

London Borough of Hackney  
Council  
Municipal Year 2015/16  
Date of Meeting Wednesday, 27th January, 2016

Minutes of the proceedings of  
Council held at Hackney Town  
Hall, Mare Street,  
London E8 1EA

**Councillors in  
Attendance:**

Mayor Jules Pipe, Cllr Kam Adams, Cllr Soraya Adejare, Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Anntoinette Bramble, Cllr Barry Buitekant, Cllr Jon Burke, Cllr Sophie Cameron, Cllr Robert Chapman, Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Feryal Demirci, Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Tom Ebbutt, Cllr Sade Etti, Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas, Cllr Philip Glanville, Cllr Margaret Gordon, Cllr Michelle Gregory, Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr Ben Hayhurst, Cllr Ned Hercock, Cllr Abraham Jacobson, Cllr Christopher Kennedy, Cllr Sophie Linden, Cllr Richard Lufkin, Cllr Clayeon McKenzie, Cllr Jonathan McShane, Cllr Rick Muir, Cllr Sally Mulready, Cllr Guy Nicholson, Cllr Harvey Odze, Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli, Cllr M Can Ozsen, Cllr Benzion Papier, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr James Peters, Cllr Emma Plouviez, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Rebecca Rennison, Cllr Rosemary Sales, Cllr Caroline Selman, Cllr Ian Sharer, Cllr Nick Sharman, Cllr Peter Snell, Cllr Simche Steinberger, Cllr Vincent Stops, Cllr Geoff Taylor, Cllr Louisa Thomson, Cllr Jessica Webb and Cllr Carole Williams

**Apologies:**

Cllr Laura Bunt, Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Ann Munn, Cllr Tom Rahilly and Cllr Anna-Joy Rickard

**Officer Contact:**

Emma Perry, Governance Services

---

**Councillor Sade Etti [Speaker] in the Chair**

**1 Apologies for Absence**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence from Members are listed above. An apology for absence was also received from Mr Gordon Bell, MBE and Freeman of the Borough.
- 1.2 Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Ebbutt and Potter.

**2 Speaker's Announcements**

- 2.1 The Speaker wished Members a Happy New Year and referred to her newsletter which had been circulated at the meeting. The Speaker would be updating Members on forthcoming charity events in due course.
- 2.2 The Speaker informed Members that the Council had held its Holocaust Memorial Day commemoration earlier that day. The commemoration had been

- well attended. A Holocaust survivor had addressed those present as part of the service.
- 2.3 The Speaker was pleased to announce that in October 2015 Hackney Council had achieved Timewise accreditation. Timewise was a continuous improvement programme to help local authorities identify, adopt and share best practice in flexible working.
- 2.4 The Speaker was also pleased to announce that the following people with a connection to Hackney were recipients of awards in the Queen's New Year's Honours List for 2016:-
- Matthew Bourne (OBE) – choreographer, born in Hackney
  - Jack Petchey (CBE) – businessman and philanthropist, born in east London
  - Barbara Windsor (MBE) – actress, born in Shoreditch
  - Dr Adrienne Cooper (OBE) – services to Adult Social Services, independent advisor to Hackney's Health and Wellbeing Board
  - Idris Elba (OBE) – actor, grew up in Dalston
  - Carmel McConnell – (MBE), founder of the Magic Breakfast Charity
- 2.5 The Speaker advised Council that for Gifty Edila, Corporate Director Legal, HR and Regulatory Services would retire at the end of February and that as such this was her last meeting of full Council. The Speaker also advised that Greg Lane, Head of Governance Services, and Scott McAlpine, Governance Services Manager, would both leave the Council at the end of February. Richa Kataria, Deputy Head of Member Services would also leave the Council at the end of the week.
- 2.6 Mayor Pipe thanked Greg Lane, Scott McAlpine and Richa Kataria for the dedication to their work in both Governance and Member Services. The Mayor took the opportunity to thank Gifty Edila for all of her hard work and sound advice given during the past 7 years she had worked for the Council. Gifty Edila had 36 years experience of legal practise, of which 27 years were spent working in local government. Gifty had supported 93 councillors during her time at Hackney Council and had recently obtained £1m in a legal case. Mayor Pipe stated that he was truly grateful for the contribution Gifty had made to the Council and wished her all the best for the future.
- 2.7 Mayor Pipe also referred to the Holocaust Memorial Day commemoration held earlier that day and thanked the Speaker for her excellent speech. Mayor Pipe also thanked Councillors Odze and Sharer for their personal contributions.
- 2.8 Councillor Steinberger, as Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group thanked those officers leaving the Council for their advice, support and work over a number of years.
- 2.9 Councillor Sharer, as Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group thanked those officers leaving the Council. Councillor Sharer also referred to the Holocaust Memorial Day commemoration which had been emotional. He thanked all those involved with the commemoration.

