MEMBERS’ QUESTIONS

QUESTION 1

FROM: COUNCILLOR J. GRAY

TO: COUNCILLOR M. PYE (PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR COMMUNITIES AND HOUSING)

CHANGE OF USE OF FAMILY HOMES TO HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION – PLANNING PERMISSION REQUIREMENT

Can the relevant Cabinet Member please explain why planning permission is no longer required to change the use of a family home to a house in multiple occupation?

REPLY:

The Government has recently changed the planning rules to end the requirement for planning permission to change from a house into an HMO. Property owners or agents do not need to apply to the Council for planning permission if they want to change a family house into an HMOs because this is now “permitted development”. Due to this change the Council now has little power to limit the potential spread of HMOs.
QUESTION 2

FROM: COUNCILLOR K. BELLAMY

TO: COUNCILLOR M. PYE (PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR COMMUNITIES AND HOUSING)

HOUSING BENEFIT

What will the impact be of the proposed changes to Housing Benefit in Waltham Forest?

REPLY:

In the Emergency Budget of June 2010, the Chancellor proposed that there should be a cap on the amount of housing benefit (HB) and local housing allowance (LHA) claimants may receive. For HB, the limit will range from £280 a week for 1 bedroom property to £400 a week for a four bedroom property or larger. This cap system is due to be introduced in April 2011.

The direct impact for residents of Waltham Forest in receipt of these benefits will be limited in that fewer than 20 families are in receipt of benefits above the cap level.

However, the logical outcome of this policy is that residents in London boroughs with higher rental levels, like Hackney, Westminster, Camden and Kensington & Chelsea, will either have to make up the shortfall in their rent, fall into arrears or move to parts of London such as Waltham Forest where rents are cheaper.

This will be a difficult experience not only for those affected, but also for those boroughs having to cope with an unplanned influx of additional residents. According to research by London Councils conducted with DWP data and in consultation with landlords, approximately 82,000 households across London will be at risk of losing their home as a result of the changes. This includes households in central London, but also families claiming benefit and living in private accommodation in Barnet, Brent, Ealing, Haringey, Hounslow, Lambeth, Merton, Richmond and Wandsworth.

Further research by the East London Housing Partnership (ELHP) has used migration data to look at the choices tenants might make, which suggests that over 2,800 households could migrate into outer East London boroughs. This could result in up to 700 additional families moving into private rented accommodation in Waltham Forest over the next four years.

This would present us with a series of challenges including:

Significantly increased pressure on school places.
A potential increase in demand for children's services, particularly for vulnerable children.

Increased workload in relation to advice and administration of Council and housing benefit.

A reduction in the percentage of residents who are in employment, as a significant proportion of those in receipt of housing benefit will be work less.

An increase in the percentage of our housing stock which is rented out by the private sector, possibly in areas where we have not traditionally seen a significant amount of private sector rented.

Additional pressures on the landlord accreditation scheme and HMO licensing.

A need for additional enforcement in relation to the private sector including planning, lettings signs, environmental health, housing standards and public realm.
QUESTION 3

FROM: COUNCILLOR A. KHAN
TO: COUNCILLOR C. ROBBINS (LEADER OF THE COUNCIL)

120 POLICE CAMPAIGN

Could the Leader of the Council give an update on the 120 police campaign?

REPLY:

A cross-party delegation attended City Hall on Wednesday 13 October 2010 in order to re-launch our "We're Calling For Back-Up" campaign. We invited the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, to meet us to accept a personal invite to Waltham Forest but were told that his schedule was 'too busy'. We attended Mayor's Question Time, where our GLA representative asked several questions on the borough's behalf. These can be found online here, though the responses have not yet been printed:

http://mqt.london.gov.uk/mqt/public/member-question-list.do?member=Jennette%20Arnold&recordsPerSlice=25&slic...E_MS&orderBy=SEQ_ID

The crux of the Mayor's response was to acknowledge Waltham Forest's delegation, acknowledge Waltham Forest's problems and to acknowledge the fact that he would doubtless be hearing from us in the future. Beyond this there was no direct agreement, besides a general assertion that London will receive the policing resources it requires, even with spending cuts on the horizon.

