



**A P P R O V E D  
M I N U T E S  
O F T H E C O U N C I L  
M E E T I N G H E L D O N  
W E D N E S D A Y ,  
2 M A R C H 2 0 2 2**

**15**    **Approved Minutes**            (Pages 3 - 42)

This page is intentionally left blank



---

## London Borough of Hackney Council

**Municipal Year: 2021/22**

**Meeting held at: Hackney Town Hall, Mare Street, London E8 1EA**

**Wednesday 2 March 2022 at 7pm**

---

### **Councillors in Attendance:**

Mayor Philip Glanville

Cllr Michael Desmond - Speaker

Cllr Brian Bell, Deputy Mayor  
Anntoinette Bramble, Cllr Sophie  
Cameron, Cllr Robert Chapman, Cllr  
Mete Coban, Cllr Kofo David, Cllr  
Sade Etti, Cllr Susan  
Fajana-Thomas, Cllr Margaret  
Gordon, Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr Ben  
Hayhurst, Cllr Christopher Kennedy,  
Cllr Hershy Lisser, Cllr Anna Lynch,  
Cllr Yvonne Maxwell, Cllr Clayeon  
McKenzie, Cllr Anthony McMahon,  
Cllr Sem Moema, Deputy Mayor  
Guy Nicholson, Cllr Harvey Odze,

Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli, Cllr M Can  
Ozsen, Cllr Sam Pallis, Cllr Benzion  
Papier, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr  
James Peters, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr  
Ian Rathbone, Cllr Anna Joy  
Rickard, Cllr Nick Sharman, Cllr  
Gilbert Smyth, Cllr Peter Snell, Cllr  
Simche Steinberger, Cllr Vincent  
Stops, Cllr Lynne Troughton, Cllr  
Jessica Webb, Cllr Carole Williams,  
Cllr Caroline Woodley and Cllr  
Sarah Young

**Officer Contact:** Andrew Spragg, Team Leader - Governance

---

This meeting was live streamed and can be viewed at:

<https://youtu.be/XbnMEf7qfGQ>

### **The Speaker, Cllr Michael Desmond, in the Chair**

The Speaker welcomed Council Members, officers and members of the public in attendance, and those watching the livestream.

The Speaker reminded Councillors who were accessing the meeting remotely that they would not be counted as being 'present' for the purposes of the Local Government Act

1972, and could not propose or second a motion or vote on any item under consideration. They would, however, be able to speak at his discretion.

Cllr Chapman proposed and Cllr Steinberger seconded that Rule 25.1 of the Council's Procedure Rules be suspended for the duration of the meeting. It was agreed unanimously by all present that Councillors would remain seated when addressing the Council through the Speaker.

## **1. Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chauhan, Conway, Garasia, Levy and Race.
- 1.2 Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Billington, Lisser, Moema, Pallis and Selman.
- 1.3 It was noted that the following Councillors had joined the meeting remotely: Councillors Adams, Adejare, Chauhan, Garasia, Gregory, Joseph, Lufkin, Plouviez, Race, Rennison, Sizer Spence and Wrout

## **2. Speaker's Announcements**

- 2.1 The Speaker acknowledged the war in Ukraine and those who were affected.
- 2.2 It was noted that this was the last meeting of the electoral term 2018-2022 and municipal year 2021-22. He thanked those Members who would not be seeking re-election for their dedication and commitment to public service.
- 2.3 The Speaker paid homage to former Speaker and Councillor of 16 years, Geoff Taylor, who passed away in 2020. It was announced that a special category in the Mayor's Music Awards had been named after him as had a block of flats on the Frampton Park Estate. Geoff Taylor was described as a talented musician and wise orator.
- 2.4 Council was informed of recent civic visits and initiatives undertaken by the Speaker which included working with Initiatives of Change and students from Brunel University on an intergenerational project, and a visit to the Tomlinson Centre where he had presented school crossing patrol awards. It was noted that Tomlinson Centre had prepared and served over 90,000 meals to homeless people during the pandemic. He had also made a recent visit to Kidzmania, a play centre in the borough.
- 2.5 The Speaker outlined plans for further civic visits to Hackney Archives, Dalston Curve, Our Lady's Catholic High School and Lubavitch Senior Girls' School. Upcoming civic events included a fundraising dinner at De Beauvoir Block on 31 March and the Annual Speaker's Quiz on 7 April.
- 2.6 The Speaker would be holding a reception in support of Ukraine on 15 March and was working with Urswick School on a paintings for peace project.
- 2.7 The Speaker invited all present in the Chamber to hold a minute's silence for the victims and all those affected by the situation in Ukraine.

- 2.8 Mayor Glanville addressed the Council condemning the calculated act of brutality on Ukraine and the impact on all those adversely affected. He highlighted the Council's solidarity with the people of Ukraine and those of Ukrainian and Russian descent in the borough. He pledged the Council's assistance in relief efforts. The Mayor spoke strongly against distressing reports of racism faced by black and ethnic minority communities in Ukraine who had struggled to cross EU borders into safety. He described such actions as unacceptable and inhumane. A commitment was made to work together with other London boroughs to implore Central Government to work with European countries to end racist border policies.
- 2.9 Tribute was paid to the Salvation Army in Clapton, Hackney Civic Society and the E5 Baby Bank for their relief efforts. Members and Council staff had raised over £1000 in donations for the Red Cross appeal in three days. Those who had not yet donated were encouraged to do so.
- 2.10 Cllr Steinberger echoed the Mayor's sentiments condemning the war on Ukraine and solicited the administration to adopt an innovative, creative, cross-party approach to the humanitarian crisis.
- 2.11 The Speaker announced that former Cllr Jeffrey Shenker had recently and unexpectedly passed away. The Speaker and Cllr Steinberger paid tribute to him.

### **3. Declarations of Interest**

- 3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

### **4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

- 4.1 Paragraph 7.8 - Correction to Cllr Steinberger's comments; *'the Council's response to the backlog in housing repairs'* to be amended to read *'the Council's response to the backlog in housing benefit payments'*.
- 4.2 Agenda item 20 - The motion to be recorded as having been 'unanimously' agreed.
- 4.3 **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 26 January 2022 be agreed as a true and correct record of proceedings subject to the aforementioned amendments at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2.

### **5. Questions from Members of the Public**

#### **5.1 From Grace Adebayo to the Mayor**

I have used Ridley Road for the last 40 years so I was proud to hear that it received the national award for the 'Best Large Outdoor Market 2022'. Can the Mayor tell me what he is doing so that it stays the best for the next 40 years?

Deputy Mayor Nicholson responded on behalf of Mayor Glanville.

## Response from Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Housing Supply, Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy

Deputy Mayor Nicholson highlighted that Ridley Road market had in excess of 100 traders and pre-pandemic, attracted a footfall of over 4 million people a year. He was pleased to report it was the only fruit and vegetable market in London that had remained in full operation 6 days a week throughout the pandemic. Deputy Mayor Nicholson spoke of some of the accolades of Ridley Road Market which included: £40,000 worth of fruit and vegetables traded to local residents as part of the Alexandra Rose Charity scheme and the commendable recycling rate which saw 87% of all waste produced within the market recycled.

In reference to the recent award, the Deputy Mayor paid tribute to Cllr Peter Snell, Dalston Ward Councillor, who had championed the traders, led on engagement and assisted in the well deserved recognition of the market.

### Supplementary Question and Response

Grace Adebayo asked a supplementary question. In response, the Deputy Mayor outlined the Council's plans to support the market. The Dalston Conversation, which launched in 2018, provided an opportunity for local people to take part in discussions about Dalston and the market. The importance of Ridley Road market to the Dalston community and the need to ensure it was protected for future generations was a recurring theme. The Council was delivering on a £1million investment to enhance Ridley Road, bringing forward new facilities for traders and free public access wifi for the market area. In addition, the Council had recently acquired the lease for the indoor market, to provide fit for purpose storage for market traders, alongside a new market office hub, new facilities for the traders and new trading spaces. Deputy Mayor Nicholson reiterated the administration's commitment to the market for the next electoral term and beyond.

### 5.2 From Temi Abiodun to the Mayoral Advisor for Homelessness, Housing Needs and Rough Sleeping

I would be grateful if the Mayoral Advisor could outline the plans to support young adults in Hackney with housing, especially people who fit in my category, who do not necessarily need emergency accommodation, but cannot afford to live in the borough regardless of having decent jobs?

Cllr Moema responded on behalf of Cllr Etti.

### Response from Mayoral Advisor for Private Renting and Housing Affordability

Cllr Moema explained that Hackney was in the midst of a housing crisis, which was having a profound impact on the borough and its residents. One of the main factors contributing to the crisis was inadequate grant funding from Central Government to support building affordable homes and also meeting priorities for new and existing homes such as fire safety and net zero. The ongoing impact of the right-to-buy scheme,

removing social homes from circulation and fewer households moving out of a social tenancy were also reported to be contributing factors

Cllr Moema stated that the Council had committed to doing everything in its power to provide effective and genuine housing guidance to residents with lower housing needs who did not qualify to join the Housing Register. Some of the initiatives undertaken by the Council included: lobbying for longer tenancies for people in the private sector through the Better Renting Campaign and building homes for private renting for those who did not qualify for social housing. The Council continued to push for rent controls and reforms in the private rented sector.

Cllr Moema confirmed that in spite of the lack of Government funding, the challenges caused by Brexit and the Coronavirus pandemic, the Council was set to start or complete more than 1,500 new homes between May 2018 and May 2022, and more than half the homes would be affordable to local people.

Cllr Moema outlined a number of schemes and incentives in place to assist young adults with housing, these included: Shared ownership, Hackney Living Rent Homes-which saw rents capped at one third of local incomes, developing modular forms of housing, tackling under occupancy and utilising empty properties in the private sector. In addition, the future role of Hackney Housing Company and how best it could contribute to housing supply would be reviewed.

Cllr Moema concluded by reiterating the administration's commitment to social housing for those most in need and to working with private landlords and housing associations during the next electoral term to achieve this.

There was no supplementary question.

