

Information Governance Report

Responses to Requests

Period: 01/11/2013 to 30/11/2013

Type	Sub Enquiry ID	Date Received	Date Responded	Service	Enquiry Details	Response Details
	17405	01/10/2013	04/11/2013	Adult Services (FOI)	<p>Subject: Home Care Services</p> <p>Please answer all the questions you are able to, prioritising questions from the top down (with 1. being the highest priority). For the purposes of this request, (home care services) refers to services whereby a carer visits somebody in their own home to provide medical or other necessary care.</p> <p>1. How much</p>	<p>Summary:</p> <p>How much have you spent on home care services for each of the last ten financial years (2003/04, 2004/05, 2005/06, 2006/07, 2007/08, 2008/09, 2009/10, 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13)? If any of this data is missing, please explain this.</p> <p>2013/14 = £9,300k (forecast) 2012/13 = £10,118k 2011/12 = £10,487k 2010/11 = £10,283k 2009/10 = £12,624k 2008/09 = £12,515k</p> <p>Gathering the information in the specified format for the years 2003 to 2008 would be resource intensive, as the data will have to be extracted from archive. To recreate them would be resource intensive and take longer than the permitted 2.5 days permitted for an FOI request.</p> <p>Under the Freedom of Information Act the Council has a right to refuse a request for information held if the cost of complying with a request exceeds the appropriate limit. The appropriate limit for local authorities is £450 or 2.5 days or 18 hours. We believe in this case such an exemption applies for the requested years 2003 to 2008 and have decided to refuse your request for information under section 12(1) of the Act.</p> <p>12 Exemption where cost of compliance exceeds appropriate limit</p>

				<p>have you spent on home care services for each of the last ten financial years (2003/04 2004/05 2005/06 2006/07, 2007/08 2008/09, 2009/10 2010/11, 2011/12 2012/13)? If any of this data is missing, please explain this.</p> <p>2. Are these services run directly by the council, or are they subcontracted to a third-party provider? If the latter, please name the provider. Where there are several providers in any given financial year, please stipulate the value of each individual contract.</p> <p>3. Do care workers who visit people in their homes get paid</p>	<p>(1) Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the authority estimates that the cost of complying with the request would exceed the appropriate limit.</p> <p>2) Are these services run directly by the council, or are they subcontracted to a third-party provider? If the latter, please name the provider. Where there are several providers in any given financial year, please stipulate the value of each individual contract.</p> <p>Providers 2012/13 2011/12 2010/11 Unique personnel £2,247k £1,287k £1,130k Randstad Care 0 £1,220k £1,432k Redspot £966k £570k £542k Oasis Care £150k £163k £225k Genesis Care £679k £838k £743k London Care £465k £573k £676k First Choice Homecare £1,570k £1,730k £1,729k Eastwards Trust £775k £919k £1,309k Crossroads Care 0 £343k £379k Carewatch (Newham) £558k £708k £674k Carewatch (East London) £778k £761k £399k Bluebird Care (Newham) £254k 0 Alters Recruitment £535k £454k £623k Other suppliers £1,141k £921k £422k</p> <p>Gathering the information in the specified format for the years 2003 to 2010 would be resource intensive, as the data will have to be extracted from archive. To recreate them would be resource intensive and take longer than the permitted 2.5 days permitted for an FOI request. We believe in this case such an exemption applies for the requested years 2003 to 2008 and have decided to refuse your request for information under section 12(1) of the Act. Please see exemption 12 in answer to question 1 above.</p> <p>3) Do care workers who visit people in their homes get paid for "contact time" (the time spent in somebody's house) and "travel time" between jobs, or merely the former? Each provider on our framework contract varies its approach to paying staff in terms of travel time, Some pay an hourly rate to include travel costs and other</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---

					<p>for “contact time” (the time spent in somebody’s house) and “travel time” between jobs, or merely the former?</p> <p>4. How many people within your local authority area require and receive home care services?</p> <p>5. What proportion of your overall council spending is directly accounted for by providing home care services?</p> <p>6. What proportion of your overall council spending on health services is directly accounted for by providing home care services?</p>	<p>do not.</p> <p>4) How many people within your local authority area require and receive home care services? As at 17th October 2013 - 3,902 service users are receiving home care services.</p> <p>5) What proportion of your overall council spending is directly accounted for by providing home care services? As at 17th October 2013 - Home care accounted for 0.78% of the total expenditure by the council.</p> <p>6) What proportion of your overall council spending on health services is directly accounted for by providing home care services? N/A. Please direct your enquiry to Newham’s Clinical Commissioning Group. enquiries@newhamccg.nhs.uk or call: 0203-688 2300</p>				
	17408	01/10/2013	08/11/2013	Finance	Subject: Investments	Summary:				
					1. Which private equity funds do	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>HIPEP V-Cayman Partnership</td> <td>£15,649,010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HIPEP V-Cayman Direct</td> <td>£3,088,102</td> </tr> </table>	HIPEP V-Cayman Partnership	£15,649,010	HIPEP V-Cayman Direct	£3,088,102
HIPEP V-Cayman Partnership	£15,649,010									
HIPEP V-Cayman Direct	£3,088,102									