Cllr Robbins will be meeting Sir Simon Milton and Kulveer Ranger later in the year and will discuss this matter with them. We will continue to raise awareness and drum up support for the campaign through our petition, and newly launched Facebook page. Postcards to complete and return as part of the petition are available from Corporate Communications.
QUESTION 4

FROM: COUNCILLOR C. COGHILL

TO: COUNCILLOR L. ALI (PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY AND COHESION)

POLICE CUSTODY SUITE

Could the relevant portfolio holder give an update on the new police custody suite and how this will benefit the police and our borough?

REPLY:

The new Custody facility will increase cell space from 14 places to 32. Frequently police "run out of space" and end up transferring detainees all over London – which proves costly and a poor use of resources. Frequently local police are forced to go as far as Lambeth for cell space. It is also in the area of most need in the Borough again cutting transport costs / time etc further.

The community can be assured that the new build is state of the art and has all the necessary safeguards for those detained such as CCTV and safer cells ensuring that detainees are best looked after and staff protected.

It should be remembered that some people detained are not criminals, and can be those who are mentally ill and vulnerable.
QUESTION 5

FROM: COUNCILLOR M. DAVIS

TO: COUNCILLOR C. ROBBINS (LEADER OF THE COUNCIL)

DEPUTY LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Leader of the Council will be aware that under the terms of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 the council must make provision for, and he is required to designate, a Deputy Leader of the Council.

Who is the Deputy Leader of the Council?

REPLY:

In accordance with paragraph 7.2.5 of Article 7 of the Council’s Constitution, each Cabinet Member shall serve as Deputy Leader on a rota for a period of 2 months.

For October and November Cllr Angie Bean is Deputy Leader.

As part of the savings programme no extra payment is being made for those who undertake this role.
QUESTION 6

FROM: COUNCILLOR M. LEWIS

TO: COUNCILLOR C. ROBBINS (LEADER OF THE COUNCIL)

OLYMPICS – IMPROVEMENT OF SPORTS CENTRES

The Olympic Authorities have announced that they are going to fund the improvement of 30 Sports Centres, in Boroughs close to the Olympic Park, which are to be used by teams taking part in the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Would the Leader, as the Portfolio Lead for the Boroughs Olympic Activities, please inform the council whether any of the Sports Centres in Waltham Forest were included on the list and if so which ones?

REPLY:

On October 1st LOCOG announced that 16 venues had been signed up as Games Time Training Venues and that a further 12 would be signed up by the end of the year. Of the initial 16, 12 are in London and one of these, Eton Manor, has been mistakenly identified on the LOCOG media release as being in Newham. No other sports facilities within Waltham Forest are on the list.

LOCOG state that the further 12 to be signed up ‘are mainly football training facilities outside London’.

Full media release can be found at,

QUESTION 7

FROM: COUNCILLOR W. SMITH

TO: COUNCILLOR S. MAHMUD (PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE)

WALTHAMSTOW SCHOOL FOR GIRLS – BUILDING WORKS

Can the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People explain why some of the walls of the BSF building at Walthamstow School for Girls have recently been covered with plastic sheeting? What remedial works are being undertaken? When are they due to be completed? Will the cost fall on the Council or on the Governing Body of the school?

REPLY:

Some of the walls of Walthamstow School for Girls are covered with plastic sheeting due to a failed process to fix brick slips. The manufacture of the brick slips or the LEP who constructed the school have not been able to fully determine the cause of the problem after a thorough investigation. The problem could stem from defective batch of materials, the process or weather conditions when the work was undertaken or a possible combination of these.

The contractor needs around two weeks to complete the work and due to health & safety reasons it needs to be undertaken when the pupils are not in school, therefore the work is likely to be undertaken during Christmas break (Weather permitting).

No cost will be incurred by the School or the Council.

However due to the cancellation of the BSF programme, a decision made by the Conservative and Liberal Democrat government there will be considerable problems in our schools across the borough due to age and dilapidations. It is hoped that questioner will take appropriate steps to draw this matter to the government's attention and fight for the restoration of our programmed capital investment in Waltham Forest Schools.
QUESTION 8

FROM: COUNCILLOR E. VINCENT

TO: COUNCILLOR C. ROBBINS (LEADER OF THE COUNCIL)

BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE PROGRAMME

Could the Leader of the Council give an update on the Building Schools for Future Programme recently cancelled by the Government?

REPLY:

Background
As Members are aware, the Secretary of State (SoS) for Education Michael Gove set out a complete overhaul of capital investment in England’s schools on 5 July 2010 and brought an end to Building Schools for the Future (BSF).

