (£000)</td>
<td>10,604</td>
<td>10,054</td>
<td>9,504</td>
<td>8,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Projected Outturn (£000)</td>
<td>11,104</td>
<td>10,754</td>
<td>10,754</td>
<td>10,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (£000)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings allocated (£000)</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description

A £0.7m overspend is projected for 2016/17 (£0.5m is due to the underlying overspend that was reported for 2015/16 and £0.2m is due to unachieved savings for 16/17 out of the £550k target). The spend pressure in this area is due to increases in the overall volume of Looked After Children (LAC) placement days and the increasing costs of placements due to their changing profile as a result of the increasing complexity of LAC’s needs.

The equivalent overspend was £1.6m in 2014/15 and since then there has been a budget reduction of £1.1m in line with approved MTFS savings so a £2.7m spend reduction would have been required to break even in 2016/17. So although there is now a projected overspend of £0.7m for 16/17 there has been a £2.0m reduction in the Looked After Children placements spend since 2014/15.

The placement demand strategy highlighted below aims to deal with the existing £0.7m overspend pressure for 2016-17 and aims to deliver the further £1.1m MTFS savings that have been approved for the next 2 financial years. The projected spend on LAC has reduced by £0.35m since 2015/16, however the current overspend has increased by £0.2m due to the 16/17 budget reduction of £0.55m.

## Mitigation Strategy - Details
Proposed Mitigating Action

A Placement Demand Board has been set up to create a forward looking placement demand strategy to target improvements in efficiency, maintaining / improving outcomes and reducing costs of LAC placements.

The strategy includes:

- Reducing costs by reviewing the effectiveness of high cost placements
- Shifting the profile of placements
- Commissioning / contract managing more effectively to enable unit cost reductions to those that are focussed more on effective demand management.

The strategies with the largest projected impact are:

- Cost reductions from reduction of residential placements via Star Chamber Review
- Potential shift in placements from Independent Fostering Agencies (IFA) to less expensive In-House Foster Care placements.
- Increasing the % claim rate of post 18 clients for Housing Benefit to 70% and beyond from the current claim rate of 50%.
- Developing the market in the borough for RSL providers who are significantly cheaper than other semi-independent providers and have the added benefit of being able to claim housing benefit against support costs.

Many of the other strategies target improvements in the commissioning and contract management of placements e.g. lean review of placements. The current assumption in the model is that this will yield a 5% reduction in the average unit cost of placements compared with the 2014/15 position.
Impact of Mitigating Action

The aim of this placement demand strategy is to reduce the underlying £1.6m overspend that existed in 2014/15 and to help deliver the approved MTFS savings target of £2.2m between 2015/16 and 2018/19 for this area. The Table below lists out the savings ideas to the end of 2018/19 set out in the placement demand strategy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Efficiency Saving £'000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-House Fostering Service</td>
<td>Increase in costs</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Fostering Service</td>
<td>Decrease in Costs</td>
<td>(1,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private and Residential</td>
<td>Decrease in Costs</td>
<td>(1,430)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi Independent</td>
<td>Decrease in Costs</td>
<td>(930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>Decrease in Costs</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN – Social care element</td>
<td>Decrease in Costs</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other LA</td>
<td>Increase in costs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying Put Grant</td>
<td>Decrease in Costs</td>
<td>(80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Benefit</td>
<td>Decrease in Costs</td>
<td>(220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLA Discounts</td>
<td>Increase in costs</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Efficiency Savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>(4,200)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timescales of Impact

The Placement Demand Strategy aims to deliver the £2.2m MTFS savings relating to LAC placements and reduce the underlying overspend by the end of 2018/19. Some costs have already been significantly reduced as a result of this strategy, notably significant reductions in the costs of residential placements and the use of Independent Fostering Agencies. Spend on semi-independent accommodation for care leavers has remained static, and this is now a key area of focus for cost reduction.

Latest Projection

The projected overspend for 2016/17 remains at £0.7m and through the mitigation strategy £350k of the £550k 16/17 savings targets are projected to be met with £200k of the savings shown as RED. However at this stage it appears unlikely that the underlying overspend will be significantly reduced further during 2016/17 and beyond. This is because the significant savings already outlined have been achieved through efficiencies and practice change and these will continue to maintain the reduced spend at the current LAC cohort level which appears to be the base line for Hounslow. To achieve the projected savings targets a more radical approach will need to be found and the service will continue to explore all budget and practice areas to reduce spend. To ensure the underlying £0.7m overspend is eliminated staff numbers would need to be reduced and this will increase the risk to the safety of looked after children.
### Projected Financial Performance. (To be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016/17 Projection</th>
<th>2017/18 Projection</th>
<th>2018/19 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget (£000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Projected Outturn (£000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (£000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Impact of the Mitigation Strategy. (£000)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this stage the Director is projecting the mitigation plan will reduce spend levels by £350k, following the £2.2m reduction in spend since 14/15. This will only part deliver the £550k placements savings target for 2016-17 and the underlying LAC overspend therefore rises from £500k to £700k. This ties in with the current RAG ratings against placement savings.

### Projected Performance Changes. To be completed as applicable to the mitigation strategy and service. See separate placement demand strategy which has several streams (detailed unit cost and activity data is yet to be updated for 16-17.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator/KPI/ Demand levels</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015/16 Performance Average</th>
<th>QTR1 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR2 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR3 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR4 16/17 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Levels (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Performance target. (Add additional rows as required)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B.3

Finance Mitigation Strategy 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref: Service</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAS</td>
<td>Education and Early Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service leadership

| Cabinet lead  | Cllr Tom Bruce |
| Director      | Michael Marks  |
| Service Lead  | Merle Abbott and Mandy Walker |

Financial Pressure. (As is)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget (£000)</td>
<td>3,309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Projected Outturn (£000)</td>
<td>5,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (£000)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings allocated (£000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

The SEN Transport Service provides home to school transport for students with Special Educational Needs. The increase in school population has been mirrored with an increase of students assessed as having SEN. Some of these students will be eligible for home to school transport, according to our current policy, and the LA is required to provide transport for these students.

