

Public Document Pack

Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee Agenda

Wednesday, 11 May 2016

7.00 pm,

Access point, ground floor

Laurence House, Lewisham Council

London SE6 4RU

For more information contact: Simone van Elk (02083146441)

This meeting is an open meeting and all items on the agenda may be audio recorded and/or filmed.

Part 1

Item	Pages
1. Minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2016	1 - 6
2. Declarations of interest	7 - 10
3. Council's employee survey - Talkback 2015	
To follow	
4. Poverty review - final report and recommendations	11 - 38
5. Select Committee work programme	39 - 52
6. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet	

Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee Members

Members of the committee, listed below, are summoned to attend the meeting to be held on Wednesday, 11 May 2016.

Barry Quirk, Chief Executive
Tuesday, 3 May 2016

Councillor David Michael (Chair) Councillor James-J Walsh (Vice-Chair) Councillor Brenda Dacres Councillor Colin Elliott Councillor Stella Jeffrey Councillor Alicia Kennedy Councillor Jim Mallory Councillor John Paschoud Councillor Luke Sorba Councillor Paul Upex Councillor Alan Hall (ex-Officio) Councillor Gareth Siddorn (ex-Officio)	
---	--

MINUTES OF THE SAFER STRONGER COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE

Thursday, 14 April 2016 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors David Michael (Chair), James-J Walsh (Vice-Chair), Brenda Dacres, Jim Mallory, John Paschoud, Luke Sorba and Paul Upex and

APOLOGIES: Councillors Colin Elliott, Stella Jeffrey and Alicia Kennedy

ALSO PRESENT: Gary Connors (Strategic Community Safety Services Manager), Barrie Neal (Head of Corporate Policy and Governance), Geeta Subramaniam-Mooney (Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People), Simone van Elk (Scrutiny Manager) and David Edwards (Food Safety Manager)

1. Confirmation of Chair and Vice Chair

1.1 Simone van Elk (Scrutiny Manager) introduced the item, and invited Members to confirm the election of Councillor David Michael as the Chair of the Committee and Councillor James-J Walsh as the Vice-Chair of the Committee.

1.2 RESOLVED: that Councillor David Michael be confirmed as Chair of the Committee and that Councillor James-J Walsh be confirmed as Vice-Chair.

2. Minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2016

2.1 That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2016 be agreed, subject to the following amendment:

- That paragraph 5.3 include that the Committee wanted to be kept informed about the progress of the community payback scheme.

2.2 The Chair asked about the Committee's referral on the Comprehensive Equalities Scheme to the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel. Simone van Elk (Scrutiny Manager) related the following based on the minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel: that the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel suggested that all members briefing on the Comprehensive Equalities Scheme be arranged.

2.3 RESOLVED: that the minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2016 be agreed, subject to the amendment in paragraph 5.3

3. Declarations of interest

3.1 The following non-prejudicial interests were declared:

Councillor David Michael is a working patron of the Marsha Phoenix Trust.

Councillor John Paschoud is a member of the Voluntary Action Lewisham's Children and Young People Forum (in relation to agenda item 4 Select Committee work programme).

Councillor Jim Mallory is a member of the Lee Green Lives community organisation (in relation to agenda item 4 Select Committee work programme).

Councillor Brenda Dacres is a Trustee of the New Cross Gate Trust (in relation to agenda item 4 Select Committee work programme).

4. Select Committee work programme

4.1 Simone van Elk (Scrutiny Manager) introduced the report. The following key points were noted:

- That the draft work programme contained suggestions from officers, items considered each year, items considered by virtue of the Committee's Terms of Reference, and suggestions from last year's Committee.
- That some meetings already have four or more items scheduled.
- That the Committee might find the prioritisation process on page 17 helpful in prioritising its work.

4.2 In the discussion that followed, the Committee agreed to:

- To move the Tuesday 6 September meeting to Thursday 15 September.
- To remove the item on VAWG service from the draft work programme and to incorporate information on work done more broadly against VAWG into the report on Safer Lewisham Plan monitoring and update scheduled for the September meeting.
- To combine the item on the Council's employee survey 2015 and the Council's employment profile into one report scheduled for the 4 July meeting.
- That the item on the Leisure Centre Contracts may fall within the Terms of Reference of Healthier Communities Select Committee but the Committees specifically requested that this item was also presented to them.
- That the item on the Criminal Justice System and the Probation Service are brought to the same meeting on 19 October.
- To receive a report on the London Fire Brigade at the 4 July meeting, instead of inviting Lewisham's Borough Commander for the fire brigade to the 19 October meeting. The item was to include information on which decision was taken by the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority to save £6.4m for 2016-17, the Council's submitted response to the consultation around the two options for this budget saving, and any available information about drafting of the 6th London Safety Plan.
- That the item on developing capacity in the voluntary sector be considered for a short in-depth review instead of an agenda item for 28 November meeting. The topic would include questions around how the voluntary sector could be best supported in developing and maintaining capacity. The topic should also look at how volunteering could be encouraged as well whether there would be opportunities for crowdfunding activities.
- That the report on Local Assemblies be scheduled for the 28 November meeting. The item should contain information about how each assemblies' grant programme was managed. Evidence should also be sought from fellow

Councillors and members of assembly coordinating groups in addition to Council staff.

- That the item on the evaluation of changes to the voluntary sector accommodation be moved to the 8 March meeting.
- That, while this item and its scheduling still needed to be discussed with the Lewisham Disability Coalition, the item on Lewisham Disability Coalition: Accessibility of the public realm for people with disabilities could be considered as an item for the Sustainable Development Select Committee.
- That the item on library service performance monitoring should include information on any lessons learned from the experience with the community libraries set up in 2011. The item should also include information about the building maintenance of community libraries, their general facilities and provision of IT. The item should be scheduled so that any new contracts with community groups to manage any of the libraries had been in existence long enough to provide the Committee with a meaningful opportunity to evaluate their performance alongside the rest of the libraries. This could mean the item would be considered in 2017-18 municipal year.
- That the item on the impact of welfare reform would be removed from the work programme. That the Committee instead consider a short in-depth review to look at modelling of the demographic changes in the borough so the Committee can evaluate the balance of socio-economic groups across the borough.

4.3 RESOLVED: That the Committee's meeting scheduled for 6 September be moved to 15 September, and that Committee's suggestions be incorporated into its draft work programme for submission to Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel.

5. Review of the enforcement service

5.1 Geeta Subramaniam (Head of Crime Reduction and Supporting People) introduced the item. The following key points were noted:

- The new service was created following a proposal from the Lewisham Future Programme, which had been agreed by Mayor and Cabinet. This report details a review of the service after it had been operating for 6 months.
- All staff had received training on all aspects of the work of the new service.
- Information about the new service was not yet available in one place on the Council's website. This was area that the service was looking to improve.
- There had been a lot more activity in the area of licensing than originally expected, but no deadlines had been missed.
- There had been 15 unauthorised traveller encampments in the borough since August 2015. In the same period last year, there had been three.
- Some services had had to be stopped following budget reductions and the subsequent forming of the new service, for example a monthly surgery for any issues. This has now stopped as a standard practice and instead a risk based approach is taken. A lot of preventative work in schools) has been decreased. A number of road shows to raise awareness about the service have also stopped.
- There are a number of risks for the service and its performance. Changes are happening in partner organisations such as the police, fire brigade and

probation while the new service has been developing which could lead to problems in the future.