					<p>you invest in? Are any of these private equity investments in a. land b. agriculture c. companies that have their primary business as plantations or agriculture d. food or agribusiness company's e. bio fuel companies? What are the names of these companies?</p> <p>2. Do you have any direct investments in land or agriculture in a. Africa, Asia, Latin America b. Europe c. United states of America via investments in properties, agriculture, private equity, real estate, alternatives, UK equities or Overseas equities?</p> <p>3. In which countries are your investments in a.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>HIPEP VI-Cayman Partnership</td> <td>£5,407,468</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Harbourvest funds have minimal exposure (less than 1% of overall current value). Some of the companies may include those that provide services/products to these sectors as it is difficult to distinguish them clearly. The names of these companies are:</p> <p>Land Cetellus Development Corp Agriculture Agria Agrivida Alliance tire Arcadia Bioscience BC foods Clondalkin Netafirm Penguen Gida Sanayl Pla group Roka Bioscience Sohan lal Commodity management Zuari Industries Ltd Sursem Group Companies that have their primary business as Plantations Santanol Pty food or agribusiness companies N/A Biofuel Companies Amyris Ceres Codexis EdenIQ L59</p> <p>There is also exposure through our Morgan Stanley Diversified fund (£73.9m) and this portfolio has two allocations to two private equity fund of funds: Morgan Stanley Global Secondary Opportunities I LP (2.93% of the portfolio at 30/9/13) and Morgan Stanley Global Secondary Opportunities II LP (0.58% of</p>	HIPEP VI-Cayman Partnership	£5,407,468
HIPEP VI-Cayman Partnership	£5,407,468							

				<p>property b. real estate located? What are the amounts of these investments and what are the names of companies through which these investments are made?</p> <p>4. In which countries is any developing country equities located and in which companies? What are the amounts invested in these?</p> <p>5. Do you invest directly in companies which have a. agricultural plantations b. bio fuels plantations c. extractives operations? Please list names of companies and size of investments.</p> <p>6. Do you screen pension fund investments</p>	<p>the portfolio at 30/9/13). These funds allocate to venture, growth, buyout and special situations private equity strategies through primary LP investments, secondary market purchases and co-investments alongside private equity general partners. Allocations to the sectors listed above are not a core component of the investment strategy and it is estimated that they represent less than 0.04% of the overall diversified alternatives portfolio.</p> <p>2. Overseas. We invest in a Japanese Industrials company called Taisei (value at 30/9/13 in portfolio - £1,651,310.54) that has real estate development in Japan.</p> <p>3. The Newham overseas property investments managed by CBRE Global Investors' Global Multi Manager team ('GMM') are in Global Alpha. (Newham holds £4.485m (1.7%) of the fund - as at 30th September 2013). Please see the table below showing the countries where Global Alpha is invested (and the \$m USD amount).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1317 703 2237 1050"> <tr> <td>Sweden</td> <td>17.4</td> <td>Norway</td> <td>10.9</td> <td>Denmark</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Finland</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>Germany</td> <td>9.3</td> <td>Belgium</td> </tr> <tr> <td>France</td> <td>5.2</td> <td>Japan</td> <td>22.5</td> <td>Australia</td> </tr> <tr> <td>US</td> <td>118.4</td> <td>Lithuania</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>Hong Kong</td> </tr> <tr> <td>New Zealand</td> <td>16.2</td> <td>Singapore</td> <td>15.4</td> <td>Italy</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spain</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>Netherlands</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>Czech Republic</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hungary</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Poland</td> <td>15.1</td> <td>Slovakia</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UK</td> <td>4.2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>The Morgan Stanley Diversified fund portfolio has exposure to private real estate through a fund investment in Morgan Stanley AIP Phoenix Global Real Estate Secondaries 2009 LP, which represents 3.55% of the total portfolio. The allocation has the following geographic exposure:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1375 1238 1850 1337"> <tr> <td>US</td> <td>47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UK</td> <td>16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>France</td> <td>3%</td> </tr> </table>	Sweden	17.4	Norway	10.9	Denmark	Finland	9.0	Germany	9.3	Belgium	France	5.2	Japan	22.5	Australia	US	118.4	Lithuania	1.0	Hong Kong	New Zealand	16.2	Singapore	15.4	Italy	Spain	0.3	Netherlands	0.9	Czech Republic	Hungary	0.5	Poland	15.1	Slovakia	UK	4.2				US	47%	UK	16%	France	3%
Sweden	17.4	Norway	10.9	Denmark																																															
Finland	9.0	Germany	9.3	Belgium																																															
France	5.2	Japan	22.5	Australia																																															
US	118.4	Lithuania	1.0	Hong Kong																																															
New Zealand	16.2	Singapore	15.4	Italy																																															
Spain	0.3	Netherlands	0.9	Czech Republic																																															
Hungary	0.5	Poland	15.1	Slovakia																																															
UK	4.2																																																		
US	47%																																																		
UK	16%																																																		
France	3%																																																		