It is the sheer volume of students that is driving the cost pressure within the SEN transport service. The home to school transport service commission, route and monitor the routes not directly provided by the transport service.

For the 2015/16 Academic year the transport service ran / commissioned
- 64 in house routes (primarily 17 seater minibuses and accessible transport)
- 107 commissioned routes (a mix of minibuses, MPVs and minicabs)

The above routes provided a service for 663 students in total
- 406 on the in house service
- 257 on the commissioned service

This pressure is expected to continue as the Council is legally required to provide transport for students where they meet the eligibility criteria and the projections for SEN student numbers are not currently predicted any decline in the near future.

The budget also funds reimbursements (for example funding travel cards to support parents taking their children to school on public transport) to avoid the cost of supplying a more expensive space on a council or commissioned route) and travel training. This team support students to build their confidence and independence so that they can use public transport rather than the Home to School Transport Service.
Parents / Carers are required to apply every year for home to school transport and each case is assessed against the current school transport policy. This enables the service to annually monitor each case to assess if there have been changes to their circumstances which mean that they would no longer be eligible for home to school transport.

A thorough benchmarking of students with SEN was undertaken in the last financial year by colleagues in Corporate finance, which showed that Hounslow’s numbers whilst higher than some other LAs were broadly proportionate when compared with the wider student population in Hounslow. This information can be provided if Cabinet would like to see it.

External Analysts were commissioned earlier this year to undertake an assessment of the SEN transport service. Thus included assessing the cost, value for money and quality of the current service. The summary presentation from the analysts can be provided if Cabinet would like to see it.

The service has submitted a growth bid for £1.6m and the projections within this plan are based on the assumption that this £1.6m will be added to the base budget from 2017/18 onwards.

**Mitigation Strategy - Details**

In the last financial year external analysts were commissioned to collate data on the current service, costings, quality and cost effectiveness. This information was requested to inform a review of the current service in turn that review would inform if alternative models of delivery, including externalising the service, could offer a more cost effective way to provide the service whilst maintaining quality and standards in the future.

The analysts identified that the current service was offering appropriate quality and value for money.

Following the analysts review officers considered the options for a future delivery model and concluded the following:

- That the service should not be externalised through a 100% commissioned model
- That some of the service should still be delivered by external providers as the in house service did not have the capacity to deliver any more of the current service.
- That the current framework contract, used to identify external providers would be replaced with a dynamic purchasing system (DPS) which provides more flexibility and will allow new providers to join the system at any time.
- That to establish the DPS that a request to extend the current framework contract would be sought through a waiver.

The Department has:

- Reviewed the current Appeals Panel Process for SEN transport and has tightened the process to ensure that the Panel applies the policy when hearing appeals to ensure that only those entitled to transport receive it.
- Committed longer term to deliver and complete the expansion programmes of existing Special schools in the borough to reduce the number of out of Borough placements and so reduce some of the transport costs.
- Started to explore and met potential Free School providers for an additional SEN school in the Borough which would create additional SEN places and so reduce the number of out of borough placements in the future.
- Been working with the West London Alliance (WLA) reviewing its and other WLA Borough’s transport policy. This has included whether thresholds can be increased
to reduce demand and whether LAs can insist that any family in receipt of mobility allowance can be directed to use this rather than the LA’s SEN transport service.

The department will:
- Expect feedback from the SEN Task and Finish Group in the Autumn 2016 term. This group was established to explore the financial benefits of increasing the thresholds for High Needs funding to reduce the number of children and young people requiring transport.
- Undertake a risk analysis with HBLaw to identify the risks of any potential legal challenge should the Hounslow Transport policy be amended in light of the proposals above.

Highlight the mitigation strategy to be implemented.
Detail each strand of the programme of work and the timeframes for it’s implementation.
Detail the Service/KPI/Volume changes expected to be delivered by the mitigation strategy.
Complete the two tables below with detailed SMART objectives expected from the mitigation strategy.

### Projected Financial Performance. (To be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016/17 Projection</th>
<th>2017/18 Projection</th>
<th>2018/19 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget (£000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Projected Outturn (£000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (£000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Impact of the Mitigation Strategy (£000)</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Performance Changes. To be completed as applicable to the mitigation strategy and service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator/KPI/ Demand levels</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015/16 Performance Average</th>
<th>QTR1 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR2 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR3 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR4 16/17 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Levels (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost (if appropriate)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART Performance target. (Add additional)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rows as required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B.4

Finance Mitigation Strategy 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref: Service</th>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-ResCare</td>
<td>CHAS</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet lead</th>
<th>Councillor Kaur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Alan Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Lead</td>
<td>Mun-Thong Phung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Pressure. (As is)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget (£000)</td>
<td>52,445</td>
<td>52,097</td>
<td>49,334</td>
<td>46,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Projected Outturn (£000)</td>
<td>52,445</td>
<td>52,797</td>
<td>50,070</td>
<td>46,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (£000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings allocated (£000)</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>5,313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

Describe the service delivery under pressure and what the cost drivers are that are creating the financial pressure. What policy/Service/Demographic changes have resulted in the current financial issue? Is this pressure expected to continue and what is the projected ongoing pressure?