### 5.3 From Clair Battaglino to the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and the Public Realm

Why has Richmond Road, a designated through route, been closed to through traffic displacing many thousands of vehicles each day onto more heavily residential roads like Dalston Lane which has a nursery, primary school, blocks for elderly, a library, two community gardens and is a pedestrian corridor between transport hubs?

#### Response from the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and the Public Realm

Cllr Coban explained that from 2020 the Council had introduced 19 Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) and 40 School Streets in the borough. As a centrally located borough, surrounded by the City, East London and North London, many people drove through Hackney to get to their destination. Approximately, only one third of households in the borough owned a car.

Cllr Coban stated that the purpose of the LTNs was to assist with the management and reduction of external traffic on residential roads, which started and ended outside of the borough, to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions in the borough. He outlined the positive impact the implementation of LTNs and School Streets had on local

residents. He also reported that the Council had recently published an air quality pollution map and was the first London borough to do so.

In specific reference to Richmond Road, Cllr Coban informed Council that residents had raised issues relating to the level of traffic on Richmond Road for some years and work had been undertaken to resolve these issues. The Council held two public meetings following which the favoured solution was to filter the street. Richmond Road was not considered to be a designated through road, or an A or B road and did not form part of the principal road network within the borough.

In conclusion, Cllr Coban highlighted the Council's commitment to listening to residents. This had already resulted in a number of changes made to existing LTN schemes. The Council's continued commitment to building a greener Hackney was also emphasised as was the borough's lead in the Healthy Streets Scorecard.

#### Supplementary Question and Response

Clair Battaglino asked a supplementary question relating to the adverse impact of road closures on residents who lived in social housing and were of a different socio-economic status to residents of Richmond Road. Cllr Coban informed Council that he had met with Clair Battaglino on a number of occasions, as had the Mayor and Deputy Mayor Nicholson, to discuss this and other issues. He explained that the closure of Richmond Road formed part of the London Fields LTN which was one of the trial schemes set up to tackle toxic air pollution and encourage active travel. This had mostly worked well for local residents. Cllr Coban stated that the Council would be looking at the decision making process for the London Fields LTN and all relevant information would be made publicly available.

#### 5.4 From Ruth Parkinson to the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and the Public Realm

Given only 30% of Hackney residents have cars and rely heavily on buses to move around the borough, what does the Cabinet Member think of the huge reduction in bus services and what will be the impact for thousands who use these essential services, especially women, BAME and the less well off?

#### Response from the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and the Public Realm

Cllr Coban agreed that buses were an essential service in Hackney, which had a high share of bus users. Hackney had benefited from a frequent network of daytime and Night Bus services. The Council recognised the importance of this mode of transport for minority and working-class communities who were less likely to be car owners. Ten of Hackney's bus routes were in the top 25 busiest bus routes of London. The Council had a long history of prioritising buses in the design of road schemes. The Council had recently consulted on extending bus lane hours on Mare Street to improve journey time reliability on 5 routes.

Cllr Coban explained that due to the Government's failure to provide long-term funding support for Transport for London (TfL), it was reliant on passenger fares to cover running costs. The pandemic had significantly reduced TfL's income with the passenger network



having seen up to a 95 percent drop in passengers during periods of the pandemic. TfL's financial position as a result of a large drop in fare income during the pandemic had meant that further reductions had been implemented on bus services.

Cllr Coban informed Council that concerns relating to bus frequency in the borough had been communicated to TfL in a meeting with the Commissioner last year, in addition, Mayor Glanville in his capacity as Chair of the Transport and Environment Committee for London Councils had lobbied the Government to seek support for TfL. Cllr Coban stated that although TfL had received a short term deal until June 2022, what was needed was a fair settlement from Central Government to ensure that bus services were maintained.

Cllr Coban shared concerns that a reduction in bus services would have a negative impact on many residents in the borough who were already disadvantaged and invited residents to join the Council's call to TfL to save London buses.

There was no supplementary question.

#### 5.5 From Eluzer Goldberg to the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years, Parks and Play

In Hackney we're seeing a significant rise in demand for Education, Health and Care Plans and still no sign of the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Review promised by the UK Government. What is Hackney Council doing to improve opportunities and outcomes for children and young people with special educational Needs?

#### Response from the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years, Parks and Play

Cllr Woodley agreed that there had been a rise in Education and Health Care Plans (EHCP) since the inception of the Children and Families Act in 2014. In 2014 Hackney had 1399 children with either a Statement or EHCP. In 2021, this had increased to 2645 children or young people with EHCPs, an increase of 89 percent over 7 years. Whilst there had been a national increase of children requiring these locally, the rise had increased more rapidly than national rates.

Cllr Woodley explained that the national SEND Review was ongoing and had been delayed, in part, due to the pandemic. Central Government had set up a steering group of key stakeholders to ensure the completion of the review. It was understood that a Green Paper would be developed and published for consultation by the end of March 2022.

Cllr Woodley gave assurances that resources and provision set out in EHCPs formed only part of the support offered to pupils with special educational needs. In addition to pupils with EHCPs, over 6,000 pupils were provided with special needs support.

Cllr Woodley stated that the largest type of provision in Hackney were mainstream schools and 96 percent of pupils at such schools in Hackney were in good or outstanding provision; well above the national average.

Cllr Woodley outlined the measures that were being undertaken by the Council to improve opportunities and outcomes for children with special educational needs, which included a SEND strategy, with four main priorities:

1. Accessing good and outstanding provision and services - the School Place Strategy, led by Deputy Mayor Bramble was a vital part of this work. Efforts were focussed on creating an expansion of specialist SEND places in mainstream and special schools. Work was being undertaken with the Orthodox Jewish community to develop faith-based, good quality SEND places. The number of local SEND places had increased by over 100 in the past 2 years.
2. An earlier response - the Council's Graduated Response to SEND had recently been launched, bringing together the resources and provision for all pupils with SEND. Training for staff in schools was a key part of this.
3. Preparing for adulthood - health funding had been agreed for a one year post to significantly accelerate coordination and communication about the transition to adulthood. This would enable clearer routes for children and families.
4. Joined up services - The Council was working closely with parents and pupils. One of the ways this was being achieved was by setting up specific issue working groups.

In conclusion, Cllr Woodley stated that the Council was committed to improving its SEND offer and would be closely monitoring the outcome of the SEND review.

*Questions that were not taken at the meeting due to time constraints, and where a written response was to be provided are attached at **Appendix 1**.*

## **6. Questions from Members of the Council**

### **6.1 Question from Cllr Rebecca Rennison to the Mayor**

The past two years have been beyond anything any of us could have imagined; given the scale of the response required to the pandemic, could the Mayor of Hackney provide Councillors with an overview of the number of residents the Council has supported and the different ways it has done this over the past 24 months?

#### Response from Mayor Glanville

The Mayor acknowledged the 613 lives that had been lost to Coronavirus in the borough. He referenced the efforts of Town Hall staff, Governance Services and all who had been instrumental in facilitating the set up and running of virtual meetings early on in the pandemic and the safe return to in-person meetings following the lifting of restrictions. This had enabled democracy to continue in an open and transparent way.

Mayor Glanville explained that at the start of the pandemic, the Council was very much aware of the economic and social impacts on residents who were already living in poverty. It was known that this group would be one of the hardest hit directly and indirectly. This had continued to unfold in the cost of living crisis which pushed even more residents into poverty. The Mayor outlined specific measures the Council had taken to support residents during the pandemic, which in summary included: the direct delivery of 14,000 food parcels, joining forces with its partners to tackle food poverty on a long term

basis, ensuring that culturally appropriate food was delivered to various diverse communities and working with schools to tackle 'holiday hunger'. The Mayor highlighted that there had also been an emphasis on tackling rough sleeping in the borough. The Council paid tribute to its partner organisations and its volunteers who had delivered 5000 hot meals and parcels on a weekly basis to those most in need and had been involved in supporting over 2000 people to directly shield or self-isolate. This offer remained in place until the end of March 2022.

The Mayor continued to highlight the ways in which the Council had supported residents and gave special recognition and thanks to various Council departments.

The Mayor announced that the Council had brought in nearly £6 million from Central Government through successful lobbying for poverty-related funding, which had been used to support the Council's response.

Mayor Glanville concluded that the response to the pandemic was evolving into a permanent, proactive and resident-focussed approach through the Poverty Reduction Framework which sets out how the Council would develop and sustain further work in this area. This was due to be considered by Cabinet on 14 March 2022.

#### Supplementary Question and Response

Cllr Rennison asked the Mayor if he would join her in thanking all those who had worked with the Council in its response to the pandemic. The Chamber applauded the work of all those who had assisted the Council throughout the pandemic.

#### 6.2 Question from Cllr Gilbert Smyth for Deputy Mayor for Housing Supply, Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy

Our libraries are one of Hackney's greatest assets and they make a huge contribution to community well-being across all age groups, providing space for everyone to take part in a wide range of activities. Following the conclusion of the Council's "Our Libraries" survey, can the Deputy Mayor please share some of the learnings from the survey, whilst reassuring residents that under this administration, residents can look forward to "Libraries of Tomorrow" which are future proof and meet the needs and expectations of all our users?

#### Response from the Deputy Mayor for Housing Supply, Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy

Deputy Mayor Nicholson put on record his thanks to Cllr Smyth and other Councillors for their contribution to the "Our Libraries" initiative, which he believed demonstrated the administration's commitment to libraries and their future. Over 8,500 residents had engaged with the "Our Libraries" public consultation campaign. Responses were collected from library users and non-users across all ages and backgrounds as well as from businesses, cultural organisations and the Voluntary and Community Sector and 1,200 children were reached through school competitions and workshops.

Deputy Mayor Nicholson summarised the top recurring themes that came out of the consultation and described the administration's commitment to meeting the needs and

expectations of library users as unequivocal. He stated that the Council would produce a vision for the future of Hackney's Libraries that would be resident-led.

There was no supplementary question.

### 6.3 Question from Cllr Sarah Young to the Cabinet Adviser for Older People:

It's been a year since we launched our Ageing Well Strategy and a really tough year of increasing isolation for many older people. Can you update on what has been achieved under the Strategy including how we are helping to reduce isolation?