					<p>based on social, environmental or ethical considerations? If not, do you have any intention to do so in the future?</p> <p>7. Please provide information on who advises you on where and how to invest (both internally and externally). What are the investment advisors' criteria for their decisions regarding where to invest? Please include the terms of agreement between the council and investment advisors in your response.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Hong Kong	4%
Brazil	22%
China	7%
Macau	1%
Philippines	1%

The portfolio also has a 5.56% allocation to liquid real estate securities, through fund investments managed by DWS and Morgan Stanley Investment Management. The allocation to real estate securities has the following geographic exposure:

Australia	8.67%
Belgium	0.04%
Brazil	0.10%
Canada	4.15%
China	0.23%
Finland	0.31%
France	6.00%
Germany	1.10%
Hong Kong	4.51%
Italy	0.11%
Japan	8.84%
Jersey	0.52%
Netherlands	0.86%
Norway	0.19%
Singapore	2.67%
Sweden	0.68%
Switzerland	0.58%
United Kingdom	8.50%
United States	51.89%
Ireland	0.03%

4. We invest in Russia and China in this fund. At the end of September 2013, the holdings were as follows:

						<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Company</th> <th>Country</th> <th>Value (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Baidu.Com Spon Adr</td> <td>China</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>China Resources Enterprise</td> <td>China</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tencent Holdings Ltd</td> <td>China</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lukoil-Spom Adr Ln</td> <td>Russia</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Magnit Ojsc Spon Gdr Regs</td> <td>Russia</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sberbank- Sponsored Adr</td> <td>Russia</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bangkok Bank</td> <td>Thailand</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Energy Dev't Corp</td> <td>Phillipines</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>APOLLO HOSPITALS</td> <td>India</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NASPERS</td> <td>S.Africa</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCR</td> <td>Brazil</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CHINA MOBILE</td> <td>China</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>5. Agricultural plantations We invest in three materials companies which have businesses in the fertiliser/seed sector and they have various small subsidiaries that would include agricultural plantations. They are Du Pont (value at 30/09/13 in portfolio - £2,264,856.06), Monsanto (value at 30/09/13 in portfolio – £2,157,334.04) and Syngenta (value at 30/09/13 in portfolio – £1,500,820.79). Bio fuel Plantations - Royal Dutch Shell (see below) Extractives operations:</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>MOSAIC</td> <td>£1m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>YAMANA GOLD</td> <td>£600k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WORLEYPARSONS</td> <td>£511k</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BAKER HUGHES</td> <td>£1.6m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SANTOS</td> <td>£870k</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Company	Country	Value (£)	Baidu.Com Spon Adr	China		China Resources Enterprise	China		Tencent Holdings Ltd	China		Lukoil-Spom Adr Ln	Russia		Magnit Ojsc Spon Gdr Regs	Russia		Sberbank- Sponsored Adr	Russia		Bangkok Bank	Thailand		Energy Dev't Corp	Phillipines		APOLLO HOSPITALS	India		NASPERS	S.Africa		CCR	Brazil		CHINA MOBILE	China		MOSAIC	£1m	YAMANA GOLD	£600k	WORLEYPARSONS	£511k	BAKER HUGHES	£1.6m	SANTOS	£870k
Company	Country	Value (£)																																																					
Baidu.Com Spon Adr	China																																																						
China Resources Enterprise	China																																																						
Tencent Holdings Ltd	China																																																						
Lukoil-Spom Adr Ln	Russia																																																						
Magnit Ojsc Spon Gdr Regs	Russia																																																						
Sberbank- Sponsored Adr	Russia																																																						
Bangkok Bank	Thailand																																																						
Energy Dev't Corp	Phillipines																																																						
APOLLO HOSPITALS	India																																																						
NASPERS	S.Africa																																																						
CCR	Brazil																																																						
CHINA MOBILE	China																																																						
MOSAIC	£1m																																																						
YAMANA GOLD	£600k																																																						
WORLEYPARSONS	£511k																																																						
BAKER HUGHES	£1.6m																																																						
SANTOS	£870k																																																						