Adults residential Care

1) Savings of £861k removed from budget in anticipation of preventative strategies reducing demand for residential care
2) Residential care numbers are decreasing due to a strong and very robust funding panel monthly but the cost of the placements due to increased complexity of residents is increasing
3) Demographic changes show a projected increase in the elderly population
4) Demographics also show an increase in numbers of people with Learning disability and long term health conditions moving from children's to adults services
5) Limited number of suitable placements and this is making the market governed by the providers
6) Increased challenge at the funding panel to ensure that care is appropriate and that no other means of supplying the care can be achieved

Summarise any relevant policy considerations.

Care Act 2014

Provide relevant comparisons/benchmarking where applicable against other similar services.

1) LBH is the lowest funded London local authority based on population etc
Mitigation Strategy - Details

Highlight the mitigation strategy to be implemented.

1) Current review of all double handed (currently 240 x 2 carers on every visit) to look at new forms of equipment to reduce the care package to one carer
2) New extra care schemes been developed for early 2017 (impact will be felt in 17/18) to deflect people from residential care
3) Ongoing reviews of all care packages to reduce need and ensure that all care packages are appropriate
4) Increased usage of CRS (community recovery service) to improve independence of residents and reduce needs
5) Greater screening at first contact to sign post people to voluntary sector and limiting the need for current of future care
6) 131 project - reviewing 130 out of borough Learning disability cases to establish if care can be provided in a more cost effective way in borough
7) Half year effect of preventative measures outline above is expected to mitigate £350k of current unachieved savings of £700k.
8) At present it is anticipated that all of 17/18 red-rated savings will be mitigated through the re-commissioning of LIFE project, increase in Better Care Funding and further impact of the preventative strategies outlined above.

Projected Financial Performance. (To be)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016/17 Projection</th>
<th>2017/18 Projection</th>
<th>2018/19 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Budget (£000)</td>
<td>52,097</td>
<td>49,334</td>
<td>46,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Projected Outturn (£000)</td>
<td>52,447</td>
<td>49,334</td>
<td>46,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (£000)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Impact of the Mitigation Strategy. (£000)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Performance Changes. To be completed as applicable to the mitigation strategy and service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator/KPI/Demand levels</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015/16 Performance Average</th>
<th>QTR1 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR2 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR3 16/17 Performance</th>
<th>QTR4 16/17 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand Levels (if applicable)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost (if applicable)</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SMART Performance target. (Add additional rows as required)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Capital Programme 2016/17 - 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Executive Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Chief Executive Department</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regeneration, Economic Development &amp; Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning, Regeneration &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Public Health</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Fleet Management</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Regeneration, Economic Development &amp; Environment</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s, Housing And Adult Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intervention and Education</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
<td>57.26</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>27.81</td>
<td>29.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools</td>
<td>78.55</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>34.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition Works</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Safeguarding &amp; Specialist Services</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults Safeguarding, Social Care &amp; Health</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing General Fund</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Children’s, Housing and Adult Services</td>
<td>186.01</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>101.86</td>
<td>84.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Fund</strong></td>
<td>231.63</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>127.08</td>
<td>104.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Revenue Account</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Build Programme</td>
<td>52.22</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>30.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Investment Programme</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Revenue Account</td>
<td>68.27</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>35.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Programme</strong></td>
<td>299.90</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>160.33</td>
<td>139.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Programme Funding 2016/17 – 2020/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>£M</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudential Borrowing</td>
<td>141.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported borrowing</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap Grant</td>
<td>67.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S106</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Fund</td>
<td>231.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Revenue Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap Allowance</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap grant</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S106</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA reserves</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA reserves</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Revenue Account</td>
<td>68.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Funding</strong></td>
<td>299.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2016/17 Major Capital Projects - Quarter 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Executive Department</strong></td>
<td>5.523</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.573</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ICT**

The ICT capital projects are progressing as planned and will be delivered by the expected date.

**Regeneration, Economic Development & Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast 2016/17</td>
<td>21.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Budget 2017/18 - 2020/21</td>
<td>18.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport**

Transport schemes for 16/17 are on target and include the Network 2020 Scheme and major schemes at Feltham and Hounslow Town Centre.

**Leisure**

Section 106 is being spent according to profile. Hogarth House project has started (HLF Development Phase) and Boston Manor House project is about to start. The Civic Centre contract has been awarded and the development agreement has been signed. Work is due to start shortly.

**Children’s, Housing and Adult Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>186.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast 2016/17</td>
<td>101.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Budget 2017/18 - 2020/21</td>
<td>84.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schools**

Works have started on site on 2 Secondary School Expansion schemes; Chiswick, and Isleworth & Syon.

School expansion projects are also underway for Wellington Primary, St Mary’s, Lindon Bennett Marjory Kinnon and Oaklands at Gresham Road.

**Housing Revenue Account (HRA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>68.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast 2016/17</td>
<td>33.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Budget 2017/18 - 2020/21</td>
<td>35.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HRA Programme**

The HRA capital programme for 16/17 is on target. Works continue on the kitchen and bathroom, and heating installations. Projects include the extension at the Danehurst sheltered housing scheme, the door entry systems and the start of the pilot project for the external wall insulation at Brentford Towers. Other spend will be on general estates improvements and structural repairs.

