

Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive
Tuesday 10 May 2016 9:30am

Mayor Jules Pipe was in the chair

Present

Member	Position
Mayor Jules Pipe	Chair
Cllr Claire Kober	Deputy Chair
Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE	Vice chair
Cllr Ruth Dombey	Vice chair
Mr Mark Boleat	Vice chair
Mayor Sir Steve Bullock	
Cllr Peter John OBE	
Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE	
Cllr Lib Peck	
Cllr Julian Bell	
Cllr Ravi Govindia	Substituting for Cllr Philippa Roe

London Councils officers and Ms Lesley Seary (Islington Chief Executive), Sir Derek Myers (London Councils Challenge) and Mr Ian Hickman (London Councils Challenge) were in attendance.

1. Apologies for absence and announcement of deputies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Philippa Roe for whom Cllr Ravi Govindia substituted.

2. Declaration of interest

Cllr Julian Bell declared an interest as a housing association tenant and Mayor Sir Steve Bullock and Mr. Mark Boleat as members of the Housing Finance Institute Board in respect of item 7 *London Housing Proposition*.

3. Minutes of the Executive Meeting held on 1 March 2016

The minutes of the Executive meeting held on 1 March 2016 were agreed.

4. Relationship with incoming Mayoral administration

The report was introduced by the Chair.

The Executive agreed to note the report.

The Executive agreed to suspend standing orders to take item 8 next

8. The Work and Health Programme in London

Cllr Peter John OBE introduced the report saying:

- In the Spending Review, London had secured a commitment from government to co-design and co-commission this programme with DWP
- Key features of the emerging agreement with DWP were:
 - London's sub-regions would lead the design, development, commissioning and management of the programme
 - There would be some core national policy and commercial design elements of the programme that would need to be adhered to but that these would be kept to a minimum
 - So there would be four different programmes in London, led by London boroughs, with boroughs being responsible for the procurement process and deciding on the provider. We would work with DWP but lead the process.
- This represented a real step forward compared to previous national employment programmes, with a lot more local control. Boroughs would be able to design and

manage the process according to local priorities, on a scale that would provide the opportunity for better integration of local services

- The detail was still being finalised with DWP officials and sign off from Ministers was also needed
- Resources in boroughs and sub-regions would need to be mobilised to undertake a significant amount of design and development work in a short period of time. A pre-qualifying questionnaire and prospectus would need to be developed by the end of July this year and there would need to be a readiness to issue an invitation to tender by October.

Ms Lesley Seary continued the presentation:

- Close contact with Greater Manchester, which had a similar devolution deal, was being maintained
- London Councils was lobbying so that the sub-regions could become ESF co-financing organisations.
- DWP was being pushed for flexibility on direct provision, although this was considered challenging for DWP

Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE, Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE and Cllr Ravi Govindia all expressed their support for the proposals and applauded the work so far.

The issue of any borough not part formally of a sub-regional grouping was raised. Ms Seary pointed out that residents would clearly need to be able to access the programme via one of the contract areas. This, in effect, was the same as when a national programme was being run in specific localities and this would not necessitate individual boroughs being forced to join up to the wider apparatus of a sub-regional partnership if it did not wish to.

The Executive agreed to note the report and the progress made towards agreeing a London-led programme with DWP, operating at sub-regional level.

5. *Educational Excellence Everywhere* White Paper

Cllr John also introduced this report saying:

- On Friday 6 May – after the report being considered by the Executive had been circulated - the Secretary of State for Education had announced that she was no longer going ahead with plans to force academy conversion on all maintained schools. Her intention now was to convert all maintained schools to academy status in areas where local authorities were ‘underperforming’, an assessment not yet defined so it was unclear how this would affect London schools
- In the light of the Secretary of State’s announcement on academisation, it was not yet clear how much of the White Paper *Educational Excellence Everywhere* still stood. For example, would the government go ahead with either freehold land transfers for academy conversions or the removal of the school improvement role from local government?
- There were still unresolved issues relating to local authorities’ remaining statutory duties. Even in an only partially-academised education system, it was becoming increasingly difficult to deliver these duties without appropriate powers
- There was likely to be an Education Bill to be announced in the Queen’s Speech next week which should clarify the government’s intentions, a further paper on this would go to Leaders’ Committee in June
- Lobbying around the National Funding Formula continued. The All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) for London, which was supported by London Councils, held a backbench debate in the House of Commons last Wednesday on education funding. Over twenty-five MPs attended to put forward London’s views. The Minister committed to a meeting to discuss

London's concerns about funding reductions. This would be followed up with him.