						<table border="1"> <tr> <td>SUNCOR ENERGY</td> <td>£1.8m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>£2m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ROYAL DUTCH SHELL</td> <td>£2.1m</td> </tr> </table> <p>6. The Fund has its own Socially responsible investment (SRI) policy and excludes direct investment in tobacco based companies as per its statement of investment principles - both documents are available on the council's website: SRI policy http://www.newham.gov.uk/Documents/Council%20and%20Democracy/SociallyResponsibleInvestmentPolicy.pdf SIP http://www.newham.gov.uk/Documents/Council%20and%20Democracy/StatementOfInvestmentPrinciples2012-13.pdf</p> <p>7. Barnett Waddingham is the Newham Fund's main adviser and we have an independent investment adviser (Judy Saunders). We also use Bfinance to provide a portfolio risk model service and Fathom to provide macro-economic forecasting information. The Council's Investment and Accounts Committee sets its own criteria for investment and these are set out in its Statement of Investment Principle. The Committee obtains investment advice from a wide range of sources and is not reliant on any particular adviser on where to invest. The terms of agreement with our Investment advisers is commercially confidential.</p> <p>Under the Freedom of Information Act we have the right to refuse a request for information held if an exemption applies. We believe in this case such an exemption applies and has decided to refuse your request.</p> <p>Section 41 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 states:</p> <p><i>"41. (1) Information is exempt information if –</i></p> <p><i>(a) it was obtained by the public authority from any other person (including another public authority), and</i></p>	SUNCOR ENERGY	£1.8m	TOTAL	£2m	ROYAL DUTCH SHELL	£2.1m
SUNCOR ENERGY	£1.8m											
TOTAL	£2m											
ROYAL DUTCH SHELL	£2.1m											

						<p><i>(b) the disclosure of the information to the public (otherwise than under this Act) would constitute a breach of confidence actionable by that or any other person.</i></p> <p><i>(2) The duty to confirm or deny does not arise if, or to the extent that, the confirmation or denial that would have to be given to comply with section 1(1) (a) would (apart from this Act) constitute an actionable breach of confidence."</i></p> <p><u>Description of the exemption</u> In order for this exemption to apply, the information must have been obtained from another person or public authority and disclosure of it would mean that the London borough of Newham would be open to legal action for a breach of confidence.</p> <p>London borough of Newham is relieved of the duty to 'confirm or deny' whether the information is held if doing so would result in a breach of confidence outlined above.</p> <p>It is our view that the information requested is also exempt from disclosure under section 43(2) of the Act. The London Borough of Newham will not disclose information which would prejudice the commercial interests of the companies concerned. Section 43 is a qualified exemption therefore we have to consider the public interest in disclosure. We have decided that in this case the public interest lies in favour of not disclosing the requested information.</p>										
	17749	01/11/2013	26/11/2013	DP Requests	<p>Subject:</p> <p>1. How many street lights were in operation in your Local Authority in calendar year a) 2010 b) 2011 c) 2012 d) 2013 (so far)?</p>	<p>Summary:</p> <p>1. Our records are held by financial years, rather than calendar years. Please see below the total number of street lights in the borough for the requested financial years.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2009/10</td> <td>2010/11</td> <td>2011/12</td> <td>2012/13</td> <td>Currently</td> </tr> <tr> <td>18074</td> <td>17913</td> <td>17927</td> <td>18,000 (approx)</td> <td>18,000 (approx)</td> </tr> </table> <p>It may be useful to note the drop in numbers from 2010 was due to the closure of roads for the Olympic Park. Unfortunately we do not have an exact figure since that time but it is very near to the estimate of 18,000.</p> <p>2. No street lights have been deliberately turned off in the borough during the</p>	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Currently	18074	17913	17927	18,000 (approx)	18,000 (approx)
2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	Currently												
18074	17913	17927	18,000 (approx)	18,000 (approx)												