This announcement has a significant impact on Waltham Forest’s BSF programme in that all planned BSF schemes in our Wave 5 programme have been stopped with immediate effect. The schools affected are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belmont Park</th>
<th>Kelmscott (additional 6th Form element)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield House School</td>
<td>Lammas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingford Foundation</td>
<td>Leytonstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connaught Girls</td>
<td>New Provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mitchell</td>
<td>Norlington Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathcote</td>
<td>Rush Croft Sports College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highams High</td>
<td>Tom Hood (Buxton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Family (RC)</td>
<td>William Morris Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Clarke</td>
<td>Willowfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SoS made a further announcement on 6 August 2010, confirming the continuation of a number of academies and first wave BSF sample schemes. These schemes were categorised as ‘for discussion’ in the SoS’s original list published on 5 July 2010. These did not include any Waltham Forest schools.

As part of the government’s announcement on BSF, the Education Secretary announced a review (James Review) of education capital spending which commenced in July 2010 and outcomes of which are likely to be published by the end of the year. The government is also scheduled to make formal announcements on capital spending plans on 20 October 2010 as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review.
**Actions to Date**
The borough has taken a vigorous approach in challenging Partnership for Schools (PfS), Department for Education (DfE) and Ministers on the decision to cease the BSF programme in Waltham Forest.

There has been a significant drive from the borough through the Leader and Lead Member for Children Services to get the SoS to review his decision with regard to Waltham Forest. There has also been support from the local MPs in getting our case reviewed. There has also been extensive coverage in the local media and also featured on BBC London. The Council has also launched an on-line petition in order to engage the Waltham Forest community in getting our BSF programme reinstated.

The borough has written on a number occasions to PfS, DfE and the SoS and Lord Hill the Schools Minster.

On 24 September 2010, Lord Hill visited a selection of Waltham Forest schools and meet with secondary school headteachers to see and hear for himself the issues relating to our schools. He also met with the Leader of the Council during his visit. The visit was extremely positive and Lord Hill saw for himself the challenging issues facing our schools.

The Council took legal advice in relation to the SoS’s decision to cease the BSF programme in Waltham Forest. Legal Counsel advised, that we have a strong case for seeking a Judicial Review of the SoS’s decision to cease BSF in Waltham Forest.

The Council has made a number of attempts to avoid the Judicial Review process and a key one being a pre-action letter sent to the SoS outlining our key evidence and our grounds to seek Judicial Review. No substantive response has been received to our letters.

The time limit to launch a Judicial Review is three months from the date of the original SoS’s decision which was the 4 October 2010. The Council filed for Judicial on 4 October 2010 and the SoS has 21 days to respond to our submission. A judge will consider evidence from both parties and make a decision whether to allow or disallow a Judicial Review.

Going forward, the situation is under close review in order to deal with any specific government response to our Judicial Review submission and announcements on capital spending as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review.
QUESTION 9

FROM: COUNCILLOR N. ASGHAR

TO: COUNCILLOR C. ROBBINS (LEADER OF THE COUNCIL)

GOVERNMENT’S COMPREHENSIVE SPENDING REVIEW

Could the Leader of the Council give his initial thoughts on the Government’s Comprehensive Spending Review?

REPLY:

The announcement that, nationally, approximately 28% will be taken out of local authority budgets is a real blow to the communities of Waltham Forest – especially given that, over the past three years, the Council has succeeded in saving £30m in order to ensure the best value for money for our residents.

We calculate that, as a result of the CSR, over the next four years we are going to have to find savings of at least £65m - though this figure could in fact be higher still particularly if the allocation of government grant to London Council’s is reduced in favour of that allocated to councils outside London. This comes after the cancellation of the BSF, which was due to bring over £250m of investment into the borough and transform our schools for our young people. In addition the Coalition Government withdrew £2.6m in the emergency budget earlier this year.

The Council is committed to protecting vital front line services. That is why we have acted swiftly to make sure we balance our books. On Tuesday, the Cabinet signed off the Medium Term Financial Strategy which seeks to begin to proactively address the huge savings that the Council will need to make over the next four years.