Cllr Teresa O'Neill MBE asked whether local government wanted to have responsibilities around school places and SEN without the resources to fund those responsibilities?

The Chair agreed with Cllr O'Neill and also argued that it looked as though the original government intention of forced academisation would come in by the back door.

Cllr Claire Kober suggested that there was an opportunity not to be constrained by responding only to a top-down Government initiative, but instead to come forward with a London proposition that took account of the capital's very particular circumstances, including the performance of London's schools. Cllr. John said that the Mayor of London might be encouraged to play some part in an aligned London proposition of this type.

Cllr Ruth Dombey thought multi-academy trusts broke down local partnerships but also saw this as an opportunity to come forward with a London proposal.

Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE wanted to place greater stress on a cross-party approach from London Councils, with national support if possible, rather than joint work with the Mayor. Cllr Kober reassured that the suggestion was not to hand over education responsibility to the Mayor of London but to take a pragmatic approach to the Education Bill.. Cllr Govindia concluded the exchange by suggesting that London Councils developed its approach first before going to the Mayor to seek support.

The Executive agreed to those aspects of the London Councils' response to the proposals (those that were still applicable and had not been superseded) set out in the White Paper *Educational Excellence Everywhere*, particularly in relation to:

- The (subsequently modified) proposal to make all schools academies by 2022
- New duties for local authorities, including making them accountable for facilitation of academy conversions
- A newly defined role for local government in relation to education as set out in the report

- Removal of responsibilities from local authorities including school improvement and alternative provision
- Delivery of remaining duties in relation to education.

6. Health and Care Update

Cllr Teresa O'Neill OBE introduced the report saying:

- This report summarised progress on four pieces of work:
 - Health and care devolution
 - Sustainability and Transformation Plans
 - Better Care Fund
 - HIV prevention in London
- On Health and Care devolution London Councils had made a financial contribution to the London-wide activity in support of the devolution pilots with a priority that it added value and allowed work to be shared with the rest of London
- The next meeting of the London Health Board was to be held on 28 June when a clearer idea of how the new Mayor wanted to engage in health devolution should emerge
- On Sustainability and Transformation Plans, these were introduced by the NHS Planning Guidance published in December of last year. The purpose of the Five-year Plans was to deliver the Five Year Forward View, though there was a heavy emphasis on fixing the financial gap, particularly in the first year, and to provide a coherent plan to deliver the £22 billion efficiency as part of the Spending Review agreement with Government. There were real problems about its timetable and awareness

- On the Better Care Fund, the Spending Review 2015 had made a commitment that by 2019/20 government would make additional funding worth £1.5 billion available to local authorities to be included in the Better Care Fund
- On PrEP (Pre Exposure Prophylaxis), despite the NHS having planned to introduce PrEP for the last 18 months, in March NHS England announced that it no longer considered the provision of HIV prevention drugs as its legal responsibility. This had clear costs-shunting implications for councils as well as health implications for Londoners who would benefit from the drug. London Councils had written to NHS Chief Executive, Mr Simon Stevens and it was raised directly with the Public Health Minister, Ms Jane Ellison MP. The Minister clearly understood the strong feelings expressed. NHS England had recently announced that it would reconsider its position at a specialist commissioning meeting in June
- On the London HIV Prevention Programme – public polling had shown some impressive results and were a great reflection of the work being done through the programme
- It was intended that a report be taken to Leaders' Committee on health and care devolution and STPs

Cllr Ray Puddifoot MBE pointed out the ludicrously fast timetable required by the NHS in part of the STP process.