					<p>2. How many street lights in operation have been turned off in your Local Authority in calendar year in a) 2010 b) 2011 c) 2012 d) 2013 (so far)?</p> <p>3. How many street lights in operation have been dimmed in your Local Authority in calendar year in a) 2010 b) 2011 c) 2012 d) 2013 (so far)?</p> <p>4. What has been the total cost spent by your Local Authority on turning off or dimming street lights in calendar year a) 2010 b) 2011 c) 2012 d) 2013 (so far)?</p> <p>5. What has been the cost spent to a. turn off street lights completely b. dim street lights c. dimmed</p>	<p>requested years. There may have been instances where there may be faults pending repair or replacement or the area is subject to redevelopment but no street lights have intentionally been permanently switched off where they are in areas of normal operation.</p> <p>3. No street lights have been dimmed in the borough during the requested years.</p> <p>4-7. Not applicable. Please see our responses to Questions 2 and 3.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>between a certain set time at night d. turned off completely</p> <p>between a certain set time at night in calendar year a. 2010 b. 2011 c. 2012 d) 2013 (so far)?</p> <p>6. What has been the total savings made by your Local Authority on turning off or dimming street lights in calendar year a. 2010 b. 2011 c. 2012 c. 2013 (so far)?</p> <p>7. What has been the total saving to your Local Authority from a. turning off street lights completely b. dim street lights 3 dimmed between a certain set times at night d. turned off completely between a certain set times at night in calendar year a. 2010 b. 2011 c.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					2012 d. 2013 (so far)?	
	17752	01/11/2013	20/11/2013	Social Care	Subject: Access to British Sign Language for families of deaf children.	Summary:
					<p>This is part of a nationwide request, using a standardised format to ensure consistency. The information may be held by more than one team, including officers responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • education services for deaf/hearing impaired children and young people • speech and language therapy services for deaf/hearing impaired children and young people • social care services for deaf/hearing impaired children 	<p>1. Do you provide funding for parents of deaf/hearing impaired children to access sign language training? No a) If yes, up to what British Sign Language (BSL) Level you fund (i.e. Level 1, 2 or 3). b) Is there a charge to parents to access sign language training? If yes, please give details. c) What criteria must be met to obtain funding? d) Is childcare provided for parents learning BSL? e) Is funding available for both parents to learn BSL</p> <p>2. Have you developed any proposals to enable parents to use personal budgets to access BSL courses? No</p> <p>3. Do you have a named contact within your local authority for families of deaf/hearing impaired children who are interested in learning sign language? If yes, please give details. Yvonne Arnold the Local Teacher of the Deaf will direct families to organisations providing Sign Language Tuition when requested.</p> <p>4. Have you funded a sign language course specifically aimed at families (such as a Family Sign Language course) in the past three years? No, but we have hosted a Sign Language tuition for families, run by a volunteer at no cost.</p> <p>5. Do you currently have any proposals to fund a sign language course specifically aimed at families in the next 12 months? No</p> <p>6. Do you currently provide information to parents of deaf/hearing impaired</p>

					<p>and young people</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • finance <p>In some cases the information requested may relate to services which the authority commission from private companies or other providers. In such circumstances as the authority remains publicly accountable for the service, we would still expect it to accept responsibility for collating the information, rather than referring us on to separate bodies.</p>	<p>children where they can learn BSL within the local authority or nearby?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>7. If yes to question 6, in what form is this Information? Direct, face to face information through Yvonne Arnold the Teacher of Deaf or Family Officer. The National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS) information is provided to all families.</p> <p>8. Do you have any other sources of support to provide families with access to opportunities to learn BSL? Local (East London) charitable and voluntary organisations provide courses where there is demand.</p> <p>9. Do you have a written policy around BSL learning for families? If yes, please attach to this response. No</p>
	17384	02/10/2013	07/11/2013	Housing Options Centre	<p>Subject: Housing Policy</p> <p>I have been informed that, following a change of policy last October, homeless families originally housed</p>	<p>Summary</p> <p>1. The Council's Bond Scheme (the Scheme) was used to incentivise private landlords to offer tenancies to those who had presented to the Council as homeless or those who were threatened with homelessness (i.e. to prevent them becoming homeless). The Scheme related to the Council's duties under Part VII of the Housing Act 1996. The Council's Allocations Policy is concerned with the allocation of Council accommodation to those on the Council's Housing Register in accordance with Part VI of the Act. The Scheme was never therefore included in the Allocations Policy.</p>