We will continue to monitor Government announcements to ensure that we continue to act as quickly as possible in the best interests of our residents. Despite the above this review will seriously damage Waltham Forest residents through higher unemployment, lower investment and a reduction in services. Waltham Forest will continue to campaign on all of these issues to ensure a fair society.
QUESTION 10

FROM: COUNCILLOR E. NORTHOVER

TO: COUNCILLOR C. ROBBINS (LEADER OF THE COUNCIL)

CAMPAIGN FOR ADDITIONAL POLICE OFFICERS

Following recent press reports can the Leader of the Council please tell us why his recent "delegation" to City Hall to lobby for a recalculation of the borough's police numbers did not arrange a meeting with the Mayor but chose to merely watch Mayoral Question time?

Can he also tell us whether the Council is looking at alternative ways to allocate and improve policing? e.g. creating a scheme allowing Council employees to become Special Constables.

Can he also explain why for 8 years under a Labour Mayor he seemed to regard the police numbers as fair and did not complain; yet as soon as a Conservative mayor was elected it suddenly became a problem requiring a campaign?

Can he also please explain how he squares his belief about police numbers with the fact that the Borough Commander is adamant that we do not require greater police numbers?

REPLY:

I wrote to the Mayor of London on 26th July to ask him to visit Waltham Forest to see for himself the impact that a lack of police numbers is having on our residents' lives and to discuss a review of our police resources. Sadly the Mayor declined.

I asked the Mayor to meet briefly with me to accept a personal invitation to visit the borough before his Mayor's Question Time on the 13th October. Sadly the Mayor declined.

I strongly support the special constables scheme and I was delighted when it was advertised on the front page of Waltham Forest News on 24th May. It is a brilliant way to for people to do their bit for their community and a great support for our fully trained police force. But they are no replacement for permanent police officers.

In his response to a question at Mayor's Question time, the Mayor acknowledged that there is an issue around gang crime and knife crime in Waltham Forest. Specials aren't the answer to this.

The simple fact of the matter is that if we want to drive down crime then we need more permanent police officers who know their local community - not
volunteers and not officers drafted in to temporarily deal with entrenched problems.

We raise our part of the Council Tax to provide Council services and stand up for our community. The Mayor raises his part to pay for our police and our residents deserve a fairer allocation.

This campaign has always been cross party, and I was delighted to have been joined by the Leader of the Opposition at its original launch. This isn’t a party political matter. The reason we launched our campaign last year was because an internal police report showed that the borough was being short changed by 120 permanent police officers.

It is now five years since the police resource allocation formula has been reviewed and Waltham Forest has changed dramatically since then. We will be hosting the Olympics in just two years time, our population has grown by 20,000 and our police resource no longer matches our needs. It wouldn’t matter who was Mayor, we’d still be campaigning on behalf of our residents, 7300 of whom cared enough about this issue to sign a petition.

Steve Wisbey, our borough commander, and I are forging an excellent relationship and I know that our borough police are dedicated and working hard to deal with the crime problems we have here. I know that he is doing everything he can to improve the safety of our borough and drive down crime, but he simply does not have enough officers.

But the facts speak for themselves. Home Office figures released earlier in the summer show that the clear up rate for crime in Waltham Forest is one of the lowest in the UK, and the borough’s crime rate continues to rise. Apart from sexual offences, all other types of crime in Waltham Forest fall into the top 10% of crime rates in England and Wales.

 Whilst 663 new permanent police officers were deployed across London since January 2009, Waltham Forest has actually lost two and the other Olympic boroughs have significantly more police than us:

- Waltham Forest: 560
- Hackney: 771
- Greenwich: 693
- Newham: 822
- Tower Hamlets: 809

Simply put, Waltham Forest has the highest rate of serious crime in London with fewer resources than other boroughs to deal with it.

It is our privilege and responsibility to speak on behalf of our community. I hope Cllr Northover will join me in calling for more police.
QUESTION 11

FROM: COUNCILLOR W. SMITH

TO: COUNCILLOR S. MAHMUD (PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE)

SCHOOL ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS

Why were the brochures explaining admission arrangements for children entering primary and secondary schools in September 2011 published without information about the number of preferences expressed for individual schools in the previous year as required by the Admissions Code?

Why, for a number of schools listed in the primary schools brochure, has the council omitted to indicate whether those schools have a uniform policy, operate a breakfast club or provide a teatime club? Does she agree that for many parents this information would be of significance when deciding on their preferences?