#### Response from the Cabinet Adviser for Older People:

Cllr Maxwell stated that maintaining connection throughout the pandemic had been difficult for many, and for some older people, social isolation and loneliness had been a challenging reality long before the pandemic. In the last year, the Ageing Well strategy and the Hackney Older Citizens Committee had been raising the profile and voice of older people in relation to the co-production of services and the importance of intergenerational dialogue. Older people had expressed their desire to be part of the wider Hackney community.

Cllr Maxwell outlined a few of the ways the Ageing Well Strategy had helped to tackle isolation over the past year, highlighting the Digital Buddies scheme which involved younger students supporting older residents to get online. Hackney Youth Parliament, Hackney Young Futures and the Older Citizens Committee had planned regular intergenerational events and cross-mentoring projects that included a variety of topical conversations about safety, mental health, racism and historical perspectives. The Resident Engagement had supported older residents on estates through the 'Let's Talk' project.

Current and future plans included the relaunch of the Hackney Circle, a digital platform for older people which provided information on local activities in arts and culture and The "Chatty Corner" pilot scheme in Shoreditch park.

There was no supplementary question.

### 6.4 Question from Cllr Anna Joy Rickard to Deputy Mayor for Housing Supply, Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy:

Can the Mayor please update on when the first brick of the Nightingale estate housing regeneration scheme will be laid and how the Council will ensure there are no further delays to the project?

#### Response from the Deputy Mayor for Housing Supply, Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy

Deputy Mayor Nicholson gave special recognition to Hackney Downs ward Councillors for their leadership and tenacity in relation to the Nightingale project. The first phase of the development would consist of 70 new homes - next to Olympus Green. These were

set to start on site by the end of 2022. Additional funding had been secured from the Greater London Authority Building Council Homes for Londoners programme to ensure that the first phase would be delivered, all of which would be for social rent.

Deputy Mayor Nicholson informed Council that in recent months, the Housing Regeneration Team had put the first phase out to tender and a full analysis and assessment would be made of the bids received. He spoke about the challenges and pressures of the economy and in particular the construction industry. The Deputy Mayor stated that there was no access to government grants, however the administration remained ambitious and committed to maintaining the house building programme.

In conclusion, Deputy Mayor Nicholson highlighted the progress that was underway. Seaton Point, part of the Nightingale Estate was being brought up to current fire safety standards, with no passing on of costs to leaseholders. There was also a renovated and redesigned green space at Olympus Green and a new temporary community centre prior to a permanent build.

There was no supplementary question.

#### 6.5 Question from Cllr Anna Lynch to the Mayor:

Can the Mayor please provide an update on the recovery from the cyber-attack, particularly regarding the Council Tax system; does the Mayor envisage any challenges to distributing the Government's £150 council tax energy rebate?

#### Response from the Mayor:

Mayor Glanville emphasised that restoring all of the Council's services remained his number one priority since the criminal cyber-attack.

The Mayor explained that the Council continued to rebuild its services. Assurances were given that good progress was being made; however, it would be several months before services were fully restored and back to normal in all aspects. The Mayor acknowledged the profound impact the cyber-attack had on residents, businesses and Council staff.

In reference to Council Tax, the Mayor reported that direct debit collection was able to be maintained throughout. However, information relating to changes to circumstances had not been able to be updated in the normal way. The complex work to recover the Council Tax system had been completed and work was underway to clear the backlog by summer 2022. The main focus was on the most vulnerable residents in complex circumstances. The commitment was to ensure that residents were not out of pocket or at risk because of the cyber-attack.

The Mayor advised that the recent Government announcement of a £150 payment to support people affected by rising energy costs, would be processed by the Council Tax System. This would be a challenge for all local authorities to switch from a collection to a payout service. In Hackney, this payment would total approximately £15 million to band A-D residents. Separate arrangements would be made for Council Tax Reduction Scheme residents. The Council continued to urge residents to set up direct debits as this was the most efficient way to receive the £150 payout. Restoration of the Cashier's

Service was soon to begin, and this service would enable residents to clear arrears in cash and provide another means by which to sign up for direct debit payments. The Council would do all it could to ensure that the £150 reached the most vulnerable residents as quickly as possible and that the hardship discretionary fund was used alongside other funds to target support where most needed.

There was no supplementary question.

*Questions that were not taken at the meeting due to time constraints, and where a written response was to be provided are attached at **Appendix 1**.*

## **7. Elected Mayor's Statement**

- 7.1 The Mayor opened by paying tribute to all Council staff who had worked to provide a quick response to repair damage in the borough caused by the recent storms which saw a number of streets, homes and businesses impacted.
- 7.2 Reflecting on the past four years of office, the Mayor paid tribute to former Cllr Taylor who passed away in 2020 having stepped down before the last local elections. The Mayor also paid tribute to former Councillors Burke, Klein, Kuye, Rahilly and former Deputy Mayor Clark all of whom had stepped down since the last election. He thanked them for their contribution to the Council.
- 7.3 The Mayor noted that it was the last Full Council meeting before the local elections on 5 May 2022. He paid tribute to those Members who would be standing down and not seeking re-election. The Mayor thanked Cllrs Bell, Cameron, Chauhan, David, Gregory, Hanson, McMahon, Odze, Peters, Plouviez, Rennsion, Sharman, Spence and Stops. Collectively, they had 145 years of public service between them. Speaking briefly about each member and their areas of service and advocacy, he thanked them all for their tireless efforts, passion and commitment to public service. Thanks were also offered to Ajman Ali, Group Director for Neighbourhoods and Housing, who would be leaving the Council in April to take up a senior position at Sheffield City Council.
- 7.4 Cllr Steinberger responded on behalf of the Opposition Group. He paid tribute to Cllr Odze, for his years of service and wished him well personally and professionally. Cllr Steinberger proceeded to pay tribute to Labour Councillors who were standing down. He also thanked the Speaker, Cllr Michael Desmond, for his speakership and management of Full Council meetings.

## **8. Council Budget and Council Tax Report 2022/23**

- 8.1 The Speaker reminded Councillors that this decision was covered by Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. This provided that if a Member owed two or more months' arrears of Council Tax, they were obliged to disclose this fact to the meeting and not vote on the matter. Failure to comply was a criminal offence punishable by a fine.
- 8.2 Mayor Glanville informed the meeting of the proposed adoption of the 2022/23 budget.

The Mayor placed on record his thanks to Cllr Chapman, Cabinet Member for Finance and his predecessor, Cllr Rennison, as well as all Cabinet Members for their leadership and support. He gave commendation to Cllr Gordon, Chair of the Scrutiny Panel and Cllr Sharman, Chair of the Audit Committee for imposing the necessary checks and balances. A vote of thanks was also offered to Ian Williams, Group Director Finance and Resources and Jackie Moylan, Director Financial Management.

- 8.3 The Mayor highlighted that this was the second budget produced amid the backdrop of the ongoing Coronavirus pandemic and the cyberattack, which continued to impact the Council. He stated that although there had been an increase in funding levels in the 2022/23 Local Government Finance Settlement, the Council faced significant challenges as there remained uncertainty with regard to future funding levels.
- 8.4 Mayor Glanville expressed concern that the 1.5% increase in National Insurance contributions to fund social care would impose huge pressures and costs to the Council due to increased demand for other services impacting the Council's ability to respond. He stated that the Council was in need of resources to make long term decisions to support and protect the borough's most vulnerable residents, enabling them to have the best opportunities and outcomes. Concerns were raised that continued funding gaps may impact much needed discretionary spending in areas such as social care.
- 8.5 Mayor Glanville outlined the areas in which the Council continued to make savings to protect front line core services and the long-term decisions which resulted in capital spends.
- 8.6 Mayor Glanville announced there would be an increased Council Tax of 2.99% to raise £2.7 million to continue to run the services that residents needed. This would result in an average household bill increase of less than £1 a week, although Hackney remained one of the lowest Council Tax boroughs in London. It was recognised that this was a difficult time to increase. He commended the budget proposals to Council.
- 8.7 Cllr Steinberger responded on behalf of the Opposition to the proposed budget and advised that he was moving the tabled amendment to the budget proposals as attached at **Appendix C**. The motion was seconded by Cllr Odze. Cllr Steinberger placed on record his thanks to Ian Williams, Group Director of Finance and Resources and Jackie Moylan, Director Financial Management.
- 8.8 Cllr Steinberger stated that the proposed amendment was with a view to offering residents best value for money whilst retaining public services. He spoke against the increase to the Greater London Authority (GLA) precept.
- 8.9 Cllr Steinberger expressed dissatisfaction regarding the consultation and implementation of various traffic calming measures that had taken place. He stated that these processes were inefficient and ineffective and consultation on these issues was contradictory and meaningless, as they did not take the views of residents into account.
- 8.10 Cllr Steinberger expressed concern about the Council's expenditure on communications,

notably the publication of Hackney Today and Hackney Life which he described as an unnecessary spend.

- 8.11 Cllr Steinberger objected to the Council's proposal to increase Council Tax which he stated was avoidable. He recommended a reduction to Council Tax by £54.07p. He applauded the £150 Government Council Tax rebate and raised concerns about the impact of the cyber-attack on the most vulnerable residents in the borough.
- 8.12 Cllr Odze stated that an end to the implementation of public realm schemes relating to road closures and other traffic calming measures such as Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs), were required as these were ineffective, costly, compromised safety and had adversely impacted local residents and businesses.
- 8.13 A debate of the amended motion ensued. Councillors Lynch, Hayhurst, Fajana-Thomas, Chapamn, Rathbone, Deputy Mayor Bramble and Mayor Glanville contributed to the debate speaking against the motion. Concerns were raised regarding the proposed rephrasing of key projects such as King's Hall Leisure Centre and the LED light bulb replacement. The lack of costings, the omission of vitally needed services, repairs and improvement works were criticised. Councillors expressed that the amended budget proposal was short term and did not reflect Hackney values and its diverse communities.
- 8.14 Cllr Steinberger exercised his right to reply, reiterating his criticisms of the Mayor of London. Cllr Steinberger stated that the Council's position relating to the backlog of housing benefit payments had not progressed since the last budget meeting a year ago.
- 8.15 The amendment to the motion as outlined and as appears at Appendix C was MOVED by Councillor Steinberger and SECONDED by Councillor Odze.