5.2 Geeta Subramaniam, Gary Connors (Strategic Community Safety Services Manager) and David Edwards (Food Safety Manager) responded to questions from the Committee. The following key points were noted:

- Officers would investigate the issues raised by Committee Members that residents had found it difficult to reach the noise service over the weekend to report noise, and would provide feedback to the Committee. The number of complaints around noise was greatly reduced compared to the same period last year.
- The work by the contact centre that captures issues raised by residents was under constant review. There was currently a system in place for staff to respond to any contacts made within 48 hours, and ensure an appropriate follow-up to the issue was put in place. Where residents were suffering from alarm, distress or harassment they would always be referred to the police.
- There are areas where there is a clear overlap between the work of the Crime, Enforcement and Regulation Service (CER) and planning enforcement, but there are also clear areas where the work of planning enforcement ties in more closely with the work of the rest of the planning service. One consideration for the future could be to look at how planning enforcement and CER establish closer links - senior officers responsible for both areas would need to discuss the options.
- The savings target for this service area had been met.
- The CER performed test purchasing of licensed goods such as tobacco, alcohol and knives to test whether premises were adhering to their licenses. There had recently been an inspection by surveillance commissioner which judged this particular part of the service to be functioning well.
- The service was moving to a system where instead of issuing many temporary events notices for the same premises, premises would apply for a venue license. This had the advantage that conditions could be set on the license which would be enforceable.
- The service reports on the number of cases raised but it would be difficult for the service to meaningfully capture and quantify the success rate of the response to each case.
- The service have made their work around contaminated land an area of focus.
- The digital strategy would allow staff to work more efficiently whilst mobile as part of their work. This improved mobile working service should significantly reduce unnecessary travel time back to the office for staff.
- The list of training provided to staff is extensive and all staff have completed all those training sessions. All members of staff would have used knowledge from all those different sessions within a two week period of working for the new service.
- There were no concerns around staff retention at this point, as some members of staff from elsewhere in the organisation had specifically asked to be notified if new positions became available.
- A risk based approach has been used in the area of food safety since the early 1990s. Venues were assessed for whether they cater to vulnerable groups such as hospital, schools or nursing homes. They were also assessed for whether

they were using particularly high-risk methods such as for example dry ice. If a complaint was raised about a venue, an immediate review would take place.

5.3 Standing orders were suspended at 21.25 to enable the completion of the Committee's business.

5.4 The Committee made a number of comments. The following key points were noted:

- The Committee requested again that a brief note would be circulated to all Councillors to inform them about the services provided by the CER, the contact details for the team, and the hours they are contactable.
- The Committee expressed concern about depleted resources for the Environmental Protection Service given the potentially serious consequences of cases of contaminated land.
- If partner organisations and external agencies such as consumer rights advise were experiencing budget cuts, there was a risk for the service provided to residents if these organisation had to be relied upon for referrals.
- That the service seemed to be doing good work and needed to be properly supported in their communications with the public. The information on the Council's website should be improved so all information about the service was in one easy to find location.

5.5 The Committee resolved to advise Mayor and Cabinet of the following:

The Committee was concerned about the depleted resources available to the environmental services including those areas dealing with contaminated land. The Committee sought assurances that adequate resources have been put in place to both minimise the risk of a major incident occurring and, should a major incident occur, that sufficient resources are in place to respond given the potentially serious consequences.

The Committee was also concerned about the increased reliance by the service on external agencies to provide advice and support to residents (such as Consumer Advice). The Committee specifically highlighted the dependence on organisations in the voluntary sector in light of reducing budgets in both the voluntary sector and public sector more generally.

The Committee noted the good work done by the new Crime, Enforcement & Regulation Service (CER) and the Environmental Health Service during and following reorganisation. The Committee felt this work should be adequately supported by a dedicated communications strategy as well as general support from the Council's communications service, especially with regards to information on the service being available in one place on the Council's website.

5.6 RESOLVED: That the report be noted, and the Committee's views as agreed be referred to Mayor and Cabinet.

6. Items to be referred to Mayor and Cabinet

The Committee's views under item 5 were referred to Mayor and Cabinet.

The meeting ended at 9.55 pm

Chair:

Date:

Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee		
Title	Declaration of interests	
Contributor	Chief Executive	Item 2
Class	Part 1 (open)	11 May 2016

Declaration of interests

Members are asked to declare any personal interest they have in any item on the agenda.

1. Personal interests

There are three types of personal interest referred to in the Council's Member Code of Conduct:

- (1) Disclosable pecuniary interests
- (2) Other registerable interests
- (3) Non-registerable interests

2. Disclosable pecuniary interests are defined by regulation as:-

- (a) Employment, trade, profession or vocation of a relevant person* for profit or gain
- (b) Sponsorship – payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than by the Council) within the 12 months prior to giving notice for inclusion in the register in respect of expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member or towards your election expenses (including payment or financial benefit from a Trade Union).
- (c) Undischarged contracts between a relevant person* (or a firm in which they are a partner or a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest) and the Council for goods, services or works.
- (d) Beneficial interests in land in the borough.
- (e) Licence to occupy land in the borough for one month or more.
- (f) Corporate tenancies – any tenancy, where to the member's knowledge, the Council is landlord and the tenant is a firm in which the relevant person* is a partner, a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest.
- (g) Beneficial interest in securities of a body where:
 - (a) that body to the member's knowledge has a place of business or land in the borough;

(b) and either

- (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that body; or
- (ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person* has a beneficial interest exceeds 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that class.

*A relevant person is the member, their spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom they live as spouse or civil partner.

3. Other registerable interests

The Lewisham Member Code of Conduct requires members also to register the following interests:-

- (a) Membership or position of control or management in a body to which you were appointed or nominated by the Council
- (b) Any body exercising functions of a public nature or directed to charitable purposes, or whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy, including any political party
- (c) Any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25

4. Non registerable interests

Occasions may arise when a matter under consideration would or would be likely to affect the wellbeing of a member, their family, friend or close associate more than it would affect the wellbeing of those in the local area generally, but which is not required to be registered in the Register of Members' Interests (for example a matter concerning the closure of a school at which a Member's child attends).

5. Declaration and Impact of interest on members' participation

- (a) Where a member has any registerable interest in a matter and they are present at a meeting at which that matter is to be discussed, they must declare the nature of the interest at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered. The declaration will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. If the matter is a disclosable pecuniary interest the member must take no part in consideration of the matter and withdraw from the room before it is considered. They must not seek improperly to influence the decision in any way. **Failure to declare such an interest which has not already been entered in the Register of Members' Interests, or participation where such an interest exists, is liable to prosecution and on conviction carries a fine of up to £5000**
- (b) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest they must still declare the nature of the interest to the meeting at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered, but they may stay in the room, participate in

consideration of the matter and vote on it unless paragraph (c) below applies.

- (c) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest, the member must consider whether a reasonable member of the public in possession of the facts would think that their interest is so significant that it would be likely to impair the member's judgement of the public interest. If so, the member must withdraw and take no part in consideration of the matter nor seek to influence the outcome improperly.
- (d) If a non-registerable interest arises which affects the wellbeing of a member, their, family, friend or close associate more than it would affect those in the local area generally, then the provisions relating to the declarations of interest and withdrawal apply as if it were a registerable interest.
- (e) Decisions relating to declarations of interests are for the member's personal judgement, though in cases of doubt they may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer.

6. Sensitive information

There are special provisions relating to sensitive interests. These are interests the disclosure of which would be likely to expose the member to risk of violence or intimidation where the Monitoring Officer has agreed that such interest need not be registered. Members with such an interest are referred to the Code and advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance.

7. Exempt categories

There are exemptions to these provisions allowing members to participate in decisions notwithstanding interests that would otherwise prevent them doing so. These include:-

- (a) Housing – holding a tenancy or lease with the Council unless the matter relates to your particular tenancy or lease; (subject to arrears exception)
- (b) School meals, school transport and travelling expenses; if you are a parent or guardian of a child in full time education, or a school governor unless the matter relates particularly to the school your child attends or of which you are a governor;
- (c) Statutory sick pay; if you are in receipt
- (d) Allowances, payment or indemnity for members
- (e) Ceremonial honours for members
- (f) Setting Council Tax or precept (subject to arrears exception)

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee			
Title	Poverty Review	Item No.	4
Contributors	Scrutiny Manager		
Class	Part 1	Date	11 May 2016

1. Purpose of paper

- 1.1 As part of the work programme for 2015/6, the Select Committee agreed to carry out a review on Poverty. The review was scoped in July 2015 and evidence sessions held between October 2015 and January 2016.
- 1.2 The attached report presents the evidence received for the review. Members of the Committee are asked to agree the report and suggest recommendations for submission to Mayor and Cabinet.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Members of the Select Committee are asked to:
 - Agree the draft review report
 - Consider any recommendations the report should make
 - Note that the final report, including the recommendations agreed at this meeting, will be presented to Mayor and Cabinet

3. The report and recommendations

- 3.1 The draft report attached at **Appendix 1** presents the written and verbal evidence received by the Committee. The Chair's introduction, recommendations and conclusion will be inserted once the draft report has been agreed and the finalised report will be presented to a Mayor and Cabinet at the earliest opportunity.

4. Legal implications

- 4.1 The report will be submitted to Mayor and Cabinet, which holds the decision making powers in respect of this matter.