**HRA New Build Programme**

The following sites have completed or are due for completion during 2016/17: South Road (B), Hogarth Court, New Heston Road site B, Midsummer Avenue, Tivoli Road and Brookwood Road. The construction of the new Rectory Court sheltered scheme is underway and is due to complete in 2017/18. In addition, we plan to commence development of our 94 home extra-care scheme at the site of the former Feltham Ex-Servicemen’s Club during 2016/17, which will complete at the end of 2017/18.
TREASURY MANAGEMENT UPDATE 2016/17 PERIOD TO 31 JULY 2016

1.0 Summary

This Report summarises the Treasury Management activity, borrowing and investments compared to budget, of the Council in the four months ended 31 July 2016 and highlights the following:-

* Activity is in line with the Strategy agreed by Borough Council on 23 February 2016;
* There are currently no areas of concern regarding security or liquidity of investments;
* Short-term investments at 31 July 2016 were £223.09m;
* External investment income to 31 July 2016 was £0.6m compared to a profiled budget of £0.4m, primarily due to higher levels of lending than anticipated;
* In line with the Strategy no new long-term borrowing has been undertaken and long term external borrowing is currently £194.1m;
* The prudential indicators were not breached;
* The weighted average rate of return on the temporary investment portfolio at 30 June 2016 was 0.82%, compared to the local authority average of 0.72%.

2.0 Introduction

2.1 Hounslow adopted the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy’s (CIPFA) revised Treasury Management Code of Practice at the Borough Council meeting on 2 March 2010, and approved the Treasury Management Strategy for 2016/17 at the Borough Council meeting on 23 February 2016. The revised Code advises that Members should be informed of treasury management activities at least twice a year, but preferably quarterly. This report covers our investment and borrowing activity in the four months to the end of July, monitors our prudential indicators and ensures that the Council is following best practice.

2.2 Treasury management reporting is covered by the CIPFA Code and covers a suite of reports. These are:-

* Strategy to the February tax setting Borough Council, after having been to Audit Committee
* Outturn report to July Borough Council
* Quarterly reporting to Cabinet
* Mid-year report to Borough Council

3.0 Economic Background

3.1 The Monetary Policy Committee (MPC) cut bank base rate from 0.50% to 0.25% on 4 August. This was the first time that the rate had been changed since March 2009, and is at the lowest level it has ever been. The MPC also increased its quantitative easing policy in order to stimulate the economy, following the vote to leave the European Union on 23 June.
4.0 Investment Activity

4.1 Borough Council approved the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) for 2016/17 on 23 February 2016. The Council’s Annual Investment Strategy, which is incorporated within the TMSS, identifies the Council’s investment priorities as being:

(a) the security of capital and
(b) the liquidity of investments.

There is also an objective to achieve an optimum return on investments after recognition of proper levels of security and liquidity.

4.2 At the end of July 2016 Table 1 shows that the authority had £223.09m invested in temporary investments. These are with other local authorities and those financial institutions meeting our credit criteria as detailed in our Investment Strategy. Our credit criteria are sterling deposits in banks and money market funds offering high security and high liquidity with high credit ratings. The average we have had invested over the quarter is £210m.

4.3 Our funds are available for investing purely on a temporary basis. Their availability is primarily dependent on the timing of council tax receipts, on the receipt of grants in advance of spending needs, and on the level of reserves and provisions. The exception to this are the funds for the Private Finance Initiative (PFI), and recommendation is being made to invest these funds in a longer term investment vehicle, which is covered in Appendix G of this report.

4.4 In line with the low bank base rate, investment rates available in the market are currently at an historical low point. During the quarter funds were invested in institutions listed in the Council’s approved lending list, for investment periods ranging from 7 days to 2 years. The average rate achieved was 0.79%. This compared with the average 7 day LIBID (London Interbank Bid Rate) of 0.36%.

4.5 The Council’s original budgeted investment return for 2016/17 agreed at Borough Council was £1,100,000 and the profiled budget to the end of July is £366,000. Investment income received to 31 July was £571,000. This was primarily due to higher levels of lending than anticipated. Another factor was the ongoing enhanced investment returns achieved by investing with the part nationalised bank, Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS). During the four months most new investments were for periods of up to 1 year. The longest investments were for 2 years. In April £10m was invested with RBS for 2 years at a very advantageous rate, and during the four months £25m was invested with five local authorities at interest rates from 0.85% to 0.90%.

4.6 The government has started to sell off its share in the part nationalised banks, Lloyds and RBS. The sale of its share of Lloyds is well progressed and the government stake now only stands at 13%. However, the sale of its share in RBS has only just started, and the government stake still stands at 73%. It is expected to take some years for the
sale of RBS to be completed. Lloyds is now being treated the same as other banks, but the policy of treating RBS as a special case for investment limits is being kept under review, and we will continue to monitor progress.

### Table 1: Summary of Temporary Investments at July 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monetary limit</th>
<th>Currently invested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Debt Management office</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Various local authorities</td>
<td>individual £30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Part nationalised UK banks</td>
<td>individual £50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other banks &amp; building societies</td>
<td>individual £30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Money market funds</td>
<td>individual £20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A full list of investments held as at 31 July is shown in Appendix F, on the confidential part of this Agenda.

### 5.0 Benchmarking

5.1 The Council is the member of a benchmarking club organised by its treasury advisers, Capita Asset Services (formerly Sector). Capita has 227 local authorities in its client base. The weighted average rate of return on Hounslow’s investment portfolio at 30 June 2016 was 0.82% compared with the local authority average of 0.72%. This was achieved despite having a low weighted average credit risk score of 2.6, lower than the local authority average of 3.9. The credit risk score is calculated by Capita and is based on counterparty risk. Scores are between 1 and 6, where 1 is the lowest risk e.g. AAA rated investments such as gilts, treasury bills and Money Market Funds, and 6 is the highest risk. 6 represents weaker investment grade credit rated institutions. Anything below investment grade does not even qualify to be on Capita’s scoring methodology.