- 2.10 Councillor Fajana-Thomas, as a former Speaker of Hackney also thanked Gifty Edila for all of her good advice and support during her time as Speaker.
- 2.11 Mr Siddiqui, as former Councillor and an Honorary Freeman of the Borough, on behalf of all former Members thanked those officers leaving the Council for their hard work, support and good advice over a number of years.

### 3 Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 Councillor Burke declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 10 – Senior Manager Pay Policy, as his partner worked for the Council within Children and Young People’s Services.
- 3.2 It was noted that a number of Members had an interest in Item 14 – Motion - Housing and Planning Bill. The Corporate Director of Legal, HR and Regulatory Services advised that a Standards Committee meeting had been held earlier that evening and agreed to grant a general dispensation to Members so that they could participate in the debate. This was subject to Members declaring any interest prior to making their contribution to the debate.
- 3.3 The following Members declared a pecuniary interest in Item 14 – Motion - Housing and Planning Bill:-
- Councillors Adams, Fajana-Thomas, Gregory, McKenzie and Peters – who are Council Leaseholders
  - Councillors Ozsen and Patrick – who are Council tenants
  - Councillors Glanville and Selman – who are private sector tenants

### 4 Minutes of the previous meeting - 25 November 2015

Councillor Odze highlighted a number of corrections needed.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 November 2015 be approved, subject to the following amendments:-

- Paragraph 2.3, line 1 – Change the word **was** to **of**
- Paragraph 3.6, line 3 – Delete the word **of**
- Paragraph 4.1, bullet point 1 line 3 – Change the word **therefore** to **there**  
After Hackney before the final quote marks add the words, **not just the Jewish community**
- Paragraph 5.9, lines 2 and 7; paragraph 5.11, line 2; paragraph 5.13, line 2; paragraph 5.14, lines 2, 4 and 7 – Change the word **minimum** to **Living**
- Paragraph 5.22 line 3 Change **mental health users** to **mental health service users**
- Paragraph 5.23, line 3 – Delete the word **the** before GAP and insert the word **he** between the words **and** and **was**
- Paragraph 7.3, third paragraph of Response from the Deputy Mayor line 1 – Replace the word **an** with the word **the**  
Paragraph 3 of Response from the Deputy Mayor, line 2 – Add the word the word **the** before **spending**  
Paragraph 3 of Response from the Deputy Mayor, line 3 – Replace the word **which** with the words **whose numbers**

- Paragraph 3 of Response from Deputy Mayor, line 4 – Add the word *being* before *applied*
- Paragraph 8.1, line 8 – Replace the word *were* with the word *was*
  - Paragraph 8.3, line 6 – Change *al* to *all*
  - Paragraph 8.7, line 8 – Change *the agreement of public questions* to *with the agreement to allow public question*
  - Paragraph 10.5, line 1 – Change *removed* to *truncated*
  - Paragraph 10.5, line 2 – Change *reinstated* to *restored to its former route through Stamford Hill*
  - Paragraph 12.5, line 2 – Add after *Theydon Road* the words *with relation to the site at Oak Wharf, Timberwharf Road*
  - Paragraph 18.2, line 2 – Change the words *natural justice* to *recourse to the courts*
  - Paragraph 18.2, line 3 – Replace the words *was not required* with the words *should be abolished as recommended by the Government*
  - Paragraph 22 Motion – b) Trade Union Bill – The full motion text to be included in the minutes.