5. Financial implications

- 5.1 There are no direct financial implications arising out of this report. However, the financial implications of any specific recommendations will need to be considered in due course.

6. Equalities implications

- 6.1 There are no direct equalities implications arising from the implementation of the recommendations set out in this report. The Council works to eliminate unlawful discrimination and harassment, promote equality of opportunity and good relations between different groups in the community and to recognise and to take account of people's differences.

For more information on this report please contact Simone van Elk, Scrutiny Manager, on 020 8314 6441

Overview and Scrutiny

Poverty in Lewisham

Safer Stronger Select Committee

May 2016

Membership of the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee in 2016-17:

Councillor David Michael (Chair)

Councillor James-J Walsh (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Brenda Dacres

Councillor Colin Elliott

Councillor Stella Jeffrey

Councillor Alicia Kennedy

Councillor Jim Mallory

Councillor John Paschoud

Councillor Luke Sorba

Councillor Paul Upex

Contents

1. Chair's introduction	2
2. Executive summary	3
3. Recommendations	4
4. Introduction and scope of review	5
5. The concept of poverty	7
6. Findings and recommendations	11
6.1 Measurements of poverty	11
6.2 Poverty in Lewisham	13
6.3 Interpreting data on poverty	14
6.4 Factors contributing to deprivation in the borough	14
6.5 The difficulty of effectively targeting policies to decrease poverty	15
6.6 What impact does Lewisham Council have?	15
6.7 Approaches to poverty in other local authorities	18
7 Conclusion	21
8 Monitoring and ongoing scrutiny	22
Sources	23
Appendices	24

1 CHAIR'S INTRODUCTION

[To be inserted.]

DRAFT

Councillor David Michael

Chair of the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[To be included once recommendations are agreed]

DRAFT

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee would like to make the following recommendations:

[To be included once recommendations are agreed]

DRAFT

4 INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF REVIEW

- 4.1 The Mayor of Lewisham, Sir Steve Bullock, raised the issue of poverty in his speech at the Council's annual general meeting on 26 March 2015. He said: 'Further cuts will lead to a growing number of people becoming destitute – the safety net will be taken away and they will have to rely on the goodwill of charities. Many will turn to their local councils at exactly the point where we are facing cuts on an unprecedented scale'¹. In this context, the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee felt it was timely to consider the issue of poverty in the borough and its implications. At its the Committee meeting on 20 April 2015, the Committee resolved to undertake an in-depth review looking at poverty.
- 4.2 Lewisham's Sustainable Communities Strategy (2008-2020)² sets out a vision of a resilient, healthy and prosperous borough. The Strategy informs the direction of Council policy and it guides the process of decision making. One of the governing principles of the Strategy is the ambition to 'reduce inequality and narrow the gap in outcomes for citizens'. It is recognised in the Strategy that '...deprivation and poverty can limit people's prospects (and) some of our communities are more likely to experience their effects than others'.
- 4.3 The Committee approved the scoping report for the review at its meeting on 1 July 2015 and agreed the following key lines of enquiry:
1. The developing national context:
 - Are certain groups more likely to feel the effects of poverty than others?
 - What impact have welfare reforms had on the distribution of poverty in Lewisham?
 - What are the evolving issues which will impact on future distribution and scale of poverty in the borough?
 2. A review of the Council's approach to tackling inequality:
 - How do the Council's strategies work to reduce deprivation?
 - How does the strategic approach to equalities ensure that multiple deprivation and inequality are given full consideration?
 - How are the reductions in the Council's budgets being managed to ensure that they do not disproportionately impact on protected groups and exacerbate poverty and deprivation?
- 4.4 The timetable for the review was as follows:
- 21 October 2015* – First evidence session, where a report was received from officers at the London Borough of Lewisham on the Indices of Multiple Deprivation. There was also evidence provided on the borough's demographics as part of the development of the Council's comprehensive equalities scheme.
- 30 November 2015* – Second evidence session, where information was presented on the Council's approach to changes in welfare and changes in the housing market resulting from the Housing and Planning Bill.

¹ Mayor's speech to the AGM, 26 March 2015, online at: <http://tinyurl.com/pd2w5uj>

² Lewisham's Sustainable Communities Strategy can be found here: <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/mayorandcouncil/aboutthecouncil/strategies/Documents/Sustainable%20Community%20Strategy%202008-2020.pdf>

19 January 2015 – Third evidence session, where information was received from the Chief Executive from the London Borough of Lewisham on poverty in the borough, as well as an external witness from the Greater London Authority on the wider context of poverty in London.

- 4.5 The Committee concluded its review and agreed its recommendations on [insert date once agreed].

DRAFT

5 THE CONCEPT OF POVERTY

DEFINITIONS OF POVERTY

5.1 **Poverty** is a general term, which has multiple definitions and ways of being understood. It refers to different material and social conditions, which are susceptible to change over time. Its meaning, measures of its extent and the implications of its effects are determined by the context in which it is used. It was therefore important for the Committee to gain an understanding of the different ways poverty is defined and measured.

5.2 **Absolute poverty** is one description of poverty. It is most often understood as the condition in which individuals are unable to meet a set standard of essential material needs such as food, clothing or shelter³. International definitions used by the World Bank and the agencies of the United Nations have historically used a monetary income figure for individuals (one dollar a day was first used in the 1990s⁴), below which people are considered to be in extreme poverty⁵.

5.3 The most well known example of a measurement of absolute poverty is the 'one dollar a day' poverty line, below which people are considered to be in extreme poverty⁶. This international definition is used by the World Bank and the agencies of the United Nations to compare the numbers of people living in extreme poverty across countries and time. The measure uses the monetary income figure \$1 a day to see what goods can be bought for that amount in the United States. It then looks at the amount of income needed in local currency in every other country to buy those same essential goods. Anyone who does not have that amount of income is counted as falling below the 'one dollar a day' poverty line.

5.4 *Minimum income measures of poverty* focus on the minimum income needed to cover the costs of living, and thereby establish a income threshold for poverty. One well known measure is the London Living Wage (LLW). This is a minimum hourly rate above the legal minimum wage, which takes into account the costs of living and participating in life in London. It takes account of the impact of means-tested benefits when calculating this hourly rate. The LLW is reviewed each year by the Greater London Authority, taking into account a number of costs for living in the city (adjusted for family composition). The factors which make up the basic cost of living are:

- Housing
- Council tax
- Transport
- Childcare
- All other costs (a 'regular shopping basket')

(GLA Economics 2014)⁷

³ The history of the one dollar a day benchmark, BBC online at: <http://tinyurl.com/7xehk13>

⁴ The history of the one dollar a day benchmark, BBC online at: <http://tinyurl.com/7xehk13>

⁵ A further discussion about the definition of absolute and extreme poverty is available online on the website of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation website, online at: <http://tinyurl.com/p8yw8jn>

⁶ A further discussion about the definition of absolute and extreme poverty is available online on the website of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation website, online at: <http://tinyurl.com/p8yw8jn>

⁷ GLA Economics, A Fairer London: The 2015 Living Wage in London: <https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/living-wage-2015.pdf>

5.5 **Relative poverty** is most commonly used to describe a situation where the level of income available to an individual or family falls below what's needed to sustain a ordinary standard of living in society. This is often expressed as a percentage of national median household income.

5.6 *Median income measures of poverty* is a common method of measuring relative poverty. Median income measures of poverty are calculated by contrasting a household's earnings with the country's median household income⁸ using national income data. A household with an income which is at or below 60% of the median is considered in relative poverty in the UK⁹. For example, Government figures for child poverty use this measure (adjusted by family size) when determining the number of children who are in families affected by poverty. Efforts to reduce poverty defined as a proportion of median incomes are focused on raising earnings (or benefits) above the 60% threshold.

5.7 **Poverty** can also described as either **persistent** or **transitory**. This distinction recognises the lived experience of people facing poverty and allows for the understanding that people may move in and out of poverty during the course of their life. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2014) uses a definition of poverty, which focuses on individuals and households having the resources to meet their needs. It recognises that poverty is not necessarily a persistent feature of a defined group of people:

'Poverty is not a static condition. Resources rise and fall as do needs and people's ability to meet them. Individuals can move in and out of poverty over time – so it may be temporary, recurrent or persistent over longer periods.' (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, *a definition of poverty*, 2014)

5.8 The concept of **deprivation** broadens the definition of poverty beyond calculated levels of income to include the lack of access to certain services, such as social and leisure activities. In the UK, poverty is usually measured by relative income deprivation (either low pay or worklessness) and lack of access to services.