On a recorded vote, there being;

**2 Members for:** Cllrs Odze and Steinberger

**36 Members against:** Mayor Glanville and Cllrs Bell, Bramble (Deputy Mayor), Cameron, Chapman, Coban, David, Desmond (Speaker), Etti, Fajana-Thomas, Gordon, Hanson, Hayhurst, Kennedy, Maxwell, McKenzie, McMahan, Moema, Nicholson (Deputy Mayor), Oguzkanli, Ozsen, Pallis, Patrick, Peters, Potter, Rathbone, Rickard, Sharman, Smyth, Snell, Stops, Troughton, Webb, Williams, Woodley and Young.

**No abstentions.**

The amendment to the MOTION was lost and the amendment to the proposed budget was NOT CARRIED.

- 8.16 A debate of the substantive motion ensued. Councillors Chapman and Gordon contributed to the debate speaking in favour of the budget proposals. They were critical



of the Government's funding proposals which ensured Council Tax rises were included in the core funding. It was highlighted that the budget had been subjected to scrutiny to ensure increased transparency for local residents.

8.17 Mayor Glanville exercised his right to reply. In reference to the cyber-attack, he reported that there were no outstanding housing benefit or new temporary accommodation claims outside of the normal processing times. In addition, there were no new Council Tax Reduction Scheme claims outstanding which demonstrated the Council's commitment to its most vulnerable residents.

8.18 The substantive MOTION was put to the vote.

On a recorded vote, there being;

**2 Members against:** Cllrs Odze and Steinberger

**37 Members for:** Mayor Glanville and Cllrs Bell, Bramble (Deputy Mayor), Cameron, Chapman, Coban, David, Desmond (Speaker), Etti, Fajana-Thomas, Gordon, Hanson, Hayhurst, Kennedy, Lynch, Maxwell, McKenzie, McMahon, Moema, Nicholson (Deputy Mayor), Oguzkanli, Ozsen, Pallis, Patrick, Peters, Potter, Rathbone, Rickard, Sharman, Smyth, Snell, Stops, Troughton, Webb, Williams, Woodley and Young.

**No abstentions.**

**The substantive MOTION was carried**

*Cllr Lisser and Cllr Papier were not present during the vote on either the amendment to the MOTION or the substantive MOTION.*

*Cllr Lynch was not present during the vote on the amendment to the MOTION .*

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. To bring forward into 2022/23 the Council's projected General Fund balances of £15.0m and to note the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) balances of £12.3m.**
- 2. To agree for approval the directorate estimates and estimates for the General Finance Account items set out in Table 2 of the report.**
- 3. To note that the budget is a financial exposition of the priorities set out within the Corporate Plan included at Section 6 of the report.**
- 4. To note that in line with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2003, the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources, is of the view that: The General Fund balances of £15.0m and the level of reserves, particularly in relation to capital, are adequate to meet the Council's financial needs for**

**2022/23 and that considering the economic uncertainty they should not fall below this level. This view takes account of the reserves included in the Council's latest published 2020/21 Accounts and the movements of those reserves since that date – which have been tracked through the Overall Financial Position (OFP) Reports, and the latest OFP projections. Note also, that the projections in the HRA Budget to maintain the balance at £12.3m by 31 March 2022 are also considered to be adequate at this point in time but will need to continue to be reviewed in the light of the challenges facing the HRA. In 2020/21 the HRA balance reduced from £15m because of the need to set up a provision for Thames Water agency refunds. There is a plan to get back up to £15m through the savings programme over the medium term to replenish reserves and in 2021/22 we were able to increase the HRA balance by £1.1m to £12.3m.**

**The General Fund estimates are sufficiently robust to set a balanced budget for 2022/23. This takes into account the adequacy of the level of balances and reserves outlined above and the assurance gained from the comparisons of the 2021/22 budget with the projected spend identified in the December 2021 OFP. The overall level of the corporate contingency has been set at £2m.**

- 5. To approve the proposed General Fund fees and charges as set out in Appendix 8 of the report for implementation from 1st April 2022.**
- 6. To continue the policy requiring the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources to seek to mitigate the impact of significant changes to either resources or expenditure requirements.**
- 7. To note the summary of the HRA Budget and Rent setting report agreed by Cabinet on 24th January 2022.**
- 8. To authorise the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources to implement any virements required to allocate provision for demand and growth pressures set out in this report subject to the appropriate evidence base being provided.**
- 9. To approve the allocation of resources to the 2022/23 Non-Housing capital schemes referred to in Section 24 and Appendix 7 of the report.**
- 10. To approve the allocation of resources to the 2022/23 Housing indicative capital programme referred to in Section 24 and Appendix 7 of the report, including the HRA approvals previously agreed by Cabinet on January 24th 2022.**
- 11. To note that the new capital expenditure proposals match uncommitted resources for the year 2022/23.**
- 12. To agree the prudential indicators for Capital Expenditure and the Capital Financing Requirement, the Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary for External Debt, the Affordability prudential indicators and the Treasury**

**Prudential Indicators for 2022/23 as set out in Section 24 and Appendix 3 of the report.**

- 13. To confirm that the authorised limit for external debt of £598m agreed above for 2022/23 will be the statutory limit determined under section 3(1) of the Local Government Act 2003. Further reassurance about the robustness of the budget is the confirmation that the Council's borrowings are within the boundaries of prudential guidelines.**
- 14. To continue to support the approach of using reserves to manage emerging risks and liabilities and to note the latest reserve position.**
- 15. To note that at its meeting on 26th January 2022 the Council agreed its Council Tax Base for the 2022/23 financial year as 73,981 in accordance with regulations made under section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. The Council Tax Base is the total number of properties in each of the eight council tax bands A to H converted to an equivalent number of band D properties.**
- 16. To agree that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2022/23 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Localism Act 2011. The authority calculates the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (2) of the Act)**
  - (a) £1,258.507m being the expenditure which the authority estimates it will incur in the year in performing its functions and will charge to a revenue account, other than a BID Revenue Account, for the year in accordance with proper practices.**
  - (b) £2m being such allowance as the authority estimates will be appropriate for contingencies in relation to amounts to be charged or credited to a revenue account for the year in accordance with proper practices.**
  - (c) £nil being the financial reserves which the authority estimates it will be appropriate to raise in the year for meeting its estimated future expenditure.**
  - (d) £nil being such financial reserves as are sufficient to meet so much of the amount estimated by the authority to be a revenue account deficit for any earlier financial year as has not already been provided for.**
  - (e) £4.353m being the amount which it estimates will be transferred in the year from its general fund to its collection fund in accordance with section 97(4) of the 1988 Act, and**
  - (f) £nil being the amount which it estimates will be transferred from its general fund to its collection fund pursuant to a direction under section 98(5) of the 1988 Act and charged to a revenue account for the year.**
- 17. The authority calculates the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (3) of the Act)**
  - (a) £1,170.497m being the income which it estimates will accrue to it in the year and which it will credit to a revenue account, other than a BID Revenue Account, for the year in accordance with proper practices.**

(b) £nil being the amount which it estimates will be transferred in the year from its collection fund to its general fund in accordance with section 97(3) of the 1988 Act.

(c) £nil being the amount which it estimates will be transferred from its collection fund to its general fund pursuant to a direction under section 98(4) of the 1988 Act and will be credited to a revenue account for the year, and

(d) £nil being the amount of the financial reserves which the authority estimates it will use in order to provide for the items mentioned in subsection (2) (a), (b), (e) and (f) above.

18. £94.363m being the amount by which the aggregate calculated under subsection (1) above exceeds that calculated under subsection (2) above, the authority calculates the amount equal to the difference; and the amount so calculated is its Council Tax Requirement for the year.

19. £94.363m being the amount at (paragraph 3.2.17 of the report) divided by the amount at (paragraph 3.2.14 of the report) calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31A of the Act, £1,275.50 as the basic amount of its council tax for the year.

20. That the Council in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council tax for 2022/23 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

#### Valuation Bands in Hackney

| A      | B      | C        | D        | E        | F        | G        | H        |
|--------|--------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 850.33 | 992.06 | 1,133.78 | 1,275.50 | 1,558.94 | 1,842.39 | 2,125.83 | 2,551.00 |

21. That it be noted that for 2022/23 the Greater London Authority has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

#### Valuation Bands in GLA

| A      | B      | C      | D      | E      | F      | G      | H      |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 263.73 | 307.68 | 351.64 | 395.59 | 483.50 | 571.41 | 659.32 | 791.18 |

22. That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at paragraphs 3.2.19 and 3.2.20 of the report, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for 2022/23 for each of the categories of dwellings as shown below.

#### Valuation Bands Combined Hackney/GLA

| A        | B        | C        | D        | E        | F        | G        | H        |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1,114.06 | 1,299.74 | 1,485.42 | 1,671.09 | 2,042.44 | 2,413.80 | 2,785.15 | 3,342.18 |

23. To agree, subject to the decision of Members on recommendations 3.2.15 to 3.2.18 in the report, that Hackney's Council Tax requirement for 2022/23 be £94.363m which results in a Band D Council Tax of £1,275.50 for Hackney purposes and a total Band D Council Tax of £1,671.09 including the Greater London Authority (GLA) precept. An analysis of the tax base total Band D Council Tax across Council Tax Bands is shown in 3.2.21 above and an exemplification of the taxbase and discounts by band, is shown in Appendix 5 of the report.
24. To agree that in accordance with principles approved under section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, and the new provisions included in the Localism Act 2011, the increase in the Council's Council Tax requirement for 2022/23 as shown at Appendix 9 is not excessive (3% or above) and therefore does not require the Council to hold a referendum.
25. To agree the Treasury Management Strategy for 2022/23 to 2024/25, set out at Appendix 3 of the report.
26. To agree the criteria for lending and the financial limits set out at Appendix 3 of the report.
27. To approve the MRP statement setting out the method of calculation to be used, as set out in paragraphs 24.18-24.28 of the report.
28. To approve the Audit Committee's proposal to accept the Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) invitation to 'opt in' to the sector led option for the appointment of external auditors for five financial years commencing 1 April 2023.
29. To delegate authority to the Group Director of Finance & Corporate Resources to respond to the invitation and take the necessary steps to finalise the appointment itself following the PSAA procurement process.