### 6.0 Borrowing Activity

6.1 At the end of July 2016 the Council’s total debt was £202.8m. This included £8.7m of temporary borrowing to cover a temporary cash shortage. These temporary borrowings matured in August. In line with the Treasury Management Strategy for 2016/17 no new long-term borrowing was undertaken in 2016/17. The only borrowing the authority is currently undertaking is short-term borrowing for cash flow purposes. The average rate paid for temporary borrowing during the four months was 0.28%.

### 7.0 Prudential Indicators

7.1 It is a statutory duty for the Council to set and keep under review its Prudential Indicators. The Prudential Indicators for 2016/17 were agreed at Borough Council on 23 February 2016. The indicators are complex, and measure affordability and prudence. Each authority sets its own limits, dependent on its own circumstances. The main indicators monitor whether our debt is within pre-determined limits, and
whether the structure of our debt with regard to maturity limits and interest rates is within pre-determined parameters.

7.2 Table 2 below summarises the key Prudential Indicators. The table indicates that all of the indicators were within their limits in the last four months.

**Table 2: Key Prudential Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Limit - £m</th>
<th>Actual - £m at 31 Jul 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Authorised Limit for external debt</td>
<td>294.8</td>
<td>202.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Operational Limit for external debt</td>
<td>270.3</td>
<td>202.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Limit of fixed interest debt</td>
<td>275.0</td>
<td>194.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Limit of variable interest debt</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Whilst under the CIPFA Code the Operational Limit may be exceeded for cash flow variations, if the Authorised Limit for external debt is exceeded a review should be undertaken and a report made to full Borough Council. The Operational Limit was not exceeded in the last two months. The Authorised Limit is the maximum possible limit for borrowing and includes an allowance for unusual or uncertain events. This limit has never been exceeded.

7.4 A full list of the prudential indicators for monitoring purposes are shown in Appendix F, on the confidential part of this Agenda.
INVESTMENT OF HIGHWAYS MAINTENANCE PRIVATE FINANCE INITIATIVE (PFI) RESERVE

1.0 Recommendation

1.1 To invest the Highways Maintenance PFI reserve funds in the Legal & General Short Dated Corporate Bond Index Fund, for the duration of the PFI contract, enabling drawdown as and when required;

1.2 To delegate to the Director of Finance and Corporate Services any changes to the fund to be invested in, for the duration of the PFI contract, as long as any such Fund remains of investment grade (BBB or above).

2.0 Summary

The Council commenced a 25 year contract with Vinci Ringway to deliver highways related services from January 2013. This contract is part funded by a grant from the Department of Transport and part funded from the Council’s own budget. The financing provides for the setting aside of earmarked funds at the beginning of the contract to help fund future commitments. The PFI earmarked funds were £10m at 31 March 2016. This report recommends investing these funds in an earmarked fund to generate higher rates of interest than those available on our daily cash flow management.

3.0 Details

3.1 The Council commenced a 25 year contract with Vinci Ringway to deliver highways related services from January 2013. This contract is part funded by a grant from the Department of Transport and part funded from the Council’s own budget. A detailed cash flow model for these costs has been developed covering the full 25 years of the contract. This model provides for the setting aside of earmarked funds at the beginning of the contract to help fund future commitments. The PFI earmarked funds were £10m at 31 March 2016. The cash flow model indicates that the level of earmarked PFI funds held by the Council should continue to be £10m or more for the next 10 to 15 years.

3.2 Current interest rates are low. The typical rate on AAA money market funds and other investments we currently use for our daily cash flow purposes is currently 0.25% to 0.65%, compared to bank base rate of 0.25%. However, the time frame for the PFI reserve is significantly longer than that for our daily cash flow requirements and so higher rates of interest should be capable of being generated. Given this background we took advice from our treasury advisers, Capita, on how to maximise return whilst staying within our risk parameters.

The initial brief corresponded with the Borough Council recommendation on 23 February 2016 to

**Invest the earmarked PFI funds for periods of over two years in organisations meeting our credit criteria**

3.3 Our credit criteria are detailed in our Investment Strategy, approved annually by Borough Council. The current Strategy was approved by Council on 23 February 2016. This Strategy deals with our day to day cashflow, and limits investment to organisations...
whose long term minimum credit rating is A-, or above. Interest rates for our risk parameters are currently on average well below 1%. However, as noted above the time frame for the PFI reserve is significantly longer than for our daily cash flow requirements and hence a different risk appetite can be tolerated. Our advisers did an initial analysis of the market. Their advice was that the segregated route was not available to us and is only economically viable when considering larger investment sizes, typically a minimum of £50-£100m. Capita’s view was, that in order to get a sustained rate of return of over 1%, we would need to go into a pooled fund. A pooled fund does not allow us to direct where the investments can be placed. Typically these pooled funds are invested in some organisations below our A- criteria, but they are still in “investment grade” issuance i.e. those rated as at least BBB. We also had a criteria that we would only invest in sterling denominated vehicles.

3.4 Capita did a search of the market and identified six short dated bond funds suitable for our purposes. After further analysis, officers and the adviser are recommending that we invest the PFI reserve in the Legal & General Short Dated Corporate Bond Index Fund. This fund invests in investment grade corporate bonds (AAA to BBB). It has daily trading (business days). Current one year returns are over 2%. The fund will be monitored weekly to ensure it remains fit for purpose. As discussed, the time span for the PFI reserve is longer than for our daily cash flow needs. Hence officers are satisfied at the slight increase in risk, in moving from a limit of A- to BBB, but still remaining at investment grade level.
Procurement and Commercial Services Update

Annual Procurement Plan Progress

There are currently 297 projects on the APP.
55 projects have been completed with 45 in progress.
The Overdue column refers to projects where the client requirements have changed and are currently on hold.