5.9 Poverty can be described and measured in a myriad of ways. The UK government has attempted to combine some of the aspects that form poverty into one set of measures: the indices of multiple deprivation. The Government's index of multiple deprivation includes measures relating to health, employment, access to housing and the presence of negative factors, such as crime in the lives of the communities affected by deprivation.

5.10 **Indices of multiple deprivation** Government combines information from a range of official administrative sources and census data to develop a coordinated picture of deprivation across the whole country. Understanding poverty as multiple deprivation requires the consideration of factors other than income. It is recognised that income plays a significant part in the lives of people who are in poverty. However, the index is comprised of a broader range of indicators in order to build a more complete picture of lack of access to services and the quality of living environments.

5.11 There are seven domains in the index¹⁰:

⁸ The median household income is the income of what would be the middle household, if all households in the UK were sorted in a list from poorest to richest. The median tends to be used instead of mean household income, as the mean can be influenced a relatively small number of households with very high incomes.

⁹ Further explanation of the income threshold measure of poverty is available online at: <http://tinyurl.com/p2dq5cb>

¹⁰ A technical update on the index of multiple deprivation measures, which includes information about data sources is available online at: <http://tinyurl.com/pazw2jk>

- *Income deprivation domain*
A measurement of the population in an area experiencing deprivation relating to low income.
- *Employment deprivation*
A measurement of proportion of the working age population in an area involuntarily excluded from the labour market
- *Health deprivation and disability*
A measurement of the risk of premature death and the impairment of quality of life through poor health
- *Education, skills and training deprivation*
A measurement of the lack of attainment and skills in the local population. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: one relating to children and young people and one relating to adults.
- *Barriers to housing and services*
A measurement of the physical and financial accessibility of housing and local services. Road distance to a post office, primary school, supermarket and GP surgery are also included.
- *Crime*
A measurement of the risk of personal and material victimisation at local level including violence, burglary, theft and criminal damage.
- *Living environment deprivation*
A measurement of the quality of the local environment. The indicators fall into two sub-domains. The 'indoors' living environment measures the quality of housing; and the 'outdoors' living environment contains measures of air quality and road traffic accidents.

5.12 Electoral wards were used as the basis for data gathering and analysis in the early form of the index. Subsequent indices in 2004, 2007 and 2010 have each altered and refined the process and the reporting mechanisms. Information in the index is now reported at lower layer super output area level¹¹ (LSOA). These areas are intended to be stable measures of geographical populations, which enable comparisons between data over time and between places. LSOAs are geographical areas that have been automatically generated to be as consistent in population size as possible. The minimum population is 1,000 and the mean is 1,500.

5.13 The 'indices of multiple deprivation' (IMD) are widely used for comparisons between areas and they form the basis for discussions about future approaches to policy and decisions about access to services.

5.14 The 2010 index of multiple deprivation (IMD) indicated for **Lewisham** that:

- Lewisham was the 31st most deprived local authority in England (of 326 areas).
- Lewisham was ranked 39th most deprived borough in 2007 and 52nd (of 352 areas) in 2004, indicating that, in comparison to the rest of England, Lewisham is becoming more deprived.

¹¹ Output areas are small geographical areas defined by the office of national statistics in order to accurately report area based data. Lower layer super output areas are an amalgamation of output areas. They contain a minimum of 1000 people and maximum of 3000. They contain no fewer than 400 households and no more than 1200. More information is available online at: <http://tinyurl.com/n8uuq92>

- The most deprived areas are found in Evelyn ward in the North and Downham ward in the South of the borough.

5.15 The GLA analysis of the results of the 2010 index highlighted that a quarter of London's areas fell within the poorest 20% of England. As might be anticipated, it also highlighted the difficulties faced by people in London trying to access housing.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEPRIVATION AND INEQUALITY

5.16 It is recognised in Lewisham's Sustainable Communities Strategy that people in protected groups are more susceptible to the effects of poverty because they are also likely to be affected by discrimination. It also notes that 'deprivation is often accompanied and made worse by discrimination and prejudice' (Lewisham Sustainable Communities Strategy 2008-2020, p23). It is also highlighted in the strategy that Lewisham's older citizens, those who are disabled and people from black and minority ethnic communities find it harder to secure and retain jobs. (Sustainable Communities Strategy 2008-202, p59).

5.17 The Trust for London, with the New Policy Institute, has developed a poverty profile for London. It draws on a range of sources to provide an overarching view of poverty in the city. Analysis for the profile highlights that women are more susceptible to poverty because of the gender pay gap and the uneven distribution of caring responsibilities. It is also highlighted that lone parents are more likely to be out of work in London than they are in England on average. Rates of lone parenting along with high childcare and housing costs may contribute to the causes of poverty for London's lone parent families.

5.18 The poverty profile also recognises the absence of 'hidden populations' from official statistics. Some minority groups are not defined in official statistics because their numbers are so small that sampling cannot provide reliable data for comparison. It is also recognised that there are people who are unknown to services, such as undocumented migrants:

'Many undocumented migrants are likely to be in poverty, but are unlikely to be included in official figures. While it is not impossible for them to find work, such work is almost inevitably low paid. Without documentation, it is difficult to get a bank account, which itself is often a barrier to work. They are not entitled to benefits and are excluded from most services such as health care and social housing.' (London's Poverty Profile 2015¹²)

5.19 Presented with this information, the Committee decided to focus its review on information from the IMD 2015 to obtain a rich understanding of the issues of poverty and deprivation in the borough.

¹² London's Hidden Populations, London Poverty Profile (2015) accessed online at: <http://tinyurl.com/qa6mqbp>

6. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 MEASUREMENTS OF POVERTY

6.1.1 The Committee gained a more thorough understanding of the different ways poverty can be defined and measured during the course of its review. This evidence was predominantly provided by Rachel Leeser, a Senior Research and Statistical Analyst - Social Exclusion working in the Intelligence Unit for the Greater London Authority.

6.1.2 One widely used definition describes being in poverty as having insufficient resources to meet need. Money is a significant element of that, but other things also contribute. The way 'a lack of resources to meet need' is operationalised is 'can you afford to live in society and meet the norms of that society'. This tends to be looked in terms of income, even though other elements can and do contribute to the lived experience of being in poverty. There are different measures of poverty available in the UK. **Absolute poverty**, as published by the government, is measured by looking at a fixed set of living standards, so currently income levels as at 2010/11r. This allows for comparisons over time of the percentage of people living in poverty as defined at that point in time, since poverty is constantly being redefined as society changes.

6.1.3 **Relative poverty** moves the understanding of what poverty means beyond the absolute terms of 'insufficient resources to meet need' to a comparison with the average household income that's considered to be needed to sustain a normal lifestyle in a particular society. Both absolute and relative poverty can be measured before housing costs, or after housing costs are taken into account. In the UK, an individual is considered to be living in relative poverty when they are part of a household with less than 60% of contemporary median equivalised household income.

6.1.4 **Gross income** per household is a measure of all income in a household before any taxes and it includes any payments in kind. One example of a payment in kind is free school milk. **Net income** deducts certain payments, including taxes, pension costs and transfer payments, such as support to students or maintenance payments. **Equivalised income** then also takes account of the number of people living in a household. So three people living in one household with a total income of £20,000 would have a lower equivalised income than two people living in a household with that same income. For the purposes of publication of equivalised income across London, Lewisham is counted as being part of the group of inner London boroughs.

6.1.5 The concept of **material deprivation** is also relevant to the concept of poverty. To measure material deprivation, the question is whether an individual can meet those societal norms. This includes expenses for social and leisure activities, so for a child for example these include being able to have a friend round for tea and being able to afford to celebrate occasions such as birthdays, and for pensioners being able to heat their home adequately and being able to go out once a month. **Multiple Deprivation**, as described earlier is measured at a very local scale as opposed to poverty for which data are only published regularly at a regional level.

6.1.6 **Transitory vs persistent poverty:** There is a national survey that follows a relatively small number of people over the course of many years that can show how they move in and out of poverty over time. This is used to produce statistics on persistent poverty, but not regional statistics.