## 9. Annual Report of the Audit Committee 2021/22

- 9.1 Cllr Sharman, Chair of the Audit Committee, introduced the report. He stated that the Council's financial performance, financial management and planning as well as its compliance with procedures remained healthy, although it faced significant challenges.
- 9.2 Cllr Sharman outlined the measures the Audit Committee had undertaken to carry out its responsibilities. These included supporting the external audit process of the Council's accounts, quarterly reviews and risk monitoring of the Council's main services, gauging budget targets with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Scrutiny Chairs and regular assessments of the Council's prospective income and management plans.

9.3 In conclusion, Cllr Sharman stated that issues such as climate change, joint management of health and social care, access to decent housing and combating poverty could be difficult to mitigate with good financial management alone.

**RESOLVED:** The Annual Report of the Audit Committee set out in Appendix 1 of the report be noted.

## **10. Pay Policy Statement 2022/23**

10.1 The Speaker advised that where there were questions on the content of the report, the Chief Executive would write a response to all Councillors following the meeting.

**RESOLVED:** The Pay Policy for Chief Officers for 2022/2023, as recommended by the Corporate Committee, be approved.

## **11. Appointment as Deputy Electoral Registration Officers**

11.1 The Speaker advised that where there were questions on the content of the report, the Chief Executive would write a response to all Councillors following the meeting.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be appointed as Deputy Electoral Registration Officers of the Council:

- Bruce Devile
- Dawn Carter-McDonald
- Louise Humphreys

## **12. Appointments to the Constitution Committee**

**RESOLVED: Appointments to the Constitution Committee, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, be agreed.**

## **13. Motion: Make Menopause Matter**

13.1 Cllr Cameron proposed the motion which was seconded by Cllr Etti. Cllr Cameron highlighted the lack of a single reliable diagnostic test to pinpoint the start of the perimenopause. She stated that transgender women and women of colour were likely to face additional challenges in managing symptoms and accessing appropriate healthcare. Menopausal women were the fastest growing section of the UK workforce and recent studies had shown that there was a spike in the number of women aged 45-55 leaving the workplace at a critical time in their careers. Cllr Cameron spoke of the hidden impacts of the menopause such as reduced confidence and anxiety. She was pleased that the Council had implemented a Menopause and Menstruation Policy.

13.2 Cllr Cameron reported that there was only one specialist menopause consultant at the Homerton Hospital and expressed the need for more resources, expertise and access to holistic approaches. Cllr Cameron welcomed the Government's commitment to examining the costs of Hormone Replacement Therapy (HRT) prescriptions for women in England and the establishment of an all party parliamentary group on menopause as well as a menopause task force. The Council was urged to champion over half of the UK population to get the required support.

13.2 Cllr Odze, Cllr Kennedy, Deputy Mayor Bramble, Cllr Moema and Mayor Glanville spoke in support of the motion. A vote of thanks was relayed to Cllr Cameron for bringing the issue forward and Cllr Williams for leading on the Council's Menopause and Menstruation Policy. The work of Dr Sue Mann, Consultant in Reproductive Healthcare and clinical lead for community women's health at the Homerton Hospital was also commended. The impact of health inequalities and the importance of equity of access to primary care was highlighted.

13.3 Cllr Etti welcomed the comments from Members and stated that women's health should never be political. She committed to continue to raise awareness of this issue in the borough.

13.4 Cllr Cameron welcomed the support of Members and acknowledged the barriers faced by women of Black and ethnic communities who may face additional health complications and have difficulty accessing appropriate healthcare.

**Unanimously RESOLVED:**

1. **To campaign for menopause support to form a central part of the next national Women's Health Strategy.**
2. **To work with our health partner organisations to ensure that support for those experiencing menopause is a central part of the next City and Hackney Women's Health Strategy.**
3. **To support the #MakeMenopauseMatter campaign which is calling for:**
  - **Mandatory menopause training for all GPs and menopause to be taught as part of every medical school curriculum.**
  - **Menopause guidance and support in every workplace.**
  - **Menopause to be added to the RSE curriculum in schools throughout the UK**

**Meeting duration: 7pm - 10.27pm**

**Chair:** Cllr Michael Desmond, Speaker of the London Borough of Hackney

**Contact:** Natalie Williams, Governance Officer

**Email:** [governance@hackney.gov.uk](mailto:governance@hackney.gov.uk)

## **Appendix A** Agenda Item 5 - Written responses to Questions from Members of the Public Not Taken at the Meeting Due to Time Constraints

### From Faruk Tinaz to the Cabinet Member for Housing

In the light of the overcrowding crisis in Council homes, could the Cabinet Member for Housing please explain what is being done to incentivise under-occupiers in Council housing to move more suitably-sized accommodation? Has any cost-benefit analysis been done to establish whether the incentives are sufficiently attractive?

### Written Response from the Mayoral Advisor for Homelessness, Housing Needs, and Rough Sleeping

Thank you for your question to Full Council regarding incentives to under-occupying tenants. I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to hear it on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

The council has a [downsizing incentive scheme](#), which has been in place for a number of years. The aim of the scheme is to financially encourage council tenants who are under-occupying their home to downsize to a smaller property.

There have been approx 64 moves since 2018: 25 in 2018/19, 19 in 2019/20, and 20 in 2020/21. In this time, a total of £68,214.08 has been paid out in incentives and removal costs.

The financial incentives are greater for larger homes, and for releasing more bedrooms. For example, if a tenant is in a 4 bed roomed property we could pay £1000 per bedroom released, if releasing a minimum of two bedrooms, and an additional £1000 if the applicant only needs and requests one bedroom.

If a tenant is in a 3 bed roomed property, the equivalent figures are £750 per bedroom.

If a tenant is releasing only one bedroom, they do not qualify for the cash incentive payment. However, they could qualify for a "Removal Cost" payment of £500.

Our experience is that financial incentives, while welcome, are not a primary driver that persuade households to downsize. Residents amenable to downsizing are seeking options that meet their individual needs. In many instances these will be older residents with a medical need requiring ground floor access and wanting to remain close to family members and support networks.

Unfortunately, given the high and growing demand for social housing across the board and the very short supply of this type of accommodation within our portfolio, competing factors means that this desire cannot always be met.

It has been a number of years since the incentive scheme was introduced and I have asked officers to carry out a review of the scheme during 2022/23, to understand the success of the scheme and consider if the incentives are still pitched at the right level.

We are also looking at how we can put together options and packages that make the



down-sized accommodation suitably attractive to meet their needs. This could include access to additional support and property adaptations that would increase their confidence in being able to settle within the new property.

I hope that this response is helpful and reassures you regarding the action the Council is taking to incentivise under-occupiers in Council housing to vacate their properties and take up more suitably sized accommodation.

From Grace Kujembola to the Mayoral Advisor for Homelessness, Housing Needs and Rough Sleeping

Can the Mayoral Advisor advise us on the support given to rough sleepers during cold weather?

Written Response from the Mayoral Advisor for Homelessness, Housing Needs and Rough Sleeping

Thank you for your question to Full Council regarding support given to rough sleepers during the cold weather. I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to hear it on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

Hackney is determined that no one should have to sleep on our streets. To support people off the streets, we commission a dedicated street outreach team to find individuals who are sleeping rough, and work to move them into accommodation and services.

This team comprises outreach workers who seek to quickly bring people off the streets, and navigators who work to build long term relationships with those entrenched rough sleepers who face significant barriers to leaving the streets.

The team includes access to a dedicated on-street mental health worker, to ensure that mental health support is joined up and that individuals have the mental capacity to make informed decisions.

Once a rough sleeper is identified, they will be assessed to identify their support needs, before moving them onto appropriate accommodation where we can.

During periods of extreme weather, Hackney provides emergency accommodation for all rough sleepers through the Severe Weather Emergency Protocol (SWEP). This accommodation is available whenever the temperature is forecast to fall below zero, or during any other occasions where there is a danger to life such as during the recent Storm Eunice. Hackney have signed up to the Mayor of London's "In for Good" principle, meaning that once someone has accessed SWEP accommodation, where possible they are accommodated until a support plan is in place to end their rough sleeping, regardless of whether the temperature has risen above freezing.

As well as dedicated supported housing when assisting people off the streets, the Council will utilise temporary accommodation, enhanced housing management schemes or private renting, depending on individual needs.

For those individuals who do not have a local connection to Hackney, our services work to link them back to where they have community ties and support.

For those individuals who do not have recourse to public funds and cannot be accommodated by the Council, the Council works very closely with local charities and voluntary sector organisations such as Hackney Winter Night Shelter to help rough sleepers access accommodation options wherever possible.

The Covid crisis cannot be overlooked and has significantly increased demand.

The Council has worked diligently to put in place a cross departmental holistic response.

At its peak, this approach provided accommodation, support and health care for 219 vulnerable residents with multiple and complex needs who may well have ended up rough sleeping without our intervention.

I hope that this response is helpful and reassures you regarding the action the Council is taking to support rough sleepers in the borough.

#### From Ahmad Bismillah to the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and the Public Realm

In light of the parking stress caused to residents of Stamford Hill, could the Cabinet Member for parking confirm when the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) will be implemented?

#### Written Response from the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and the Public Realm

Thank you for your question to Full Council regarding controlled parking zone implementation in Stamford Hill. I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to hear it on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

Officers have recently carried out consultations with residents and businesses on the proposed design of Parking Zones in Stamford Hill. The necessary formalities are now being completed in order for implementation in June.