				<p>in temporary private accommodation are no longer able to bid for housing, as they are deemed to be 'adequately housed'.</p> <p>I have looked at the council's housing allocation policy - which is undated - and I can see no mention of this change of policy. Indeed there is almost no reference at all to homeless families and it seems as if, for Newham Council, they have ceased to exist.</p> <p>1. With this in mind, can I please ask you to send me a copy of the council's Housing Bond Scheme, which will presumably state that the council is discharging its'</p>	<p>As we say, the Scheme was an incentive to Landlords to enter agreements with homeless households. The benefits of matching applicant families with private landlords was to open up a greater range of choice to people about where they might live and the type of property which might be available. The Scheme was popular both with landlords and with housing applicants. It is the Council's position that those who accepted property through the Scheme did so as a matter of choice and is (save where subsequent changes have occurred) "adequately housed".</p> <p>The Scheme was ended on 09 November 2012 when the Localism Act introduced changes to section 193 of the Housing Act 1996. The Council now has greater freedom to discharge its housing duty towards homeless families by making offers of accommodation. Where a private rented sector offer is accepted, the Council's duty towards the family comes to an end. The Council can still sometimes offer a bond (a deposit against non-compliance with tenancy terms and conditions) to landlords but that is now part of a wider range of options which are considered on a case by case basis.</p> <p>It is the Council's policy to use the full range of legislative powers given to it by government to address the needs of those who present to it as homeless.</p> <p>2. The Council has made changes to its Allocations Policy which takes advantage of new powers given it through the Localism Act 2011. The web link below contains the minutes of the meeting of Cabinet which considered the review of the revised Housing Allocations policy.</p> <p>https://mgov.newham.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=294&MID=8157#AI39844</p> <p>3. The link above provides access to the minutes of the decision as well as the background documents considered by the members of the authority when making the decision.</p> <p>4. The Council's main housing duties are set out in Part VI and Part VII of the Housing Act 1996 and these were recently amended by the provisions of the Localism Act 2011 in relation to the discharge of housing duty. For your reference, further information on this Act can be sourced from the link below:</p> <p>http://www.legislation.gov.uk/</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>duty to homeless families in this way.</p> <p>2. Secondly, can I please ask for date when this policy change was made and by whom: was it by the Mayor, or the Cabinet, or whom?</p> <p>3. Can I please also ask you to send me the council report upon which this change of policy is based?</p> <p>4. And lastly, can I please ask you to send me details of the legislation which enables the council to discharge its' duty to homeless families in this manner?</p>	
	17474	03/10/2013	08/11/2013	Complaints and Member Enquiries	<p>Subject: Parking Enforcement</p> <p>I should be most grateful if you would provide (in electronic format</p>	<p>Summary:</p> <p>A. Your parking enforcement contract signed and dated together with all appendices and schedules. Please see attached documents.</p> <p>B. All invoices submitted by your enforcement contractor for the Financial Years 2011/12 and 2012/13</p>

					if possible) copies of the following: a. Your parking enforcement contract signed and dated together with all appendices and schedules, b. All invoices submitted by your enforcement contractor for the Financial Years 2011/12 and 2012/13	The information requested is exempt from disclosure under section 43(2) of the Act. The London Borough of Newham will not disclose information which would prejudice the commercial interests of the company concerned. Section 43 is a qualified exemption therefore we have to consider the public interest in disclosure. We have decided that in this case the public interest lies in favour of not disclosing the requested information.
	17423	04/10/2013	01/11/2013	DP-Council Tax Benefit	<p>Subject: DHP</p> <p>We are running a series of freedom of information requests to gain better understanding of Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP). Our first Freedom of Information request was sent last August. This is our second request and refers to DHP cases and payments between April 1st</p>	<p>Summary:</p> <p>1. How many applications for DHP have you received/approved/declined from April 1st 2012 to Sept 30th 2012 and from April 1st 2013 to September 30th 2013? Applications received Applications approved Applications declined Applications awaiting approval April 1st to Sept 30th 2012 344 199 145 April 1st to Sept 30th 2013 903 373 429 101</p> <p>2. Of the applications you received from April 1st 2013 to September 30th 2013 how many came from... Applications received Applications approved Applications declined Applications awaiting approval Households containing someone with a disability? 200 83 106 11 Households affected by the size criteria? 284 117 149 18 Households affected by the size criteria AND containing someone with a disability? 127 49 76 2 Households affected by the benefit cap? 145 115 10 20</p> <p>3. What is the most common reason for declining an application for DHP? (please pick 1)</p>