REPLY:

1. The failure to include the total number of preferences expressed for each school was an oversight and a column should have been shown on page 30 of the Reception brochure and page 54 of the Secondary brochure. The missing information for Secondary and Primary schools is displayed in the relevant documents folder on the Babcock website

   http://www.babcockwf.co.uk/waltham-forest/secondary-school-admissions

   Or

   http://www.babcockwf.co.uk/waltham-forest/primary-school-admissions

2. All primary schools were contacted on a number of occasions for this information to enable us to include it in the brochure. Unfortunately, a number did not respond in time to include it by the print deadline. There is now a liaison person appointed by the Primary heads group in place, who will work with the team on next year’s publication. This is an independent person appointed and paid for by schools, who acts for head teachers in a number of areas. We have worked closely with a similar appointee for the secondary heads group.

3. I would agree that for some parents information on tea time clubs, breakfast clubs and uniform policy could have some significance when deciding on their preferences.
QUESTION 12
FROM: COUNCILLOR N. RUSSELL
TO: COUNCILLOR C. LOAKES (PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ENVIRONMENT)

DIRTY FRONT GARDENS CAMPAIGN

Can the Environment Portfolio Holder give some feedback on actions and statistics taken in relation to the new Dirty Front Gardens Campaign?

REPLY:

The front garden enforcement team consists of 2 enforcement officers who pro-actively patrol ward by ward identifying waste in front gardens that need to be cleared. They also receive requests from WfD and ward Councillors.

Where consent is not received for clearance or a bulky waste collection booked the officers serve a notice under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949.

Once the notice expires a further visit is carried out and where clearance has not taken place the waste is then cleared by a crew of 2 operatives with a truck.

A recharge is then made to the occupier/owner of the property. These costs include the cost of the officers’ time, the operatives’ time and disposal of the waste and the rate works out to £45 per half hour with a minimum charge rate of £45.

In the 3 weeks up to 15th October a total of 237 gardens have been cleared with 57 PDPA notices having been served. None of those 57 notices were complied with and all will be invoiced for the cost of removing their waste and this means that 4 of those properties will be recharged £180 each and the remaining 53 will all be recharged £45.

In total we have removed 21.8 tonnes of waste from those 237 gardens in this 3 week period.

Where the waste falls outside of the bulky waste removal service e.g. builders’ rubble, a notice is served under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and these are followed up upon their expiry. So far 69 such notices have been served since the start of this project.

A breakdown is detailed below of the wards and notices served to date along with the weekly tonnage of waste removed. It should be noted that the wards that have so far received pro-active enforcement patrols are Forest, Leytonstone, Cathall, Endlebury and Lea Bridge. All other activity shown in
the table is as a result of reactive visits due to reports from Councillors and members of the public through WFD or through pro-active visits by the area envirocrime enforcement officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Gardens Cleared</th>
<th>Gardens Cleared with consent</th>
<th>3 day Notices Served*</th>
<th>28 day notices Served**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cann Hall</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathall</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel End</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endlebury</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoe St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Bridge</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leytonstone</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markhouse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Morris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A recharge will be sent for the cost of clearance
** Failure to comply will result in fixed penalty notice or prosecution

** TONNAGE CLEARED:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W/C</th>
<th>Tonnage Cleared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27th September</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th October</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th October</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION 13

FROM: COUNCILLOR G. WALKER

TO: COUNCILLOR C. LOAKES (PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR ENVIRONMENT)

COMMUNITY TOILET SCHEME – WALTHAM FOREST DIRECT AT CHINGFORD MOUNT

It is of some concern that I have recently received several reports from members of the public, that on trying to use the "Waltham Forest Direct" Toilet at Chingford Mount they are being requested to give their names.

Is this a Council designated procedure and if so will it be stopped immediately?

I have also personally experienced having a member of staff come running down the length of the office behind me to challenge where I was going and on advising that I was about to use the toilet facility, made the excuse that they were just checking that the door was not locked. Again, this is not acceptable. It is either a private facility or a public community facility; it cannot be both at the same time. Use of a public toilet facility should not need authorisation and the door should not be locked.

Please advise what actions are being taken to eliminate these disturbing hindrances to what used to be a simple and straightforward procedure when answering a call of nature.