Once implemented, controls are expected to reduce the demand on the limited number of parking spaces on these mainly residential streets by allowing the Council to enforce against drivers that do not have parking permits and who seek free all-day parking in Stamford Hill, these are most often drivers displaced from other Parking Zones, or commuters that originate from outside the borough.

In addition to reducing parking stress, Parking Zones play an important role in reducing the number of vehicles driving around looking for free places to park which has a positive impact on neighbourhood traffic flow, road safety and local air quality.

#### From Claudia Turbet-Delof to the Mayor

The Nationality and Borders Bill proposed by this Conservative Government threatens to make second-class citizens of a huge number of Hackney residents. What is the Mayor of Hackney doing to oppose the Bill and point to its divisive nature?

## Written Response from the Mayor

Thank you for your question at Full Council regarding the Nationality and Borders Bill proposed by this Conservative Government. I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to respond to your question on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

Over 7,000 residents in Hackney hold dual citizenship. They are proud UK passport holders alongside a passport from another country. If the Government has their way, these 7,000 residents could be made second-class citizens overnight, because the Nationality and Borders Bill gives the Home Secretary the power to deprive British people of their citizenship without informing them first.

The Conservative Government's approach isn't new or surprising. Since getting into power, Hackney has stood firmly against the hostile environment that this Government has created for migrants, refugees and everyone who is a descendent of someone who came here to build a better life and a better Hackney.

Hackney has always and will continue to be a borough of sanctuary for all; we have been shaped and built by migrants and we would not be Hackney without them. In particular, Hackney's reaction to the crises in Hong Kong, Afghanistan and Ukraine in the past two years alone is evidence of our status as a borough of sanctuary. In all three of these cases, Hackney's communities and the Council are doing everything they can to welcome as many people as possible.

In total, 54,000 local residents hold a passport from another country – we are a proudly international and diverse borough which is why we stand against the Nationality and Borders Bill, as well as other Bills that threaten our values and status as a sanctuary borough.

This Bill was formed out of the Government's 'New Plan for Immigration' for which we responded to their consultation. We set out clearly that we strongly oppose their Plan, that there are no 'illegal' routes to seek asylum and refuge, and that migration is a fundamental human right. We have also previously lobbied to see an end of the No Recourse to Public Funds condition, justice for the Windrush generation, and written on behalf of the almost 25,000 residents with an EU passport that could be particularly affected by the combination of this Bill and Brexit.

Since then, we have been engaging with our Members of Parliament on our concerns and they have raised them in Parliament. Both of them voted against the Bill.

In February, I was really pleased to see the House of Lords pass an amendment to remove that particular clause from the Bill, as well as a number of other concerning clauses, including:

- that all policies or decisions arising from the draft law must comply with the 1951 Refugee Convention;
- that refugees should not be treated differently depending on how they arrive in the UK;
- that refugees should be allowed to work if no decision is made about their status after six months.

We will continue to work with our MPs and lobby the Government to see them accept these amendments before it gains royal assent. And we will continue to lead a borough of sanctuary

that celebrates our diversity and internationalism.

I hope that you have found the above response helpful.

## **Appendix B**

Agenda Item 6 - Written responses to Questions from Members of the Council Not Taken at the Meeting Due to Time Constraints

### From Cllr Soraya Adejare to Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources

Can the Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and HR update me on the Review, Rename, Reclaim work and her plans for sites named after Cecil Rhodes?

### Written Response from the Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources

On 10 June 2020 Hackney Council announced a review of plaques, statues, place and building names in Hackney's public Realm to understand how they reflect Hackney's diversity and history of fighting racism.

The project is part of the Council's longstanding Anti-racism work as well as a response to the Black Lives Matter movement.

A Community Steering Group, which was established by the council to support an audit identified the names of four individuals who profited from the Transatlantic Trade in enslaved African people or as plantation owners.

The name "Rhodes" can be found on two sites in the borough, due to the link with Cecil Rhodes, a well-known imperialist, where his policies laid the foundations for apartheid in South Africa.

Rhodes House on the Provost estate (Hoxton West ward) and the Rhodes Estate and community hall in Dalston.

As part of the Review Rename and Reclaim programme, we will be delivering a steady programme of community engagement and consultation as we look to rename this and other sites in the borough.

As part of this work we will be seeking resident participation and engagement in the process of renaming that will be carried out over the next 4 years.

The Tenant & Residents Association on the Rhodes Estate first contacted the council about renaming the estate, back in 2020, after the Council launched a review into the presence of contested names and monuments.

Conversations with residents have been ongoing since, with the estate's TRA holding a number of resident meetings to discuss their concerns and welcoming the fact that the council's investigations include the name of Rhodes - which they would like to see changed.

The council will work closely with residents. This is vital to ensure names are identified that meet our own renaming guidance while retaining a sense of connection and meaning for a place they live and call home. Research of suggested names will be provided by Hackney Archives, which is located opposite the site. Taken together, this will inform a shortlist of names.

A formal consultation has been scheduled to take place with the residents who live on the Rhodes estate and is expected to take place in the later part of this summer.

No change of address will be required for this site. A change of address would be required for the other site with the name 'Rhodes' and so far no engagement has been made with those residents living there but a formal consultation will be required. It is likely that it will have several stages because of the potential impact of any address change.

From Cllr Anya Sizer to the Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social Care, Voluntary Sector and Leisure

Can the Cabinet Member please provide an update on usage and membership figures for the new Britannia Leisure Centre; whether Britannia is meeting targets and expectations for usage; and especially its usage by local people?

Written Response from the Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social Care, Voluntary Sector and Leisure

Thank you for your question to Full Council regarding an update on the usage and membership figures for the New Britannia Leisure Centre. I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to respond to your question on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

The new Britannia Leisure Centre opened to the public on 30 June 2021.

Despite it opening with COVID Secure Operations in place, a significantly reduced transferable membership from the old Leisure Centre due to the pandemic and a reluctance amongst some customers (particularly with the recent Omicron variant and Plan B restrictions) to return to indoor facilities due to the ongoing pandemic, the usage of the new Leisure Centre has been hugely encouraging and exceeded expectations.

In the first six months of operation the new Leisure Centre has had 391,044 visits, a 161% increase in usage in comparison with the old Leisure Centre for the same period in 2019 (pre-pandemic). In addition, the Leisure Centre already has more than 5,000 members, the highest ever membership of the old Leisure Centre was 2,400 in 2018, and Pay & Play Members have also increased significantly from 6,094 in 2019 to 9,364 in December 2021.

The Leisure Centre has also seen an increase in the percentage of Hackney residents using it - increasing from 65.1% of users in 2019 to 70.6% of users in December 2021.

We are incredibly pleased with the success of the new Britannia Leisure Centre and look forward to it continuing.

I hope that this response is helpful and reassures you regarding the use of the Britannia Leisure Centre.

## From Cllr Peter Snell to the Mayoral Adviser on Homelessness and Housing Needs

Can the Mayoral Adviser for Housing Needs give an update on the steps the Council has taken to support people sleeping rough during the winter months?

## Written Response from the Mayoral Adviser on Homelessness and Housing Needs

Thank you for your question to Full Council regarding an update on the steps the Council has taken to support people sleeping rough during the winter months. I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to hear it on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

Hackney is determined that no one should have to sleep on our streets. To support people off the streets, we commission a dedicated street outreach team to find individuals who are sleeping rough, and work to move them into accommodation and services.

This team comprises outreach workers who seek to quickly bring people off the streets, and navigators who work to build long term relationships with those entrenched rough sleepers who face significant barriers to leaving the streets.

The team includes access to a dedicated on-street mental health worker, to ensure that mental health support is joined up and that individuals have the mental capacity to make informed decisions.

Once a rough sleeper is identified, they will be assessed to identify their support needs, before moving them onto appropriate accommodation where we can.

During periods of extreme weather, Hackney provides emergency accommodation for all rough sleepers through the Severe Weather Emergency Protocol (SWEP). This accommodation is available whenever the temperature is forecast to fall below zero, or during any other occasions where there is a danger to life such as during the recent Storm Eunice. Hackney have signed up to the Mayor of London's "In for Good" principle, meaning that once someone has accessed SWEP accommodation, where possible they are accommodated until a support plan is in place to end their rough sleeping, regardless of whether the temperature has risen above freezing.

As well as dedicated supported housing when assisting people off the streets, the Council will utilise temporary accommodation, enhanced housing management schemes or private renting, depending on individual needs.

For those individuals who do not have a local connection to Hackney, our services work to link them back to where they have community ties and support.

For those individuals who do not have recourse to public funds and cannot be accommodated by the Council, the Council works very closely with local charities and voluntary sector organisations such as Hackney Winter Night Shelter to help rough sleepers access accommodation options wherever possible.

The Covid crisis cannot be overlooked and has significantly increased demand.

The Council has worked diligently to put in place a cross departmental holistic response.

At its peak, this approach provided accommodation, support and health care for 219

vulnerable residents with multiple and complex needs who may well have ended up rough sleeping without our intervention.

I hope that this response is helpful and reassures you regarding the action the Council is taking to support rough sleepers in the borough.

#### From Cllr Polly Billington to Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and the Public Realm

There are now over 1 million fully electric and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles on UK roads; can the Cabinet Member please update on plans for access to EV charging points to be rolled out across our communities, including on our Council estates?

#### Written Response from the Cabinet Member for Energy, Waste, Transport and the Public Realm

Thank you for your question to Full Council regarding the roll-out of EV charging points. I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to hear it on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

In 2020 access to charging infrastructure became the main barrier to adoption of electric vehicles (EVs), overtaking cost and range anxiety. Fast and rapid freestanding charge points offer complementary charging solutions alongside low power residential lamp column chargers, which the Council envisages will further encourage the switch from heavily polluting vehicles to much cleaner EVs.

This is why Hackney is planning to install over 3000 on-street charge points by 2030 which we hope will encourage more people to adopt less polluting electric vehicles. 1500 of these new chargers are planned to be installed by 2026.