					and September 30th 2013. Please find our questions attached.	<p>0 Households judged to have enough income to cover their rent if they cut back on other expenditure</p> <p>0 Households judged to be able to meet rent without cutting back on other expenditure</p> <p>0 DHP pot needs to be rationed and other households were judged more of a priority</p> <p>1 other: rent judged too high to support through DHP.</p> <p>4. How much of the DHP government allocation have you distributed from April 1st 2013 to September 30th 2013?</p> <p>Total amount spent on Sept. 30th 2013 £173,111.19</p> <p>Total amount allocated for current financial year £270,786.17</p> <p>Total amount remaining for current financial year £2,202,109.83</p> <p>Total amount DHP government allocation for the current financial year £2,472,896.00</p> <p>Amount already promised/ set aside but not spent to date</p> <p>5. Of your DHP allocation disbursed between April 1st 2013 and September 30th 2013, how much did you spend on</p> <p>People housed by a housing association £27,884.72</p> <p>People housed by a local authority £210,318.48</p> <p>People housed within the private rented sector £32,582.97</p> <p>Other 0.00</p> <p>6. Of your DHP allocation distributed between April 1st 2013 and September 30th 2013, how much did you spend on people affected by the size criteria?</p> <p>People affected by the size criteria £31,608.73</p>
	17756	04/11/2013	19/11/2013	Housing	Subject: Rent Arrears	Summary:
					Please note: all these questions refer to eviction proceedings on the ground of rent arrears only. How many notices seeking	<p>My enquiry refers to eviction proceedings on the ground of rent arrears only.</p> <p>1. How many notices seeking possession for rent arrears did the council issue?</p> <p>a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013 = 710</p> <p>b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012 = 638</p> <p>2. Of these, how many applications were made to a court for a possession order?</p> <p>a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013 = 336</p> <p>b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012 = 296</p>

					<p>possession for rent arrears did the council issue? a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013 b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012 Of these, how many applications were made to a court for a possession order? a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013 b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012 Of these, how many postponed orders for possessions were made? a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013 b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012 How many outright orders for possession were made?</p>	<p>3. Of these, how many postponed orders for possessions were made? a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013 = 1 b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012 = 4 4. How many outright orders for possession were made? a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013 = 35 b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012 = 40 5. How many tenants were ultimately evicted for rent arrears? a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013 = 35 b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012 = 32</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013</p> <p>b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012</p> <p>How many tenants were ultimately evicted for rent arrears?</p> <p>a) Between April 1 2013 and November 1 2013</p> <p>b) Between April 1 2012 and November 1 2012</p>	
	17757	04/11/2013	13/11/2013	Schools	Subject: Schools Traded Services	Summary:
					<p>I would like to request information about which schools in your area have acquired one or more Apple iPads?</p> <p>I would also like to know if your local authority is offering training on the devices, and if so, the cost to the school?</p>	<p>1. Which schools in your area have acquired one or more Apple iPads?</p> <p>School Name:-</p> <p>Sandringham Primary School</p> <p>Altmere Infants School</p> <p>Avenue Primary School</p> <p>Britannia Village School</p> <p>Cleves Primary School</p> <p>Colegrave Primary School</p> <p>Curwen Primary school</p> <p>Davies Lane Primary School</p> <p>Drew Primary School</p> <p>Earlham Primary School</p> <p>Edith Kerrison Nursery School</p> <p>Ellen Wilkinson Primary School</p> <p>Elmhurst Primary School</p> <p>Essex Primary School</p> <p>Grange Primary School</p>

						<p>Hartley Primary School Kaizen Primary School Keir Hardie Primary School Kensington Primary School Lathom Junior School Manor Primary School Newham Partnership Working Park Primary School Ranelagh Primary School Ravenscroft Primary School Rebecca Cheetham Nursery School Ronald Openshaw Nursery School Salisbury Primary School Sandringham Primary School Sheringham Junior School Southern Road Primary School St Luke's CE (VA) Primary School St Michael's RC Primary School St Stephen's Children's Centre St Winefride's RC Primary School Vicarage Primary School Winsor Primary School</p> <p>2. Does the local authority offers training on the devices, and if so, the cost to the school?</p> <p>For the above schools (primary), training is provided as part of a comprehensive Service Level Agreement. There is no separate charge. Secondary schools deal direct with RM (the approved ICT hardware provider) and we do not hold this information.</p>
	17759	04/11/2013	20/11/2013	Human Resources	Subject: Overpayments to staff	Summary:
					Please consider this email as a request under the	We are unable to extract the information requested from our data systems going back 3 years because it is too broad or general in nature. Over payments can occur for a many number of reasons, including delays in