6.1.7 Persistent poverty is measured as living in relative poverty for three of the last four years. People in persistent poverty may not have any reserves left, where people who just entered a state of relative poverty may have some financial reserves to rely on.

National context

6.1.8 Both measures of absolute and relative poverty can be insightful when examining poverty. If median income falls, less income is needed for people to live above the line of relative poverty¹³, so less people will be measured as living in relative poverty. However, if median income falls more people tend to live in 'absolute' poverty, because median income falls when people earn less income. The measure of 'absolute' poverty has been rising in London and nearly every region of England.

6.1.9 The percentage of people living in relative poverty in London increases significantly after housing costs are taken into account. Relative income after housing costs are taken into account has always had a significant impact on the number of people in relative poverty in London as the cost of housing has always been more expensive in London.

Child poverty

6.1.10 Reduction in child poverty has been an ambition of successive governments. The Child Poverty Act 2010 formalised the enduring target to eradicate child poverty in the UK by 2020. Although changes to the way child poverty is measured were announced by the Government in July 2015, measures of material deprivation will remain part of the measurement of child poverty¹⁴.

6.1.11 Lewisham Council's Children and Young People's plan 2015-18 recognises that poverty is a relevant predictor of whether children and families are in need. It is noted in the Plan that:

'Whilst the number of children living in poverty in Lewisham has decreased over recent years, a significantly greater population of Lewisham's children live in poverty than is the case in England as a whole. The government estimates that there are c. 900 troubled families living in Lewisham. The 2011 census identified that there were 7,599 families where no adult was in employment' (CYPP, 2015-18, p10).

6.1.12 Academic research has established, via longstanding studies of families, that there is a significant impact on the outcomes of children that live in persistent poverty. Persistent poverty is measured as living in relative poverty for three of the last four years. Even though data exists for the numbers of households living in relative poverty, it is very difficult to identify whether these are the same families year on year as the data covers averages instead of pointing to individuals.

6.1.13 The Committee questioned during its review whether it would be possible for the Lewisham Council to measure which children in the borough suffer from persistent poverty by using locally collected data.

6.1.14 The Chief Executive advised that it is difficult for the Council to determine when comparing figures for child poverty between different years, whether those same children are still living in the borough. Lewisham each year has 4,700 births and 1,600 deaths which creates a net natural increase of the population of 3,100. There is a net international

¹³ This is measured as 60% of contemporary median equivalised household income

¹⁴ <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/feb/26/uk-government-forced-to-retain-household-income-as-measure-of-child-poverty>

migration of 1,900 and net domestic migration out of Lewisham of 2,400. This means that children that were measured to be living in relative poverty one year, could have stayed in the borough, moved or just entered the next year.

6.1.15 The witness from the GLA suggested some indicators could be used by local authorities to establish which children are living in persistent poverty. Local authorities may hold data such as which children are the recipients of free school meals over a number of years or whether their families are recipients of Council tax rebates over a number of years. There are also secondary indicators that could be gathered by Council's Public Health or social housing teams. An accurate indicator for persistent poverty has to be measured consistently over time and enable data to be traced to individual residents.

6.2 POVERTY IN LEWISHAM

Data from the 2015 Indices of Multiple Deprivation

6.2.1 On 30 September 2015 the Department for Communities and Local Government released the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) for England. The indices measures relative deprivation at lower layer super output area (LSOA) level, across nearly 33,000 local authority areas with 169 of those LSOAs in Lewisham¹⁵.

6.2.2 The results reveal that in 2015 Lewisham ranks 48th (1st being most deprived) out of 326 local authorities for relative deprivation. This an improvement from 31st in 2010 and 39th in 2007. Compared to other London boroughs, in 2015 Lewisham ranks tenth. This is unchanged from 2010 in terms of relative position in London.

6.2.3 New Cross and Downham are amongst the most deprived wards in the country with 90% of their LSOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally. Bellingham, Rushey Green, Whitefoot and Evelyn are the only other wards in the borough with 50% or more of their LSOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally.

6.2.4 In terms of relative change, New Cross ward shows the most significant deterioration with 90% of its LSOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally compared to 50% in 2010. Evelyn ward has shown the greatest improvement in relative terms with 50% of its LSOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally in 2015, compared to 90% in 2010. There are indications that the changes in New Cross are mainly in the areas of health and unemployment, but this needs to be further analysed.

Geographical distribution of deprivation across the borough

6.2.5 The data from the 2015 IMD seems to indicate that the borough was becoming more split in terms of equality. Some areas seem to do well while others are doing less well. There is a concentration of deprivation in the north and south of the borough, with less deprivation in the east of the borough. That geographical distribution has been persistent for the last 30 years.

6.2.6 Traditionally, the geographical distribution of poverty used to replicate where social housing was provided. Currently, the distribution of poverty replicates where people live in the private rented sector. 28% of the population of Lewisham live in the private rented

15

http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/documents/s39201/4_PovertyReview_SummaryIndexMultipleDeprivation_21102015.pdf

sector. Three quarters of the house moves in Lewisham each year happen in the private rented sector.

6.2.7 Poverty in Lewisham is mostly concentrated in the north and the south of the borough. In the north, the surrounding areas are also not that well off so residents are likely to experience less deprivation relative to their neighbours. In the south of the borough, neighbouring areas tend to be well off, which creates a sharper contrast with neighbouring areas.

6.3 INTERPRETING DATA ON POVERTY

6.3.1 Interpreting data on poverty in a meaningful way can be difficult. Using a measurement of average income can make a proper understanding of the issue of poverty more difficult. This is particularly significant in London where a small number of people with extremely high incomes pull the average income upwards, which masks the deprivation some people in London experience at the bottom end of the income distribution range.

6.3.2 Sometimes the number of people on welfare payments is used as a measure for the number of people living in poverty. As the eligibility criteria for welfare payments have become stricter, such a measure would indicate that less people are living in poverty. At the same time the material circumstances of these same people may have actually become worse as they no longer receive welfare payments to supplement their income.

6.3.3 The data used for the 2015 IMD was gathered in 2012, so one has to be really mindful of changes in socio-economic issues since then when interpreting the data. For example, the unemployment rate in the borough has gone from 10% in 2012 to 6.3% in 2015, and in that same period average house prices in Lewisham have gone up from £278k to over £400k.

6.4 FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO DEPRIVATION IN THE BOROUGH

6.4.1 The Committee discussed the difficulties in identifying causes for poverty with the Chief Executive. Generally, a problem can be categorised as a simple, complicated, complex or chaotic situation. A complicated problem is one where there is likely to be a clear relationship between cause and effect, but it requires expertise to work out the right solution to a problem. In a complex situation, many factors are interrelated so there is no one action that will certainly result in the specific problem being solved. This requires experimental practice to work out a solution. The problem of poverty is probably somewhere in between being a complicated and being a complex problem.

Labour market

6.4.2 The London economy is very successful, especially in the sectors of IT, finance and construction. The question for the long term is how Lewisham residents can benefit from that success. London's labour market is substantially different from other areas of the country, and even big cities in other countries. 53% of all jobs in London are graduate level jobs. In Paris and New York this is about 40%, while in Berlin it's 37%. The percentage of jobs at graduate level in inner London is 65%. The labour market in London at graduate level attracts people from all over the world, so children in London who are currently in education will end up having to compete globally for those graduate level jobs.

6.4.3 An relevant sociological concept that may go some way to explaining the levels of deprivation in the borough is that of the 'precariat'. This term is used to describe a group of

people that are detached from the labour market and wider economy. People in this group tend to rarely work and when they do, they tend to move from job to job without much security. 15% of the UK economy consists of people living and working in those conditions. Lewisham as well as Lambeth and Southwark tend to have a high proportion of people that can be described as part of the precariat.

6.4.4 Lewisham has a relatively large population from African and African-Caribbean background, a group which suffers from discrimination on the labour market. This has an impact on average earnings in the borough as well as individual residents' lives.

6.5 THE DIFFICULTY OF EFFECTIVELY TARGETING POLICIES TO DECREASE POVERTY

6.5.1 Policies that aim to tackle poverty or alleviate its outcomes need to reach the right people to be effective. This is difficult in the area of poverty, as data on poverty tends to describe an average for a group of people. As described in section 6.3, averages can 'hide' some of the lived experiences of people at both ends of the scale. Even though the IMD provides information about poverty and deprivation in small geographical areas, one can't simply identify residents living in poverty by their locality.