To meet demand today we recently rolled out an additional 150 lamp column chargers and 48 fast chargers bringing the total number of EV charge points to over 300 which will increase access and choice for EV drivers. With around 1500 registered ultra low emission vehicles (ULEV) registered in Hackney this provides 1 charger for every 5 fully electric or plug-in hybrid electric vehicle.

Approximately 10% of our current requests for electric vehicle charging points come from residents living on estates. The Council's plans include a provision for meeting this demand and have already identified over 100 locations for new EV chargers.

The council maintains a map of all publicly accessible chargers on its website and keeps an open portal for new or prospective electric vehicle drivers to suggest locations for new electric vehicle chargers. This ensures that we are meeting demand as we roll out the EV charging network across the borough in the coming years.

#### From Cllr Humaira Garasia to the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care

Can the Cabinet Member for Young People please provide an update on youth provision in Hackney, and particularly on future plans for Young Hackney spaces?



## Written Response from the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care

Thank you for your question to Full Council requesting an update on youth provision in Hackney and our future plans. I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to respond to your question on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

Hackney's diverse youth offer is delivered by Young Hackney- the Council's integrated open access, early help and prevention service for 6-19 year olds (up to 25 with special education needs and disabilities), alongside a range of voluntary, faith and community sector (VCS) youth providers who are directly commissioned by Young Hackney and a wider number of voluntary and community services who may receive other types of grant funding or support from the Council.

Young Hackney has an up-to-date, informative and publicly available website that details the extent of its provision, links to advice, and details how we have supported access to covid19 vaccinations for our young people.

Young Hackney supports the wider network of play and youth organisations with practice information, guidance and training as well as promoting funding and collaboration opportunities. The Youth Provider Network meeting that Young Hackney facilitates has been particularly helpful in mobilising the sector during the pandemic and for the delivery of the Holiday Activities and Food Programme.

We are pleased with our youth hubs and our playgrounds and we are committed to continued development of our services from these sites to benefit children of Hackney.

Hackney Young Futures Commission was created by the council and sought the views of children in Hackney. We have an extensive set of recommendations from this ground-breaking commission which inform our thinking about how we maintain and develop the Young Hackney Offer.

As we take forward the work of the Young Futures Commission, new developments include:

- A new multi-use sports facility for young people in Hackney Wick which I opened in February half term, developed by the Council with the support of the Greater London Authority and London Legacy Development Corporation and in close collaboration with local young people. The new dedicated Youth Sports Hub, 80z Eastway, directly responds to the 'ask' from the Young Futures Commission to continue to increase Access to Opportunities to Places, Spaces and Activities. The hub also addresses the findings of the Hackney Wick Through Young Eyes Report, which identified a lack of places and good quality facilities for children and young people to engage in youth activities, stay active, and participate in sport within Wick Ward.
- The findings of the Young Futures Commission alongside Hackney Quest's "Places of safety, places of harm, places of potential" report (2020) has evidenced how valuable Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs) are for young people (and the wider community). This has provided the impetus to pilot an approach to activating a small number of MUGAs in the borough. A pilot for the Gascoyne 2 Estate E9 (Granard House), and Fawcett Estate, E5 has been developed and provides an opportunity to build upon existing provision and maximise use of the space.
- Other opportunities to activate MUGAs continue to be explored and will also support our actions to increase intergenerational dialogue.

- The addition of Stormont House to the cohort of mainstream secondary schools and New Regents College in receipt of support from a Young Hackney Unit responds to the request for educational support and the desire to amplify student voices in decision making.
- Similarly, the refresh and subsequent election of young people to Hackney's Youth Parliament is facilitating wider opportunities for more young people to take part in the work of the youth parliament; shaping how services for young people are delivered in Hackney and pushing for positive change on issues such as climate change, systemic racism and mental health.
- My idea for enabling greater support for Hackney's voluntary sector led to us reviewing how we commission through the Connecting Young Hackney Lot 2 framework. We have repurposed this money and have launched a specific grant fund for Children & Young People. The grants programme opened for applications on 7th February 2022 and will enable more collaboration between the council and a wider spectrum of VCS partners
- The findings of our Early Help Review will see a refreshed response for young people and their families that realises our vision for connected services working together to ensure all Hackney's children and young people, and their families, have access to the opportunities, resources and support to set them up for whole-life success.

We are committed to our Young Hackney brand and we are committed to working with our young people and residents to provide relevant and impactful support for children in Hackney. I hope that this response is helpful, however, if you have any further questions or concerns please come back to me.

From Cllr Kam Adams for the Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social Care, Voluntary Sector and Leisure

I am aware that we have put in a request to become an Enhanced Response Area (ERA) for: face coverings for pupils and staff in Hackney (maintained schools, academies and independent) secondary schools in both communal areas and classrooms; an enhanced vaccination response in all secondary schools. We would like this to start after half term and to continue for the rest of the term. Have we had a response to this request from the DfE and the Cabinet Member explain the thinking behind the request?

Written Response from the Cabinet Member for Health, Adult Social Care, Voluntary Sector and Leisure:

Thank you for your question to Full Council regarding our request to become an Enhanced Response Area (ERA). I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to respond to your question on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

A request was made, through the DHSC Regional Coordinator and DfE Regional Schools Commissioner, to become an Enhanced Response Area on 7 February, when we were still dealing with a high number of outbreaks in schools and headteachers had been asking for additional help/measures. Our intention was to be in a position, working with the Contingency Framework, to advise the use of face coverings in communal areas for staff and students in all secondary schools across Hackney. However, after a number of discussions, civil service colleagues decided not to escalate our request through the national process, because we did not meet the criteria to be designated an ERA. Instead, we were allowed the flexibility to make this recommendation to schools in designated areas of Hackney only. As it happened, during

the course of these discussions, case rates in secondary schools started to fall, anyway, and the schools then broke up for half term. We are continuing to monitor the situation and are evaluating the impact of the break, as well as any pre-break measures.

We have regular briefings going out to schools and good routes of communication from them about any concerns. There was a virtual meeting briefing for headteachers on 1st March.

A public health/education letter went out on 28th February to remind parents/carers about routes to vaccination for their secondary age children and the importance of vaccination.

I hope that this response is helpful, however, if you have any further questions or concerns please come back to me.

#### From Cllr Steve Race to the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care

The Welsh Government has recently announced a trial programme to pay young people leaving care £1600 a month basic income for two years. Can the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Young People please set out what support Hackney Council offers care-leavers, and whether Hackney Council can encourage the UK Government to adopt a similar scheme for England, should the trial prove successful?

#### Written Response from the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care

Thank you for your question to Full Council regarding the support Hackney Council offers care-leavers, and whether Hackney Council can encourage the UK Government to adopt a similar scheme. I am sorry we did not have the opportunity to respond to your question on the night, so I am providing this written response to your question.

We want to do all we can to support our care leavers in Hackney and the Leaving Care Local Offer website sets out the range of support for our care leavers. <https://hackney.gov.uk/leaving-care-local-offer>.

Our support and advice includes but is not exclusively:

- Health,
- Education,
- Training or employment,
- Housing
- Finances,
- Advice about rights and entitlements such as support to access their social care records or how to get support to complain if they are unhappy with service they receive.

Every care leaver in Hackney has a personal advisor and as of the end of January 2022, we have 399 care leavers aged 18 - 25 of whom 296 are aged 18-21.

We fully support the Welsh Government's approach whereby all young people leaving care who turn 18 during a 12 month period, across all local authority areas, will be offered the opportunity to take part in a pilot to receive a monthly basic income of £1600 for 24 months following their 18th birthday is certainly innovative.

As corporate parents we commit significant resources for the support of care leavers e.g. the

projected budget for support on care leavers accommodation for 2020/21 is £4.9 million.

Some of the ways in which we support our care leavers financially are:

- When care leavers are ready to move into their own tenancy we give a **Setting up home allowance** as a one off payment of **£2,000**,
- All care leavers in **education and training receive funding to pay for their travel** to and from that education and training. **(Care leavers grant)**
- For care leavers who go to **university** we provide a grant of **£3,000** per year.
- All Hackney Care leavers living in Hackney are exempted from **Council tax** up until the age of 25. Many boroughs offer Council tax exemption for all care leavers living in their boroughs, so if one of our care leavers lives in one of these boroughs, they will also get Council tax exemption in the area that they live.
- **58% of our care leavers aged 18 - 21 live in supported accommodation** and a further **21% live with staying put arrangements** (with former foster carers) or **supported lodgings**. As corporate parents we subsidise all of these housing arrangements beyond what is covered in Housing Benefit. The average weekly cost of supported accommodation is £430 p/w, Staying Put with an in-house foster carer is £410 p/w and Supported Lodgings £241 p/w. **The projected total spend on this accommodation is £4.9 million.**
- Money for gifts and a contribution towards the cost of celebrations are provided to care leavers until they are **21: £100 for both 19th and 20th birthdays and £150 for 21st birthdays.**
- For young people who do not have a formal form of ID, we will pay the **cost of getting a passport** and a copy of the young **person's birth certificate** up to the age of 21.

We welcome the Welsh government's initiative and we look forward to learning more in the future about the impact and outcomes it achieves for care leavers.

As a Council, we take our corporate parenting responsibilities to care leavers very seriously, we want the very best for our children and are always open to working collaboratively with other local authorities to explore initiatives that may improve outcomes for them. I hope that this response is helpful, however, if you have any further questions or concerns please come back to me.