Waivers - 15/16

There has been good progress on the reduction of waivers in comparison to 2015.
Procurement and Commercial Services are assisting service areas plan projects further in advance, resulting in the reduction of waivers having to be
### Waivers - January 2016 to August 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Proposed Contract</th>
<th>Proposed Supplier</th>
<th>Responsible Officer</th>
<th>Overall Assessment</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/07/2016</td>
<td>Provision of transport to and from school for SEN</td>
<td>Susie O'Neill</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£ 589,148.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/06/2016</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>David Borrell</td>
<td>Herdeep Chaggar</td>
<td>£ 48,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/06/2016</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>Malcolm Holdsworth</td>
<td>Herdeep Chaggar</td>
<td>£ 36,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/2016</td>
<td>Detailed analysis work for East end of GWC regeneration area</td>
<td>UI Studios</td>
<td>Simon Lee</td>
<td>£ 49,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/05/2016</td>
<td>Ivy Bridge Estate CCTV Repairs</td>
<td>DSSL Group</td>
<td>Ian Williams</td>
<td>£ 33,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/05/2016</td>
<td>Community Advocacy Services</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Joanna Madejczyk</td>
<td>£ 470,560.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/05/2016</td>
<td>Short Breaks for Carers</td>
<td>Alzheimers Society</td>
<td>Joanna Madejczyk</td>
<td>£ 125,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/2016</td>
<td>Occupational Health Services</td>
<td>Siew Li McGowan</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£ 180,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2016</td>
<td>Waste Management - ICT - Procurement Tender Support</td>
<td>4OC</td>
<td>Andrew Baker</td>
<td>£ 105,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/2016</td>
<td>West Thames collage centre</td>
<td>Neil Plummer</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£ 1,160,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/2016</td>
<td>Waste Management - ICT - Procurement Tender Support</td>
<td>4OC</td>
<td>Andrew Baker</td>
<td>£ 20,276.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01/2016</td>
<td>Micro Business Training Project</td>
<td>Tom Brooks</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>£ 44,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Performance against the Key Corporate Financial Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>RAG Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Departmental Revenue Variance</td>
<td>£0.0m</td>
<td>£13.0m</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Delivery</td>
<td>5.8%*</td>
<td>5.80%</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council tax collected to date</td>
<td>39.57%**</td>
<td>39.80%</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates (NNDR) collected to date</td>
<td>38.31%**</td>
<td>37.70%</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt collection within 60 days</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors % of invoices paid within 30 days</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>92.50%</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is a quarterly figure

**These are Year to Date (YTD) figures
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1. Details of Recommendations

The Cabinet is asked to agree the following:

1. That the site is taken forward as a New Build Project in conjunction with London & Quadrant, as part of a wider master planning process, to deliver a like for like leisure facility.

2. That a budget of £150,000 be made available for due diligence and professional and legal fees, in order to bring the site forward to a contractual agreement. This will be allocated from the feasibility reserve.

3. That the cabinet recognised the need to provide a new leisure facility at the cost of nil affordable housing provision on the leisure site. (This will be subject to a full viability assessment with planning colleagues – Appendix 1)

4. That the risk of build costs inflation, planning and sales risk sits with London & Quadrant, as adjoining land owner and special purchaser.

5. That delegated authority be given to the Executive Director of Regeneration, Economic Development & Environment to execute contractual agreements with London & Quadrant for the provision of a new leisure centre.
If the recommendations are adopted, how will residents benefit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits to residents and reasons why they will benefit, link to Values</th>
<th>Dates by which they can expect to notice a difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents will benefit from a new modern facility fit for purpose.</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new leisure facility will encourage health and wellbeing for local residents.</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new leisure facility will bring more economic spend to the area, with visit from outside of the local ward area.</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site would form part of a wider master planning approach for major regeneration in the area. Resulting in increased employment opportunities for local people, and improved state of the art facilities</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Report Summary**

1. This report deals with the existing Leisure facility known as Fountain Leisure Centre, in Brentford. Its existing condition, existing use value and future use of the site where it is located.
2. It recommends that the site is taken forward as a New Build Project in conjunction with London & Quadrant, as part of a wider master planning process, to deliver a like for like leisure facility.
3. These recommendations are being made because the existing facility is in need of major refurbishment or redevelopment and will be consider not fit for purpose in 2020.
4. If adopted, the key financial implications for the Council are the provision of a new modern leisure facility at no capital costs to the council. Some budgetary requirement will be necessary for professional fees up to and including the signing of contracts for the project. This is estimated at £150k.
5. An additional point to note is that the council will have to treat London & Quadrant as a special purchasers in terms of procurement, in order to progress a negotiated contract, and not go out to open market under an OJEU process. This is on the basis of combined site marriage value, that would enable the site to be financially viable.
6. The project has been included on the Annual Procurement Plan register.

3. **Reason for Decision and Options Considered**

The existing Fountain Leisure centre was built in 1987. At nearly 30 years old it now requires significant investment or replacement to provide a good quality facility and to secure long term viability. There are significant issues facing the building which, if retained, will need to be addressed e.g. the replacement of the roof and significant elements of mechanical and electrical plant. It is also clear that leisure trends have
changes since the centre was built and the current facility cannot adequately accommodate these. The Council must decide whether to invest a significant sum to retain and refurbish the existing building or whether to take the opportunity to redevelop this site either independently or in partnership with London & Quadrant.