## 5 Deputations

### a) Sporting Hackney FC and a Hackney community football ground

- 5.1 Councillor Desmond introduced the deputation and stressed the need for a proper enclosed ground, in order to create a football legacy in Hackney. Councillor Desmond welcomed Matthew Brown and Ben Watson to the meeting.
- 5.2 Mr Brown requested a commitment from the Council to work with Sporting Hackney Football Club on establishing a community football ground in the Borough of a high enough standard and specification to host non-league football up to step 3 of the Football Association's non-league structure. Mr Brown stated that the football club had formed 30 years ago and was self-financed and member owned. They had since grown to become the most successful football team in Hackney, winning 7 trophies in 7 seasons.
- 5.3 Mr Brown explained that the club wished to extend their football offer by introducing women's' and disabled football in the future. The provision of a community football ground was vital for the future growth of the football club.
- 5.4 Mr Watson stated that other neighbouring London Boroughs had suitable facilities to enable them to play football at a higher level and he believed that Hackney, as one of the London 2012 Olympic Host Boroughs, should have the same opportunity. He explained that many of the football players within the Borough had left football as it had been too difficult for them to progress with the existing facilities. The benefits and opportunities a new community football ground would bring would reach far beyond just football and would promote social inclusion and other community benefits.
- 5.5 Mr Watson added that Sporting Hackney Football Club wanted to have the opportunity to host high level football and already had a number of interested parties backing the project with available funds, subject to a suitable venue being found.

- 5.6 Councillor Patrick thanked them for their deputation and welcomed the proposals. In response to a question from Councillor Patrick regarding their ambitions for the new football stadium, the deputies explained that they wished to host non-league football up to step 5 level. The entry level for step 5 football was the provision of turnstiles, permanent perimeter fence, floodlights and covered seating for over 100 people. Approximately 4-5 acres of land would be required.
- 5.7 One of the young footballers from the team spoke at the meeting and expressed the need for a new football stadium, which was a huge part of their development and would enable them to improve to the next level in the game.
- 5.8 Councillor Odze welcomed the deputation and questioned whether Sporting Hackney Football Club were willing to work together with Hackney Wick Football Club for a joint tenancy of a community football ground. In response, the deputies stated that although they welcomed partnership working, they wished to firstly concentrate on the first stage of finding a suitable site and determining the viability of the venue.
- 5.9 Mayor Pipe welcomed the deputation and recognised the fantastic achievements made by the football club to date. Mayor Pipe believed that the most logical location for a new community football ground was the east marsh at Hackney Marshes. There had been some issues surrounding the site being metropolitan open land and it not being able to be fenced off.
- 5.10 Councillor McShane responded to the deputation and gave his support for Sporting Hackney Football Club and everything it had achieved to date. Councillor McShane advised that the Council currently supported the club via a Community Use Agreement, which offered Sporting Hackney preferential use of the show pitches and concessionary fees and charges. Councillor McShane added that although the Council supported Sporting Hackney and its future ambitions the reality was that any space that was available, or became available, would be prioritised by the Council to fulfil one of its core strategic priorities such as providing much needed affordable housing or additional primary and secondary school places.

**b) Anti-Social Behaviour**

- 5.11 Councillor Cameron introduced the deputation on Anti-Social Behaviour associated with prostitution in the Lordship Park and Stamford Hill areas of the Borough. Councillor Cameron told Council that work was ongoing on raising awareness of the issues and in accessing services to try to resolve the long term difficulties. A petition had been signed by residents and submitted to the GLA. Councillor Cameron welcomed Penelope Roskill Griffiths, Lee Stacy and other members of the deputation to the meeting.
- 5.12 Ms Griffiths advised Members of the serious anti-social behaviour in the Lordship Park area and explained that the resident group represented a diverse range of people. Ms Griffiths stated that kerb crawlers approached young girls and elderly ladies in the area and that a number of these people come from outside the area and had a background in serious sexual assault. There was a high level of drug use, with drug dealers frequenting the area and drug

paraphernalia, including needles. Ms Griffiths referred to sexual activity taking place in cars, front gardens and public spaces, with associated litter. It was also reported that the area had a high proportion of children and young people and that a number of residents had been harassed, including her son. Ms Griffith's daughter was 13 years old and she had concerns for her safety. The Police had been consulted about the problem and one camera had been provided by Hackney Homes. However, there was a need for two moveable permanent cameras, more dedicated police patrols and improved lighting in public spaces, together with continued funding work to protect women's health and to provide alternatives to prostitution. Petitioners asked Council to consider the problem and asked for long term support and liaison with the relevant agencies that worked in this area.