## Appendix C

### 2022/23 Revenue Estimates and Council Tax

#### TABLED PAPER: Conservative Group Budget Amendment

This Council therefore amends as set out below the 2022/23 budget proposals, by proposing a reduction in the Hackney proposed element of the Council Tax of £54.06 per Band D equivalent.

|  | <b>£'000s</b>  |
|--|----------------|
| <b>Proposed changes in capital expenditure</b>   |                |
| <p>Reduce investment in planned highways maintenance</p> <p><i>Note: the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources and the Strategic Director of Sustainability and Public Realm would strongly advise that this reduction is only maintained for one year and will need to be reversed as part of the development of the 2023/24 Budget.</i></p> <p><i>There is a £4m capital budget for highways maintenance which is fully spent each year. The spend is essential to maintain safe highways and prevent slips, trips and falls; reducing spend on highways maintenance can lead to insurance from road users, drivers, cyclists and pedestrians which could lead to increased costs.</i></p> | (1,550)        |
| <p>Deferment of some of the planned investment in libraries</p> <p><i>There is a £4m capital budget for libraries - the largest of which is £2.7m for Stoke Newington.</i></p>   | (450)          |
| <p>Rephasing of investment in Kings Hall over a longer time frame</p> <p><i>The deferring of this expenditure for much longer would be contrary to a structural engineers report that states the remedial works should be completed within 1 to 2 years.</i></p>   | (500)          |
| <p>Rephasing of the programme of LED light bulb replacements</p> <p><i>There is £1.5m for the LED programme. Delaying this project may risk revenue saving re energy and remote monitoring etc.,</i></p>   | (500)          |
| <b>Sub-total of proposed changes in capital expenditure</b>  | <b>(3,000)</b> |
| Review of members allowances with a view to reducing costs of the Cabinet by, for example, reducing the number of Cabinet members.   | (100)          |
| <p>Reviewing and reducing the highways maintenance revenue budget</p> <p><i>Nb There is a risk that this investment may need to be replaced in the following year. The highways maintenance revenue budget is £635K - reducing spend in this area increases the risk of insurance claims so may cost the Council more in the long run.</i></p>   | (300)          |
| <p>Reducing revenue expenditure on tree maintenance and overall investment in this area.</p> <p><i>Nb There is a risk that this investment may need to be replaced in the following year. The revenue budget for tree maintenance, on the streets and in parks, is £565K. There is also an insurance risk if trees are not maintained - there will be a heightened risk of health and safety issues with falling trees or branches which could cause injury or damage to property. May cost the Council more in the long run</i></p>   | (300)          |
| Review the Council's expenditure on External & Internal Communications.  | (300)          |
| <p><b>TOTAL CHANGE IN BUDGET REQUIREMENT</b></p> <p><i>n.b. the proposed change in capital expenditure (i.e. the £3,000k) will take the form of a one-off reduction in Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay to fund the reduction in Council tax as set out above.</i></p>   | <b>(4,000)</b> |

Council therefore amends as follows the 2022/23 budget proposals, including a reduction in the Hackney element of the proposed Council Tax of £54.06 per Band D equivalent. The Group Director of Finance & Corporate Resources advises that he can give the reassurances required by Section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 with regard to the adequacy of the reserves and the robustness of the estimates on the basis of the notes included with the proposed amendments. It is also important to note that where resources identified above are only one off resources they can only be used to fund expenditure for one year.

The proposed amendments set out above will generate a Council Tax Requirement of £90.363m, which equates to a Council Tax of £1,221.44 (£17.03 decrease when compared to 2021/22) at the Band D level for Hackney purposes. When added to the proposals of the preceptor, the Greater London Authority, this would produce a total at band D level of £1,617.03 for residents, which equates to an overall £14.90 increase from 2021/22.

It should be noted that the Conservative Group do not agree with any increase in the GLA precept and indeed we believe that if we had a Conservative Mayor of London, there would be no increase in the GLA precept.

The GLA should end inefficient and wasteful expenditure on schemes and projects that ignore the outcome of consultations. The GLA needs to account fully for the increase of £10 per Band D property in 2022/23 in respect of the “Police precept” (and an overall increase in Band D precept of £31.93) and explain how numbers of officers on the streets have or will have changed as a result of this additional tax.

A Conservative administration would undertake a root and branch review of the budget and would introduce an emergency budget to realign the Council’s expenditure in line with a Conservative Mayor’s priorities.

In addition to the proposed amendments set out above for 2022/23, the Conservative group proposes that the following reviews take place during 2022/23 in order to identify further efficiencies, to include:

- Revoking the policy change in respect of moving to two weekly bin collection and to reinstate weekly service across all of the borough. We believe that the two weekly bin collections reward those on estates where recycling rates are lowest whilst penalising those in other types of accommodation who already recycle waste. We would also reduce unnecessary expenditure on replacement bins.
- End publication of the quarterly Hackney Today and Hackney Life which is produced eight times a year, replacing the previous fortnightly production and to explore more efficient means of publishing service information.
- Ending the implementation of public realm schemes relating to road closures and other traffic calming measures, which are ineffective, thereby reducing air pollution particularly around schools. Many such schemes have had an adverse impact on the safety of local residents and other road users. We also believe that some of these schemes have had an adverse impact on local businesses and residents. Typical examples of wasted money are the super cycle highway at West Bank, works at Clapton Common and other road closures in the Stoke Newington area.
- A review of the way in which officers support members, ensuring efficiency and reduced cost of the support provided via direct contact with relevant officers across the Council as required

- Review of street crossing patrols with a view to increasing the number across the borough to ensure the safety of children using our roads.
- A commitment to ensure that there are no reductions in the support of children in our schools with special education needs.
- A thorough research project to determine the feasibility of raising revenue income from advertisements on the council's recycling and refuse vehicle fleet.
- No further expenditure to be incurred on Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ), including those not yet implemented. Further to this we would undertake a thorough analysis of income from CPZ's and how this is used in support of the Council's budget, ensuring it is used fully in accordance with the related statutory regulations. Ensure schemes are adapted for all communities and special dispensation for Churches, Synagogues and Mosques and Public Holidays.
- A review of the consultation process, particularly regarding CPZs, to ensure that every local resident and local business have a say unlike the new consultation process which limits responses per household and that the final decisions take full account of the views expressed by residents and business, especially Zone U where 42% said they want it to be between 10 a.m and 12 p.m.
- Explore the possibility of removing estate parking charges to encourage residents of the estates to park on those estates with a view to freeing up parking capacity on surrounding roads in the borough for other users.
- A review of the application of s106 funds to ensure that those with some flexibility regarding their use are used most efficiently in pursuit of the Council's overall aims and objectives. In addition, a review of the application of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds to ensure a fairer distribution across schools in the borough.
- Review of schemes agreed with TfL as part of the Local Implementation Plan (LIP) with a view to agreeing a re-prioritisation of funding in order to reduce calls on the Council's discretionary capital programme for general repairs. This review and any subsequent proposed changes to the approved LIP will need to be agreed by TfL. Further to this, we would encourage TfL to supply seating at all bus stops, available for those residents and users that have disabilities or unable to stand for prolonged periods of time. In addition, to ensure that no further cuts are made to the buses that run through Hackney, either in terms of their numbers or routes. Additionally, a Conservative administration would lobby the GLA to end the LIP programme.
- A review of the roads maintenance programme ensuring that repairs are not required to be repeated on the same roads and pathways within short timeframes and ensuring that works by the Council are fully coordinated with those of the utility companies.
- Explore options to combine the Planning and Enforcement services with other suitable boroughs to achieve efficiencies and better understanding of the approach to large families, alongside a full review of grants available to planning authorities in order to ensure these are fully exploited, to speed up the delivery of planning applications including provision of more efficient transport management input.
- Explore more fully the potential of providing some of our services to other Council's, thus maximising efficiencies further and generating income for the Council, e.g. provision of Registrar's service to Waltham Forest.
- A review of assistance to small business to ensure that optimum level of support is provided, focusing on areas such as increasing take up of small business rate relief. In addition, undertake a review and improve communication to ensure local businesses are aware of any grants including those who do not have on-line access to ensure maximum uptake, including all Covid-related grants.

- Ensure that social care is delivered in a way that ensures the needs of all communities are respected and accommodated and ensure that all new funding streams are fully explored and utilised.
- Review existing Children's Centre provision and identify options to maintain provision at all existing sites.
- A review of the use of the corporate estate, ensuring that public areas are used to their full capacity and thus increasing revenue to the Council. This review will include specifically:
  - Review of the use of Stoke Newington Town Hall Assembly Rooms and the potential to provide parking for attendees at events such as large weddings. We believe that the lack of parking provision has led to potential users finding alternative accommodation, thereby reducing potential revenue income;
  - Review of the use of estate community halls with a view to increasing the use by residents of the borough;
  - Encourage schools to use suitable space for out-of-hours activities for residents in order to raise additional revenue income for further investment in the schools.
- End ward forums with immediate effect and use the monies thereby saved for social care.
- Review of the application of funds available to the Council for the implementation of Neighbourhood Forums, eg. In the Stamford Hill area, alongside a review of the Planning Service to ensure that consideration of applications for local neighbourhood forums is fair. It is currently very difficult to get local neighbourhood forums agreed by the London Borough of Hackney.
- A review of senior officer's salaries across the Council, particularly in respect of the senior management team.
- A review of members' allowances with a view to reducing costs of the cabinet and a recommendation to cap the Mayor's allowance at £50k per annum.
- Implement independent scrutiny before planning enforcement actions are taken to ensure that cases with low risk of success and where there is not a robust public interest argument are not taken forward.
- Discontinue the Standards Committee with immediate effect given this is no longer a legal requirement, whilst ensuring compliance with the requirements of the Localism Act and other statutory guidance. In any event, whilst the Committee exists, ensure that it does comply with those regulations.
- Further review of the Scrutiny arrangements with a view to revert to the previous system which was in place.
- Bearing in mind the increase to the GLA element of the Council Tax, to make representations to the Mayor of London regarding future scrutiny of expenditure on schemes within the Borough of Hackney, e.g the number of police officers on the streets and the number of buses he is proposing to reduce.
- Improved oversight of value for money of leisure projects to avoid waste of resources, for example London Fields Lido and Clissold Leisure Centre.
- Pause on new initiatives which create additional concerns for residents during the post-pandemic period, for example road closures.
- Review of legal expenditure in relation to defending new policy decisions.
- Look at current proposals for Clapton Common recognising the need for long-term investment.
- Undertake an efficiency review of the process for allocating Blue Badges and allocation of disabled bays.



Overall, this budget is put forward within a limited context and were a Conservative administration to be elected we would undertake a zero-base budget review of all areas of spend.

**Proposer:** Cllr Simche Steinberger

**Secunder:** Cllr Harvey Odze

This page is intentionally left blank