A new build presents an opportunity for the Council to secure the future of leisure provision at the site with a state of the art leisure centre, built to deliver the needs identified in the Council’s, recently completed, draft indoor sports facilities strategy. This is better achieved via a new build than refurbishment of the existing centre. The principle benefits of new build versus refurbishment are listed below:

- New build is more likely to result in the transformation of the facility to a state of the art leisure centre capable of maximising the increase in usage and income generation. This will lead to a greater improvement in the net revenue position for the Council.
- A new centre could be built on an alternative site, allowing the exiting centre to remain operational for the duration of the build period. Refurbishment would result in loss of provision for 12-18 months.
- A good quality new build will be designed to provide a facility that will last for 35+ years, offering a longer term solution than a refurbishment.
- There is less risk associated with a new build project, compared to refurbishment. The main risk with a new build is ground conditions. These should be established early during a detailed feasibility study on the preferred site. Once these are known they can be priced in to the costs plan helping to mitigate the risk of costs increasing.
- New build projects are likely to be of significantly more interest to building contractors and development partners in the current buoyant market. This should lead to more competitive pricing.
- The design of a new build facility will not be constrained by the existing footprint of the building, allowing a more efficient modern layout to be provided. This will help minimise the capital and revenue costs making the project more viable.
- The site options appraisal work has identified some shortcomings in the use of the existing site. A new build can address these issues. Refurbishment on the existing site cannot.

The existing leisure centre facility sits on a site of 2.12 acres, and can be identified below as site 9. Sites 1, 3, and 8 are owned by London & Quadrant.
3.1 Explanatory paragraphs here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Take the site to market and seek a Developer who is prepared to deliver a new leisure facility, at the same value as the land, with a residential planning consent in place.</td>
<td>This will mean a break in service in our existing facilities causing disruption to local residents and users of the facility. A loss of income A penalty break clause in our management contract with Fusion. A scheme in isolation that does not offer a full master planning approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transfer the site to Lampton 360, and its JV Development Partner, to deliver out the site. Producing a new leisure facility with residential to support its costs.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enter into heads of terms and negotiation with London &amp; Quadrant, an adjoining land owner, to deliver a new leisure facility, as part of a wider master plan scheme.</td>
<td>This will give continuity of the existing service until a new facility has been built. Continue income stream. No break clause required to our management contract. A scheme that can come forward as part of a wider master planning project, bringing significant benefits to the local area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Key Implications**

1. It is estimated that the existing leisure facility will be unfit for purpose by 2020.
2. If redevelopment of the existing facility is carried out in isolation, then it will be essential to close down the existing facility for a period of up to 2-3 years, which would result in both a loss of income, and a penalty in breaking the Fusion Management Contract.
3. The existing facility is one of the most used facilities in the Borough, and brings wellbeing and health benefits to local residents as well as fun.

5. **Financial Details**

a) **Financial Impact On The Budget (Mandatory)**

The financial impacts of this scheme vary dependant on which option is taken forward.

With all options there will be a requirement for professional fees to be incurred, in order to progress the scheme to a contractual position for the council. These are likely to include, but not limited to;

Option 1 – would include the cost of an OJEU process, professional fees from external consultants, and some architects fees for concept design only. This is estimated to require a budget of £700,000 in fees.

Option 2 – would require the inclusion of the Fountain Leisure Scheme into the Property 360 Business Plan, which could then jointly deal with due diligence and planning costs shared with its JV Partner. Some professional fees may need to be paid for by the Council, prior to Property 360 having its funding in place. However, this could be repaid to the Council as part of the scheme overall on costs. This is estimated to require a budget of £450,000 in fees.

Option 3 – London & Quadrant would cover all the cost for planning and due diligence, however, a level of professional fees may need to be met by the Council, for employment of its own consultants to continue site negotiations, contractual agreements, and also site valuation and cost consultancy. This is estimated to require a budget of £150,000.

(Option 3 is the option that is recommended to Cabinet).

The above fees are purely an estimate for the progression of the scheme into a contractual position, either with L&Q, an independent Developer or Property 360.

Total project costs and fees are likely to exceed £68m for the delivery of a new leisure facility and private residential apartments to support it.

Revenue and break costs fees are likely to be extensive, and have been estimated below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decommissioning costs and redundancy costs</td>
<td>£117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of profit per annum £110,442 fusion contract</td>
<td>£331,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total over the close period of the building</strong></td>
<td><strong>£448,326</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Financial Background (optional)

Appendix 1 – demonstrates a potential mix use scheme of 168 units and a leisure facility of 5,888m2 in isolation on the existing Council owned land of 2.12 acres located in Chiswick.

Chiswick is prime real estate for the Borough of Hounslow, and this site provides for a land asset of some considerable value should it be released for purely residential use.

However, LBH has a requirement to re-provide the existing facility, which has an impact on land values, should this be provided on site.

The latest valuation of the site was undertaken in April 2009 and confirm a land value at that time of £3.85m.

The attached financial appraisal assumes a scheme of 168 private apartments, situated above a new leisure facility with 100 car parking spaces. In order to achieve a project of this nature you would have to be mindful of the neighbouring conservation area, and planning constraints that would be put on the site. It is therefore not guaranteed that you could achieve this level of massing and density, which would be needed to support a scheme in isolation on the same site.

The appraisal demonstrates that you would need a minimum of 168 units, all of which would need to be private in order to provide the leisure centre at no cost to the Council. A straight swap of land value for leisure facility build costs at £3,000m2 for 5,888m2, which is the current existing facility capacity would be required.

This would assume a build cost of £17,664m net of associated on cost, professional fees, planning and all associated contingency fees.

If the same project was built out, for 100% residential and the leisure facility was built off site on another council owned site, then the land value would result in a figure over £17m, over £100k per plot. This might cover the build out costs for a new facility elsewhere, but not any additional associated land costs.