- 5.13 Councillor Odze thanked the speakers for their deputation and stated that he was in complete agreement with the views expressed. He had lived in Stamford Hill for forty years and referred to a time when the situation on Amhurst Road was worse. Councillor Odze expressed concerned about this problem in an area with so many young people and had concerns about moving the problem to other areas. He stressed that there was a need for co-operation with the surrounding areas.
- 5.14 Councillor Cameron made the point that residents were the victims of displacement. She confirmed that residents had liaised with 'Open Doors' and work was ongoing with people with multiple addictions.
- 5.15 Deputy Mayor Linden responded to the deputation and referred to the fact that Amhurst Road had once been a problem area and that she had gone to school in that area during that time and was aware of how residents felt. Deputy Mayor Linden referred to the need for support and enforcement. Partnership work would continue and she hoped that CCTV would soon be provided, but added that this was dependent on funding. The Police were undertaking enforcement work, dispersing those involved and increasing patrols. Active consideration was being given to improving street lighting. Deputy Mayor Linden reassured residents that the Council would work with them to find solutions to the highlighted problems.

## **6 Questions from Members of the Public**

- 6.1 From Christopher Sills to the Mayor:  
"What was the original budget for the improvements to the Town Hall? How much has been spent to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2015 (or any other convenient date) and what is the estimated completion cost? In the event of an overspending, please could you give the reasons?"

### Response from the Mayor:

Mayor Pipe explained that the improvement works to the Town Hall would generate an overall profit of £15million, with no overspend, following an off-set of freeing up a number of other Council owned buildings and relocating these staff into the Town Hall. Mayor Pipe advised that the works were not just 'improvements' and were in fact essential works to the Town Hall, especially given that the building was Grade II Listed. There had been 80 years of negligible investment in the building which could have resulted in the Town Hall having to be closed if the essential works had not been undertaken. There had

previously been an annual spend of £2.6million on repairs and Town Hall running costs.

Mayor Pipe reported that there had been a £20.8million expenditure on the Town Hall over the past 6 years, and the total programme, when completed, will be £25million. Mayor Pipe added that as a result of the works, there would be a 60% increase in the number of staff being relocated back into the Town Hall.

In response to a supplementary question, Mayor Pipe explained that there had been a 7 year programme of works for the Town Hall, and the delay by a few months of the availability of the Council chamber was not significant. Inevitably, in a project involving a building of this age, certain structural issues were likely to be found. However, these have all been included in the anticipated scope and budget of the project. It was hoped that the Council meetings would be relocated back into the Council Chamber as soon as possible, once all of the necessary roof works were completed. Mayor Pipe added that only 1.1% of the overall capital programme had been spent on the works to the Town Hall.

In conclusion Mayor Pipe advised that the Council's programme of works, upon completion would have taken the Council from occupying a series of shabby to near derelict buildings, costing in excess of £3million a year, to a position of occupying modern, efficient space and assets that are generating more than £2million a year towards services.

## 7 Questions from Members of the Council

### 7.1 From Councillor Adams to the Cabinet Member for Regeneration:

"With regards to the decision made by the Mayor of London to call in the Bishopsgate Goodsyrd planning application, can the Cabinet Member for Regeneration update Members on the steps the Council is taking to ensure that the voices of residents and businesses in Hoxton East are heard?"

### Response from Councillor Nicholson:

Councillor Nicholson advised that the Mayor of London had called in the Bishopsgate Goodsyrd planning application, which had previously been determined by the Planning Sub-Committee. A further Planning Sub-Committee meeting had also been held at the end of last year, as well as the London Borough Tower Hamlets, to put forward the Council's comments on the application to the GLA.

Councillor Nicholson explained that over the past 12 months the Council had done many things to raise public awareness of the proposals for the Bishopsgate Goodsyrd site and this awareness raising was ongoing. Councillor Nicholson gave examples of the ongoing communications and stakeholder engagement work including a high profile and long running campaign led by the Mayor of Hackney, numerous associated press releases and articles in Hackney Today, and a dedicated page on the Council's website which informed people about the proposals.

In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Nicholson advised that the deadline for comments to the GLA was the 15 February 2016. Representations were to be sent to the following email address – [bishopsgate@london.gov.uk](mailto:bishopsgate@london.gov.uk)

7.2 From Councillor Williams to the Deputy Mayor:

“To ask the Deputy Mayor what the Council is doing to ensure that Hackney does not permanently lose a fire engine from Shoreditch Fire Station as proposed by the Fire Commission in his latest budget consultation?”