Cllr Julian Bell was also anxious about STP proposals being rushed through during an election time.

Cllr Ruth Dombey acknowledged the problems about timescales but was more optimistic that boroughs individually, and in groupings, could influence local health economies and provision positively.

The Executive agreed to note the report and to agree that a full report on health and care devolution and Sustainability and Transformation Plans be brought to Leaders' Committee.

7. London Housing Proposition

Mayor Sir Steve Bullock circulated a draft paper he had discussed with other London Government colleagues setting out some possible shared principles on housing delivery. He introduced the report saying:

- London Councils had been working with London local government colleagues to develop a proposition for housing devolution in London that would be capable of significantly increasing housing supply across all tenures and Ministers had indicated a positive ambition to support boroughs
- The House of Commons had rejected most of the amendments to the Housing and Planning Bill made by the House of Lords
- It was likely that there would be an early meeting between London Councils, the new Mayor and the Secretary of State to discuss how to take matters forward
- It was important to note that there were two kinds of collaboration envisaged here:
 - One was a 'coalition of the willing' – interested boroughs signing up to a collaborative delivery mechanism or framework to support cross-borough approaches to housing development. This would remain entirely voluntary
 - The second was a wider, and new, approach to governance on a broad London housing strategy and responsibility for spending London's share of the spending review monies.
- Temporary accommodation was a huge issue

- The new Homes for London Board would need to be more focused and purposeful than the existing Board had been.

Cllr Ravi Govindia indicated that he felt the summary principles paper would need some amendment to reflect issues likely to be raised by Leaders within the Conservative Group. These included greater emphasis on:

- Delivery of soft infrastructure to support growing communities
- Services across borough boundaries especially in Outer London boroughs
- Temporary accommodation: did the Mayor need to have a role in this?
- Purpose-built housing: who would own the stock?
- The role of Housing Associations and developers as part of the governance or consultative mechanisms envisaged
- Construction skills, mention of which was lacking in the paper
- It was unclear what role Housing Zones would play

Cllr John argued that estate regeneration could not be seen as a short or medium term solution, it could take 20 years to deliver a project.

Mr Mark Boleat argued that:

- The best way to stop land prices spiralling was by speeding up the planning process
- There were very large disparities in house-building levels across boroughs
- Developers would build when they could make a profit, it was not possible to force developers to build if they would lose money on a project

- The lack of small and medium-sized developers in London was a problem

Cllr Govindia advocated open and transparent viability assessments.

Cllr Julian Bell took the view that the issue of viability assessment publications should be left to the borough.

In response to a question from Cllr Teresa O'Neill, Mayor Bullock pointed out that the paper had started out as an attempt to talk to boroughs and the City but it would be enormously helpful if it were possible to go to the Secretary of State with a broad aspiration that collected views of the London local government generally, without it specifically committing any boroughs to detailed propositions at this point. He cautioned that pressure would soon start to mount for a tripartite discussion involving London Councils, the Mayor and ministers.

Cllr Govindia he said he would like to be able to share the draft principles with colleagues on the basis that there would be improvements and further versions to reflect the comments he and others had made.

The Executive Committee agreed to note the update on the emerging London housing proposition.

Mayor Bullock concluded by undertaking to seek clarity on the timetable and communicating it on to colleagues.

8. The Work and Health Programme in London

The report had been taken previously.

9. Nominations to Outside Bodies

The Executive agreed to note the proportionality of London Councils appointments to outside bodies.

The Executive ended at 11:35

	Item	Action	Progress
5.	<i>Educational Excellence Everywhere White Paper</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A report on Education Bill expected in the Queen's Speech in the following week to go to Leaders' Committee in June• Follow up the Minister's commitment to a meeting to discuss London's concerns about funding reductions.• London Councils develop its approach first before going to the Mayor.	PAPA CS&E	Completed
6.	Health and Care Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A report on health and care devolution and Sustainability and Transformation Plans to be brought to Leaders' Committee.	PAPA Health	Completed
8	London Housing Proposition <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mayor Bullock to seek clarity on the timetable and communicate it on to colleagues.	PAPA Housing	In hand