6.5.2 Every ward in the borough, for example, will have children living in child poverty and children that don't live in child poverty. When looking at smaller geographical areas to focus a policy on, one could focus on LSOAs. Lewisham has 169 LSOAs and 7 of them are in the 10% most deprived LSOAs in the country. However, 7 out every 10 children in child poverty in Lewisham do not live in those specific LSOAs. So policies targeting certain areas facing deprivation would miss out large numbers of the children the policy should be reach.

6.5.3 Whether people are living in poverty also can't simply be determined by looking at their housing tenure. Lone Parent Families with Dependent Children (LPFwDC) are more likely to live in relative poverty and a large percentage of LPFwDC live on social housing estate. However, not everyone living on a social housing estate falls into that category. In addition many LPFwDC don't live on social housing estates. 'Estate' based action against poverty won't be very effective in targeting the groups suffering poverty or deprivation.

6.5.4 Socio-economic class can have a big influence on for instance educational outcomes. When the educational performance of different ethnic groups is split out by socio-economic background it becomes possible to identify that certain parts of ethnic group actually underperform, although the data for the ethnic group as whole would indicate children from that group doing well on average.

6.5.5 The Committee also observed during its review that although the IMD can indicate that certain geographical areas in the borough are very deprived, this information can mean that 'deprived' streets that are surrounded by better off streets can be easy to overlook as such an area probably won't be described as deprived relative to other areas.

6.6 WHAT IMPACT DOES LEWISHAM COUNCIL HAVE?

6.6.1 There are a number of areas where the Council can have a direct or indirect positive impact on the levels of poverty in the borough. The best strategy to tackle poverty in the long term is for people to get good jobs that are reasonably well paid. In the short term, welfare can alleviate some of the consequences of poverty and deprivation.

The Council as an employer

6.6.2 The Council can have some impact on poverty by how it pays its employees and it can set a benchmark for its suppliers in terms of providing good employment conditions. Lewisham has been a long term supporter of the London Living Wage. The Council pioneered some of the early approaches to ensuring the payment of the LLW in its contracts and worked with London Citizens and the Living Wage Foundation to share this knowledge with other boroughs.

The Council as a contractor

6.6.3 The Council can also have some impact on the pay policies of its contractors but only in a limited way. The Council can't impose conditions on contractors including construction companies to provide apprenticeships and jobs for Lewisham residents if the Council is not itself contracting the work. The Council tried to ensure there was provision of apprenticeships in its Building Schools for the Future programme and this was at best moderately successful. The approach can't be too local. It has to be viewed across the South East London economy.

The job market and qualifications

6.6.4 Good qualifications do not necessarily guarantee that someone will have a good job. Having a job doesn't necessarily guarantee you are able to work sufficient hours to have a decent income. Two thirds of the households in poverty in London are in work. The majority of non-professional jobs in London tend to be filled by women and it can be very hard for particularly young men with low qualifications to find employment.

6.6.5 Everyone is responsible for the aspirations of children and young people. People are naturally drawn to 'winner takes all' career paths. The conversation about which career to pursue should focus much more on 'which destination would be best to get to?' as opposed to asking young people the question 'where do you want to go?' One approach is to find inspirational people to motivate people into certain career paths. Oldham Council for example ran an event with Brian Cox because he came from Oldham to inspire local residents and young people to go into science.

Businesses in the borough

6.6.6 A large number of Lewisham's population (about 70,000 residents) leave the borough every day to go to work. This means Lewisham has a relatively small daytime population and the ratio of adults to children and teenagers during the day is very low compared to the rest of London. As a result, it isn't easy to encourage businesses to set up in the borough as there is a lack of footfall of people with disposable income. The borough tends to function as a transport node which people move through. When it comes to encouraging businesses, the question is how to create a place where people will spend money.

6.6.7 In November 2015, the Council agreed to offer a one-off discount in business rates to local business that become accredited as a London Living Wage Employer¹⁶.

Welfare reform

6.6.8 In the short term, welfare payments are likely to be most effective in decreasing the effects of deprivation in Lewisham so the Committee decided to receive evidence from the

¹⁶ The Mayor and Cabinet report and formal decision can be found here:
<http://councilmeetings.lewisham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=139&MId=3861>

Head of Public Benefits about the approach to welfare and welfare reform in the borough. Approximately 26,000 families or single parents and 18,500 single people are in receipt of benefits across Lewisham.

6.6.9 Universal Credit is being introduced across the country, which will combine six out-of-work benefits into one and residents will normally be expected to manage their applications online. Full migration to Universal Credit is scheduled for completion in 2020. The Council is developing a model together with Lambeth and Southwark to support people in the transition to Universal Credit. This will include support in developing budgeting skills as well as employment support. Negotiations are on-going with DWP about the model. Estimates from DWP are that about 5% of people will need support in the transition, while the Council estimates that this will be about 40% of people.

6.6.10 The Government is introducing a cap on benefits. The benefit cap places a limit on the total amount of benefits that an out-of-work household can claim so they will no longer receive more in welfare than the average weekly wage for working households. This limit has been set at £500 per week for families/lone parents and £350 per week for single adults. It is estimated that in Lewisham about 400 cases will be affected by the new benefit cap. Of those, 56% will have 3 or more children and 19% will 5 or more children. The Council currently uses discretionary housing payments to support these residents.

6.6.11 A number of residents in Lewisham are being impacted by the so-called 'bedroom tax'. The Council uses discretionary housing benefit payments to assist residents impacted by the bedroom tax while they look for smaller accommodation. A requirement of the discretionary payment is that residents look for smaller accommodation and at least bid for smaller properties but often recipients will have made no efforts to move.

Housing costs

6.6.12 Housing costs play a central role in explaining the poverty rate in London¹⁷. 27% of Londoners live in poverty after housing costs are taken into account, compared with 20% in the rest of England. It is the private rented sector that has seen the largest growth of low-income households and it now accounts for a higher share of those living in poverty than those renting from social landlords or who own their own home.

6.6.13 The Committee heard from Lewisham Council's Head of Strategic Housing, who explained that housing supply in the UK was last in line with the demand for housing in the late 1960s. Since then, the shortage of housing has been getting worse. House prices in Lewisham have increased significantly and as a result more people have become homeless. New supply of homes has gone down while demand has increased. This has also decreased the numbers of social housing units becoming available as people move out. This in turn has resulted in the number of people in temporary accommodation increasing. The number of available social housing units is miniscule compared to the numbers needed. Affordability is an issue across all tenures: home ownership, private renting and social renting.

6.6.14 More people are being evicted from the Private Rented Sector as landlords have a choice of tenants due to the shortage of properties. There are more children living in poverty in the private rented sector than before. Rent rates have a considerable impact on the

¹⁷ Trust for London London's Poverty Profile 2015:
https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjGgN7er53MAhUI5xoKHdOjC3QQFggdMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.londonspovetryprofile.org.uk%2F2015_LPP_Document_01.7-web%25255b2%25255d.pdf&usq=AFQjCNF3bVUAec4ixnm72BguJNi_k-2bww

disposable income available to renters. Most partners building housing developments in Lewisham do not set rent rates above 65% of market rates.

6.6.15 'Pay to Stay' is a policy announced by the government where households in social housing earning over £40,000 will be required to pay market rates or near market rates. A 2 bedroom property in Lewisham costs £1,300 on average. According to research by Shelter, households need an income of about £56,000 to cover these costs. A couple earning £40,000 a year would be able to afford a rent of about £950. The cap is set to apply to household and not individual incomes. This means the threshold would be reached by a couple where both people are earning slightly more than the London living wage. It's estimated that between 1,800 and 2,200 households would be affected in Lewisham across the entire social housing sector. The hope is that a scale for this payment will be introduced so that the rise in rent would scale with increases in household income.

6.6.16 It has not been confirmed yet how the households that would be required to 'Pay to Stay' would be identified. Indications are that the government will likely estimate for each local authority how many tenants are earning over this threshold and Councils would then be required to pay government the difference between the social rents and the market rents. It seems likely that Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs would share information with local authorities about the earnings of residents. Tenants would also be required to notify the Council if their earnings rise above £40,000. The onus would be on local authorities and tenants to ensure the required rents are paid. As the legislation develops, a key question is how the Council would cover the costs of implementing these changes.