				<p>Freedom of Information Act.</p> <p>1) How many staff employed by the Council was overpaid in each of the financial years? 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13</p> <p>2) In total, by how much were staff employed by the Council was overpaid in each of the financial years? 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13</p> <p>3) For each year, how much of this money has been recouped by the Council?</p> <p>4) What was the largest overpayment that the Council can locate within the FOI Act time limit in each of the financial years? 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13</p> <p>5) Based on overpayments the</p>	<p>leaver notifications, errors in the alterations in working hours, sick pay entitlements, input of overtime or other pay enhancements.</p> <p>It would be an overwhelming manual task for an office to match every overpayment in payroll against debtors / finance records, to check how much was recovered.</p> <p>Under the Freedom of Information Act the Council has a right to refuse a request for information held if the cost of complying with a request exceeds the appropriate limit. The appropriate limit for local authorities is £450 or 2.5 days or 18 hours. We believe in this case such an exemption applies and has decided to refuse your request for information under section 12(1) of the Act. 12 Exemption where cost of compliance exceeds appropriate limit</p> <p>(1) Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the authority estimates that the cost of complying with the request would exceed the appropriate limit.</p> <p>You may wish to resubmit your request by being more specific about what information you particularly wish to obtain.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

					Council can locate within the FOI Act time limit, what was the average overpayment of staff employed by the Council who were overpaid in each of the financial years? 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13	
	17768	04/11/2013	19/11/2013	Property	Subject: BSF Programme	Summary:
					I am writing to make an information request under the Freedom of Information Act. Specifically, I wish to obtain a copy of the ICT Managed Services contract between the LA and the ICT Managed Services provider for the Building Schools for the Future (BSF)	<p>The ICT Services contract includes commercially sensitive information and cannot be provided, however the standard BSF documentation can be accessed at:- http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120202141958/http://www.partnershipsforschools.org.uk/library/BSF-archive/BSF-standard-documents.html#ICTDocuments</p> <p>The information requested is exempt from disclosure under section 43(2) of the Act. The London Borough of Newham will not disclose information which would prejudice the commercial interests of the companies concerned. Section 43 is a qualified exemption therefore we have to consider the public interest in disclosure. We have decided that in this case the public interest lies in favour of not disclosing the requested information.</p>

					programme.	
	17769	04/11/2013	26/11/2013	Housing & Public Protection	<p>Subject: Property Licensing Register</p> <p>Please provide a copy of your Private Rented Property Licensing Register for East Ham postal code area.</p>	<p>Summary:</p> <p>The information requested is already publically available and can be independently sourced from the Local Authority's electronic online Property Licensing Register. For your reference, please see the relevant web link below http://pa.newham.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=simple&searchType=LicencingApplication</p> <p>This register includes the addresses and postcodes for licensed properties in the borough.</p> <p>For ease of reference you should select the 'Advanced' search option for licences and select the type as 'Personal'. You will then have the option to select the East Ham wards on the next search box criteria.</p> <p>Should you require any further information please see the web link below. www.newham.gov.uk/propertylicensing</p>
	17770	04/11/2013	25/11/2013	Finance	<p>Subject: Business Rate A/c's</p> <p>I would like to know who was the business rate occupier at 131 GREEN STREET E7 8JF for the period Aug-Oct 2009. Please provide company name.</p>	<p>Summary:</p> <p>The company liable for business rates at the requested address during the requested timeframe was a sole trader.</p> <p>We believe that disclosing the name of a sole trader would potentially result in the identification of the individual at that address for the requested period. Whilst we would disclose the names of companies, as a sole trader the name of the individual would also be the personal name of the person liable. Third party personal data is exempt from disclosure under section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act. Disclosure would therefore contravene the first data protection principle, which requires that personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully by the London Borough of Newham.</p> <p>Section 40 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 provides an absolute exemption where disclosure of personal data about individuals would contravene any of the data protection principles set out in the Data Protection Act. Therefore there is no requirement to consider the public interest test in disclosure.</p>

	17776	04/11/2013	05/11/2013	Public Health, Safety & Licensing	<p>Subject: Terms of Late Night Licenses</p> <p>I would like to submit a freedom of Information Request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.</p> <p>I would like to know how many late venues in your borough are now required to use computerised ID / Age Verification systems under the terms of their late night licenses.</p> <p>I'd like to know:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of venues that currently use computerised ID verification systems in the borough. 2. How many venues operated the system in each of the 	<p>Summary:</p> <p>No venues in the borough are required to use computerised ID or Age Verification systems under the terms of their late night licenses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council is not aware of any venues which use this technology. 2. The Council does not record this information. 3. This is not applicable as we are not aware of any venues using this technology.
--	-------	------------	------------	-----------------------------------	---	---

					financial years between 2008 and 2013? 3. If the council has issued data protection guidelines to each of the venues who use computerised ID verification systems.	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--