The appraisal clearly demonstrates that it is not possible to deliver affordable housing on this site, and generate the level of value to bring forward a new leisure facility.

The land value for this site should 40% affordable housing be applied to make the scheme planning policy compliant would generate a land value in the region of £7.5-£8m.

This would then produce a negative position on land against build out costs of nearly £10m.

The appraisal also assumes build cost for residential units at £2,600m2 and has not taken into account any potential build cost inflation. It also assumes sales values for the residential units of £715 sq. ft. This is slightly lower than some values that have been achieved recently in this location, but considered a conservative view, based on
the unknown impact of Brexit on the housing market in higher value areas in our borough.

Clearly the provision of a new leisure centre will be challenging in terms of financial position, but it is felt that a negotiated deal with London & Quadrant is the less risky option for the Council.

c) Comments of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services

The implications of the recommendations of this report are a drawing on the Feasibility Reserve of £150k. Any further expenditure will result in an overspend to the Council that would need to be met from REDE resources.

The feasibility activity will develop and assess the business case for the scheme. Current options for this scheme will mean that either the Council will not fulfil its requirements regarding the provision of affordable homes for such scheme or it will not meet the agreed outline Budget for the scheme. As such, a further report will be required to be approved by Cabinet following completion of the viability assessment and business case.

Further to this, clarity is required over the future asset ownership position of the site, as this may have significant future consequences to the Council.

6. Legal (to be completed in conjunction with the Legal Department)

a) Legal Details

b) Comments of the Head of Governance

7. Value for Money

This proposal sets out to make use of an existing property asset which will be fully utilised and generate an improved revenue income stream for the leisure team.

Based on the recommendation in this report a negotiation with a special purchase would assist with breaching any financial gap in provision of the new facility, and also bring some marriage value for all sites, being delivered through a comprehensive master plan process.

Best consideration will be achieved in terms of value of land/asset, with the key goal on the provision of a new facility at no cost to the council, this will be back by a RICS red book valuation on both an existing use basis and a subject to planning basis.

8. Sustainability Impact Appraisal

The works will be undertaken to comply with Part L of the Building Regulations that require energy efficiency measures to be included in the works. This will further meet an objective set in the Corporate Property Strategy and Asset Management Plan “to ensure that property is as sustainable as possible in design, construction and maintenance”.
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9. Risk Management

How is success to be measured?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defined Outcomes</th>
<th>Unmet</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Exceeded</th>
<th>Significantly Exceeded</th>
<th>Date they should be deliver by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery within the capital budget</td>
<td>Project over budget</td>
<td>Project within budget</td>
<td>Project less than budget</td>
<td>Project significantly less than budget</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental income within the reported business case</td>
<td>Not able to meet the minimum income target</td>
<td>Meeting the income target</td>
<td>Achieving more than the income target</td>
<td>Achieving significantly more than the income target</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of like for like facility.</td>
<td>Reduction in facility being offered.</td>
<td>All existing sports facilities being provided.</td>
<td>Additional services, or space being provided.</td>
<td>Additional services or space being provided ahead of programme.</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Links to Council Priorities

Active, healthy communities
An ambitious council delivering quality services and value for money

Regeneration and Economic Development Strategy 2016-2020
Objective 1 - Growing Business
Objective 2 – Improving Connectivity
Objective 3 – Place Making
Objective 4 – Enhancing the Environment

11. Equalities, Human Rights and Community Cohesion

The Council is required to have due regard to its equalities duties and in particular and that set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and eliminate any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act, advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The decision in paragraph 1 should not have any adverse impact on anyone with one or more protected characteristics, namely age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

In considering this report and making the decision Cabinet members will need to be satisfied that the equalities duties are met

12. Staffing/Workforce and Accommodation implications:

Input from the Leisure team is essential taking this project forward. The redevelopment of a new Leisure Facility of this type would be a major project for the
Council, and would require substantial staffing input. Project Management and contract negotiations would be delivered by staff in Lampton 360 on behalf of the Leisure Team.

13. Property and Assets

The Fountain Leisure centre currently sits as an asset in the Council general fund, and is let and managed under the Fusion Contract with the remainder of the leisure centre portfolio.

14. Any Other Implications

None

15. Consultation

Consultation has been undertaken to date with the 3 ward councillors for the Brentford Ward, with the Leader of the Council, and with the Chief Officers and staff of the Leisure team.

As part of the consultation, we explored those facilities that are considered to essential and those facilities that are considered to be desirable, please see below;

**Essential Facilities**
- Main pool (8 lane x 25m pool with demountable seating for 250 spectators)
- Teaching pool (15m x 8.5m with moveable floor)
- Sports hall (8 x badminton courts in single hall)
- Health and fitness suite (160 stations)
- 2 x multi-purpose studios
- 1 x spin studio
- 2 x squash courts
- 1 x children’s soft play area
- Crèche/meeting room/party room/studio
- Confidence water / toddler splash pool

**Desirable Facilities**
- Spa area and 3 x treatment rooms
- Clip and climb type facility

The financial costs and comparison have been undertaken based on those facilities which are essential.

16. Timetable for Implementation

This timetable is based on either option 2, or 3, where the need to take the site to market is removed. If the Cabinet approve option 1, then this is likely to add an additional 12 months to this process.

- Technical due diligence and site investigations/ surveys March 2017
- Scheme design and submission of planning by December 2017
- Commencement of construction upon planning approval – December 2018
- Completion of development- March 2021
- Sales of Private Residential Units – Start March 2020
• Last Sale of all private units March 2021

17. Appendices

Appendix 1 – financial appraisal for a mixed use scheme in isolation on the existing Fountain Leisure Centre site of 2.12 acres.

18. Background Information

Not applicable
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