6.6.17 It would be better if the threshold for 'Pay to Stay' was set with reference to the Local Housing Allowance, as this is an established mechanism linked to local market rents. The amount of rent charged under this policy should be no higher than the Local Housing Allowance for that property type.

6.6.18 Officers are working with Lewisham Homes and PFI providers to ensure all tenants receive communications about the changes to welfare and housing. This communication likely won't go out until more details about the regulations are known.

6.7 APPROACHES TO POVERTY IN OTHER LOCAL AUTHORITIES

6.7.1 During its review, the Committee also examined evidence from work done against poverty in other local authorities, namely the City of Lincoln and the London Borough of Camden.

City of Lincoln Council's scrutiny review into poverty

6.7.2 Lincoln Council's Community Leadership Scrutiny Committee conducted an extensive piece of detailed scrutiny into poverty over a nine month period in 2013-14. The aim of the scrutiny review from the start was to produce a strategy that would make a difference to the daily lives of local people who were financially vulnerable. The strategy is supported by an annual action plan detailing where effort will be focussed in the year ahead. This is reviewed and updated annually at a conference of all interested partners. So far, a Lincoln Poverty Conference has been organised in 2014 and 2015, and more than a hundred actions points have been suggested by partners.

6.7.3 Some of the actions that were developed included:

- Working with schools to pilot a scheme where Year 7 pupils get a Credit Union Savings Account, with a free £10 deposit, plus a package of financial education - believed to be one of only a handful of such schemes nationally.

- Distributing Anti Loan Shark leaflets to every new council tenant, and working with a local emergency shelter to do the same for their clients.
- Holding monthly CAB sessions for clients of a large provider of access to work services operating in the city.
- Working with a high street bank to raise awareness of support and advice available to residents.
- Holding a food bank forum to increase partner support for food banks in a period of unprecedented demand.
- Agreement of a £3.2 million scheme for vulnerable council tenants at risk of fuel poverty living in a high rise block of flats. This includes installation of a bio-mass boiler to replace the expensive electric storage heaters, putting up better insulated windows, doors and cladding, and installing 'smart meters' to put tenants in control of their energy usage.
- Agreed recruitment of a Money Management Advice Officer to support people in rent and council tax arrears.
- Working to provide signposting to benefits and council tax advice when notified of a death concerning a joint tenancy.
- Delivery of a programme providing new council tenants with an incentivised Credit Union account, with an incentivised £10 deposit to encourage saving.
- Lincolnshire County Council is developing a scheme with schools that ensures more families entitled to Free School Meals automatically receive access them.
- Development of a focused regeneration scheme in one of the city's most deprived wards, with a particular focus on tackling poor quality housing in the private sector, and inclusion of a community shop.

The Camden Equality Taskforce

6.7.4 The Camden Equality Taskforce was set up in July 2012 by Camden Council to understand and tackle the inequality faced by residents and communities in Camden. Although issues of inequality are different to poverty, the ability for people to enjoy a comfortable standard of living, with independence and security was a focus for the Taskforce. The Taskforce focused its recommendations on areas where the Council has either some degree of influence or is able to make direct interventions.

6.7.5 One of the recommendations of the Taskforce was to work with all employers to increase job opportunities for mothers. Since this recommendation was accepted by Camden Council's Cabinet, the Council has made significant progress to increase job opportunities for mothers. In particular, the Council has successfully commissioned two Growth Fund projects, which are raising the profile of maternal employment and providing innovative support to mothers. These projects are: Camden Women Like Us, which is developing a universal service for mothers seeking employment; and the Camden Parents First project (led by Hopscotch), which is supporting long-term unemployed mothers with complex barriers to employment.

6.7.6 Another recommendation of the Taskforce was that public services across Camden should adopt a 'no wrong door' (NWD) approach. The NWD approach aims to ensure that no matter where a person accesses a public service their problem will be identified and assessed to receive the right response, either directly or through appropriate referral. To that end, a task and finish group was established in 2014. The group, involving partner organisations, produced a final report in October 2014 focused on improving support for

mothers seeking work. The group also identified a set of NWD principles which can be applied to a wider range of services in the local public sector and in 2015 Camden Council was aiming to work internally and with partners to ensure the areas for action and the principles of the report are tested and implemented through a range of projects.

DRAFT

7. CONCLUSION

[to be inserted once recommendations have been agreed]

DRAFT

8. MONITORING AND ONGOING SCRUTINY

8.1 The report and its recommendations will be referred to a meeting of Mayor and Cabinet for consideration and their response back to the Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee meeting will be reported within in two months of that meeting. In order to monitor the implementation of of the review recommendations, the Committee will receive a progress update in six months' time.

DRAFT

SOURCES

[to be inserted]

DRAFT

APPENDICES

[to be inserted]

DRAFT

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee			
Title	Select Committee work programme		
Contributor	Scrutiny Manager	Item	5
Class	Part 1 (open)	11 May 2016	

1. Purpose

To advise Members of the proposed work programme for the municipal year 2016-17, and to decide on the agenda items for the next meeting.

2. Summary

- 2.1 At the beginning of the new administration, each select committee drew up a draft work programme for submission to the Business Panel for consideration.
- 2.2 The Business Panel will consider the proposed work programmes of each of the select committees on 24 May 2016 to agree a co-ordinated overview and scrutiny work programme. However, the work programme can be reviewed at each Select Committee meeting so that Members are able to include urgent, high priority items and remove items that are no longer a priority.

3. Recommendations

3.1 The Committee is asked to:

- note the work plan attached at **Appendix B** and discuss any issues arising from the programme;
- specify the information and analysis required in the report for each item on the agenda for the next meeting, based on desired outcomes, so that officers are clear about what they need to provide;
- review all forthcoming key decisions, attached at **Appendix C**, and consider any items for further scrutiny;

4. The work programme

4.1 The work programme for 2016/17 was agreed at the Committee's meeting on 14 April 2016.

4.2 The Committee is asked to consider if any urgent issues have arisen that require scrutiny and if any existing items are no longer a priority and can be removed from the work programme. Before adding additional items, each item should be considered against agreed criteria. The flow chart attached at **Appendix A** may help Members decide if proposed additional items should be added to the work programme. The Committee's work programme needs to be achievable in terms of the amount of meeting time available. If the Committee agrees to add additional item(s) because they are urgent and high priority, Members will need to consider

which medium/low priority item(s) should be removed in order to create sufficient capacity for the new item(s).

5. The next meeting

5.1 The following reports are scheduled for the meeting on 4 July 2016:

Agenda item	Review type	Link to Corporate Priority	Priority
Local police service update	Standard item	Safety, security and a visible presence	High
London Fire Brigade	Policy development	Safety, security and a visible presence	High
Library service - provision of community library facilities	Policy development	Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity	High
Council's employment profile	Performance monitoring	Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity	Low
Short review Developing capacity in the voluntary sector – scoping paper	In-depth review	Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity	High
Provision for the LGBT Community	Performance monitoring	Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity	Medium

5.2 The Committee is asked to specify the information and analysis it would like to see in the reports for these items, based on the outcomes the Committee would like to achieve, so that officers are clear about what they need to provide for the next meeting.

6. Financial Implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

7. Legal Implications

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, all scrutiny select committees must devise and submit a work programme to the Business Panel at the start of each municipal year.

8. Equalities Implications

8.1 The Equality Act 2010 brought together all previous equality legislation in England, Scotland and Wales. The Act included a new public sector equality duty, replacing the separate duties relating to race, disability and gender equality. The duty came into force on 6 April 2011. It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age,

disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

8.2 The Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act
- advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

8.3 There may be equalities implications arising from items on the work programme and all activities undertaken by the Select Committee will need to give due consideration to this.

9. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting is Monday 4 July 2016.