REPLY:

I understand it, there was free access to this toilet facility. However, Gareth and I have recently been advised by colleagues at WFD that following the closure of the Albert Crescent toilet facility the facility at WFD has been the subject of widespread and systematic misuse by the public along with abusive behaviour towards staff. It is for this reason they introduced the locking of the toilet in between use and keeping the key at their reception area. As far as we are both aware the public are not asked to give their names but are being greeted on their arrival and when indicating that they wish to use the toilets facility are allowed to do so. This has been confirmed with Kathy Hall, WFD E4 Manager.
QUESTION 14

FROM: COUNCILLOR N. QURESHI

TO: COUNCILLOR A. AKRAM (PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR CORPORATE RESOURCES, BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT)

CONSTRUCTION SKILLS CENTRE

With regard to the Construction Skills Centre in Leyton:

a) How many people have successfully enrolled on courses at the Construction Skills Centre?
b) How many courses have run successfully?
c) Please give details of how many trainees have completed their courses and qualifications achieved.

REPLY:

The Construction Skills Centre will begin taking students from the end of November, with the official opening expected January 2011.
QUESTION 15

FROM: COUNCILLOR BOB. SULLIVAN

TO: COUNCILLOR G. REARDON (PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR LEISURE, ARTS AND CULTURE)

LEYTON FESTIVAL

What was the cost of the Leyton Festival?
When was the format and budget of the event decided and by whom?
Who was responsible for the event?
Why were local organisations and charities not invited by the council’s event management contractors to participate?
How the event publicised and what was the cost of this publicity?

REPLY:

What was the cost of the Leyton Festival?

The cost of the contract to deliver the two-day Leyton Festival was £75,000. Other costs to the council amounted to a further £25,000. The spend included approximately £33,000 for performers, activities and entertainment; £19,000 for site infrastructure (stages, fencing, furniture etc.); £18,000 for staffing and security and £8,000 for first aid, safety measures, toilets and the clearing of litter. The balance was largely spent on advertising, site décor, production and pre-production costs.

When was the format and budget of the event decided and by whom?

The format and budget for the event was agreed by officers within Culture and Leisure Services in the spring of 2010.

Who was responsible for the event?

The event was delivered by Continental Drifts Limited following a procurement exercise conducted by officers within Culture and Leisure Services.

Why were local organisations and charities not invited by the council’s event management contractors to participate?

As with most council-sponsored public events, the stalls and entertainment represented a mix of local talent (e.g. local band The Stow, a display of work compiled by local artists Inky Cuttlefish and Waltham Forest Mencap) and those from further afield. Performances by six groups of pupils from three Leyton Schools were also included.

At all Council events local groups wishing to have a stall at the event can request a stall via the Arts and Events Service or the organisation contracted
to deliver an event. The Arts and Events Service send out a notice to all organisations and individuals on our stallholder listing at the beginning of the year outlining all planned events for the summer up to and including Fireworks night. This listing is updated as and when a new group approaches the council requesting information on hire space at an event or events.

**How was the event publicised and what was the cost of this publicity**

The total cost of publicity campaign was approximately £5000. Promotional activities included as follows:

10 (3m x 1m) Banners were positioned at key points across the borough.

300 houses surrounding Leyton Cricket Ground received Residents Letters and Flyers dropped through their letter boxes by hand.

50 A3 Posters and 2500 A5 flyers were distributed to businesses (pubs, shops, surgeries etc.) on Leyton High Road, Walthamstow Market and around transport hubs at Leytonstone, Leytonstone High Road, Walthamstow Central and Walthamstow Queens Road.

20,000 flyers were distributed at Leyton, Leytonstone and Walthamstow Stations, Leyton Mills and Walthamstow Market and in and around the surrounding areas.

45 x Marketing Packs with 50 flyers, 1 A3 banner and a cover letter were prepared and sent to local schools. 2000 flyers were distributed after school and handed directly to parents and children as they left school.

Publicity also included advertisements in WFN, Waltham Forest Guardian and Time Out magazine. The event was included in Internet events listings and social networking sites.
QUESTION 16

FROM: COUNCILLOR BOB. SULLIVAN

TO: COUNCILLOR C. ROBBINS (LEADER OF THE COUNCIL)

RECRUITMENT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

How many applicants applied for the post of Chief Executive?
How many applicants were (a) longlisted, (b) shortlisted, (c) interviewed?

REPLY:

We were pleased that having administered the recruitment process in-house we received 15 applications. The Member appointment panel shortlisted these to 3. These candidates undertook a range of assessments to inform the final selection panel. Unfortunately 2 candidates chose to withdraw from the process.

As is on the agenda tonight the panel unanimously recommend to Council the appointment of Martin Esom to the post of Chief Executive.