Background Documents

Lewisham Council's Constitution

Centre for Public Scrutiny: the Good Scrutiny Guide

Scrutiny work programme – prioritisation process



Safer Stronger Communities Select Committee work programme 2016-17

Programme of work

Work item	Type of item	Priority	Strategic priority	Delivery deadline	14-Apr	11-May	04-Jul	15-Sep	19-Oct	28-Nov	17-Jan	08-Mar
Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair	Constitutional requirement	N/A	-	April	Item completed							
Select Committee work programme	Standard item	High	CP1	April	Item completed	Item ongoing	Item ongoing	Item ongoing	Item ongoing	Item ongoing	Item ongoing	Item ongoing
Review of the Enforcement service	Policy development	High	CP4	April	Item completed							
Poverty review - report and recommendations	In-depth review	Medium	CP10	May		Proposed timeframe			M&C response expected			
Council's employee survey 2015						Proposed timeframe			Proposed timeframe			
Local police service update	Performance monitoring	Medium	CP4	May			Proposed timeframe					
Leisure centre contract update	Policy development	High	CP9	May				Proposed timeframe				
London fire brigade	Performance monitoring	Medium	CP4	July			Proposed timeframe					
Library service - provision of community library facilities	Policy development	High	CP 10	July			Proposed timeframe					
Provision for the LGBT community	Standard review	Medium	CP1				Proposed timeframe					
Council's employment profile	Information item	Medium	CP10	July			Proposed timeframe					
Short review Developing capacity in the voluntary sector	In-depth review	High	CP10	Ongoing			scoping paper		evidence session	evidence session	report and recommendations	
LEWISHAM FUTURE PROGRAMME	Standard item	High	CP10	Ongoing				Proposed timeframe	Item ongoing	Item ongoing	Item ongoing	Item ongoing
Safer Lewisham Plan - monitoring and update	Performance monitoring	Medium	CP4	Sept				Proposed timeframe				
Criminal justice system	Policy development	Low	CP4	Oct					Proposed timeframe			
Probation service update	Standard item	Low	CP4	Oct					Proposed timeframe			
Local Assemblies	Performance monitoring	Low	CP1	Nov						Proposed timeframe		
Short review Demographic changes to borough's population	in-depth review	High	CP 10	Ongoing						scoping paper	evidence session	report and recommendations
Main grant programme funding	Standard item	High	CP10	January							Proposed timeframe	
Evaluation of changes to voluntary sector accommodation	Performance monitoring	Medium	CP1	tbc								Proposed timeframe
Implementation of Comprehensive Equalities Scheme	Performance monitoring	Medium	CP1	March								Proposed timeframe
Library and information service	Performance monitoring	Low	CP10	tbc								Proposed timeframe

Item completed
Item ongoing
Item outstanding
Proposed timeframe
Item added

Meetings		
1)	Wed	14 Apr
2)	Thu	11 May
3)	Wed	4 July
4)	Wed	15 September
5)	Wed	19 October
6)	Mon	28 November
7)	Tue	17 January
8)	Wed	8 March

Shaping Our Future: Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy 2008-2020		
	Priority	
1	Ambitious and achieving	SCS 1
2	Safer	SCS 2
3	Empowered and responsible	SCS 3
4	Clean, green and liveable	SCS 4
5	Healthy, active and enjoyable	SCS 5
6	Dynamic and prosperous	SCS 6

Corporate Priorities		
	Priority	
1	Community Leadership	CP 1
2	Young people's achievement and involvement	CP 2
3	Clean, green and liveable	CP 3
4	Safety, security and a visible presence	CP 4
5	Strengthening the local economy	CP 5
6	Decent homes for all	CP 6
7	Protection of children	CP 7
8	Caring for adults and older people	CP 8
9	Active, healthy citizens	CP 9
10	Inspiring efficiency, effectiveness and equity	CP 10

FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

Forward Plan May 2016 - August 2016

This Forward Plan sets out the key decisions the Council expects to take during the next four months.

Anyone wishing to make representations on a decision should submit them in writing as soon as possible to the relevant contact officer (shown as number (7) in the key overleaf). Any representations made less than 3 days before the meeting should be sent to Kevin Flaherty the Local Democracy Officer, at the Council Offices or kevin.flaherty@lewisham.gov.uk. However the deadline will be 4pm on the working day prior to the meeting.

A "key decision"* means an executive decision which is likely to:

- (a) result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates;
- (b) be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards.

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS					
Date included in forward plan	Description of matter under consideration	Date of Decision Decision maker	Responsible Officers / Portfolios	Consultation Details	Background papers / materials
February 2016	2016 School Minor Works Contract	27/04/16 Overview and Scrutiny Education Business Panel	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
January 2016	Contract Variation and Single Tender Action for PLACE/Ladywell	27/04/16 Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
February 2016	Annual Lettings Plan	05/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
January 2016	Beeson Street Scheme Approval and Proposed form of Investment partnership/procurement route	05/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
February 2016	Development Agreement with the Education Commission for the Archdiocese of Southwark: St Winifreds	05/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
November 2015	Discharge into Private Rented	05/16	Kevin Sheehan,		

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS					
Date included in forward plan	Description of matter under consideration	Date of Decision Decision maker	Responsible Officers / Portfolios	Consultation Details	Background papers / materials
	Sector Policy	Mayor and Cabinet	Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
January 2016	Lewisham Homes Management Agreement	18/05/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
January 2016	Miscellaneous Debts Write Off	05/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources		
June 2014	Surrey Canal Triangle (New Bermondsey) - Compulsory Purchase Order Resolution	05/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor		
February 2016	Health and Social Care Devolution Pilot	05/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services and Councillor Chris Best, Cabinet Member for Health, Wellbeing and Older People		
January 2016	Hostels/Private Sector Leased Service Transfer to Lewisham Homes	05/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan,		

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS

Date included in forward plan	Description of matter under consideration	Date of Decision Decision maker	Responsible Officers / Portfolios	Consultation Details	Background papers / materials
			Cabinet Member Housing		
	PLACE/Ladywell Residential Units Lease to Lewisham Homes	18/05/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
February 2016	Processing of Dry Recyclables Contract	05/16 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Rachel Onikosi, Cabinet Member Public Realm		
	Contract Variation Turnham Primary School Expansion	18/05/16 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
March 2016	LED Lighting Project Laurence House	24/05/16 Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor		
	Extension of Capita CST (Revenue and Benefits) Support Services Contract	24/05/16 Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources		

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS

Date included in forward plan	Description of matter under consideration	Date of Decision Decision maker	Responsible Officers / Portfolios	Consultation Details	Background papers / materials
	Special Educational Needs and Disability Information Advice and Support Service	24/05/16 Overview and Scrutiny Education Business Panel	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
February 2016	Disposal of Land at Corner of Deptford Church Street and Creekside	06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor		
	Housing Development Programme Update parts 1 & 2	01/06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
	Autistic Spectrum Housing	01/06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
January 2016	New Bermondsey Housing Zone Bid Update	06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor		
March 2016	Lewisham Adoption Service Statement of Purpose and Childrens Guides	06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin,		

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS

Date included in forward plan	Description of matter under consideration	Date of Decision Decision maker	Responsible Officers / Portfolios	Consultation Details	Background papers / materials
			Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
March 2016	Lewisham Fostering Service Statement of Purpose and Childrens Guides	06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
February 2016	Saville Centre options for future use of site	06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor		
	Processing of Dry Recyclables Contract	01/06/16 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Rachel Onikosi, Cabinet Member Public Realm		
	Youth Services Contract Award	01/06/16 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
	Education Commission Update	29/06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and		

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS

Date included in forward plan	Description of matter under consideration	Date of Decision Decision maker	Responsible Officers / Portfolios	Consultation Details	Background papers / materials
			Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
	Adoption Service Statement of Purpose and Children's Guides	29/06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
	Fostering Service Statement of Purpose and Children's Guides	29/06/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Sara Williams, Executive Director, Children and Young People and Councillor Paul Maslin, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People		
February 2016	Contract Award Security	06/16 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor		
	Prevention and Inclusion Contract Award	29/06/16 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)	Aileen Buckton, Executive Director for Community Services and Councillor Janet Daby, Cabinet Member Community Safety		
	Besson Street Parts 1 & 2	13/07/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for		

FORWARD PLAN – KEY DECISIONS					
Date included in forward plan	Description of matter under consideration	Date of Decision Decision maker	Responsible Officers / Portfolios	Consultation Details	Background papers / materials
			Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
March 2016	Campshill Road Extra Care Scheme	07/16 Mayor and Cabinet	Kevin Sheehan, Executive Director for Customer Services and Councillor Damien Egan, Cabinet Member Housing		
February 2016	Contract Award Cleaning	07/16 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor		
February 2016	Contract Award Planned and Preventative Maintenance	07/16 Mayor and Cabinet (Contracts)	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Alan Smith, Deputy Mayor		
February 2016	Insurance Renewal	09/16 Overview and Scrutiny Business Panel	Janet Senior, Executive Director for Resources & Regeneration and Councillor Kevin Bonavia, Cabinet Member Resources		