Response from Deputy Mayor Linden:

Deputy Mayor Linden advised that the proposed budget for the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority was out for consultation and two options had been put forward. Option A, the preferred option of the Police, was to put 13 fire engines back into the service. Jeannette Arnold, Member of the GLA for North East London was currently campaigning for this. Option B recommended the permanent removal of the 13 fire engines. Deputy Mayor Linden expressed concern at the loss of a fire engine and the effect on response times. She explained that only 4 wards had not reached the response time targets, which was a matter of concern as every moment counts in such situations. She emphasised that she would be submitting strong representations that Option A be implemented.

Councillor Williams expressed concern at the risk to Hackney residents resulting from a reduction in the number of fire engines and that this would compromise the work that the Fire Service had already carried out.

7.3 From Councillor Coban to the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services:

“In the Autumn Statement, the Chancellor announced the new funding formula and that education funding would be frozen despite an increase in student numbers. Could the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services update Members on what potential impact this may have for education and schools in Hackney?”

Response from Councillor Bramble:

Councillor Bramble advised that the potential impact for education and schools in Hackney was currently unknown. The Autumn Statement confirmed the protection of the schools budget, in real terms, over the lifetime of this government, which means a “per pupil” protection for the dedicated schools grant and the pupil premium. It was assumed that this guarantee related to the schools grant nationally, which provided no protection to individual local authorities or schools.

Councillor Bramble reported that the Government was also planning to introduce a national funding formula for schools, high needs, and early years. A detailed consultation would be launched this year, with a new formula being implemented from 2017/18. The amount of funding the Council received per pupil was known as the Schools Budget Unit Funding and this was cash protected for 2016/17. The Council would not have any firm indication around reduction levels until the consultation document was issued, which was expected this summer.

Councillor Bramble added that the investment the Council had put into its schools and its children had resulted in greatly improved facilities and results and any reductions of schools budgets would hinder this improvement.



- 7.4 From Councillor Rennison to the Cabinet Member for Finance:  
“Can the Cabinet Member for Finance update Members as to how many households living in Hackney are now subject to the benefit cap?”

Response from Councillor Taylor:

Councillor Taylor stated that 400 Hackney residents were now the subject of the benefit cap and the figure had fallen from 1,500 over the previous 3 years. The benefit cap was currently set at £26,000 for couples and lone parent households. He told Council that there had been a huge increase in the number of people in temporary accommodation and that this now stood at approximately 2500 people. Those households currently impacted by the cap would see a £50 a week reduction in their income. He stressed that some of the people affected would have to move out of the Borough and that Housing Association Leasing providers were pulling out of the sector as a result of the benefit cap.

- 7.5 From Councillor Plouviez to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Sustainability:

“Councillors for London Fields ward have received many enquiries from local residents regarding the proposed road closure proposals in our ward. Can the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Sustainability reassure me that the residents’ concerns will be taken on board as part of the public consultation?”

Response from Councillor Demirci:

Councillor Demirci advised that the Council had planned to trial a road closure in the London Fields area and consult residents whilst the trial was underway. However, due to very strong feelings on both sides and the high levels of public interest, the Council was holding a full public consultation, which started earlier that month and would allow residents to have their say on a number of options, before any decisions were made. The data would then be independently analysed by a market research organisation, to ensure that residents could have full confidence in the integrity of the analysis.

Councillor Demirci explained that the traffic filtering scheme had been proposed to support the Mayor of London’s Cycling Vision, whilst also assisting Hackney Council’s priorities of reducing through traffic and improving safety for cyclists and pedestrians. The consultation would run until 27<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

In response to a question from Councillor Steinberger, Councillor Demirci reassured Members that the Council had taken on board the views of residents and had therefore chosen to undertake a full public consultation. Councillor Demirci added that more than 350 people had attended a public meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2015 to discuss the proposed London Fields filtering scheme, where further options were presented to residents.

- 7.6 From Councillor Cameron to the Cabinet Member for Housing:  
“Can the Cabinet Member for Housing give an update on what he, Hackney Council and Hackney Homes are doing to improve the performance of the repairs contact centre?”

Response from Councillor Glanville:

Councillor Glanville stated that the standard of the repairs contact centre had been below that expected and apologised to tenants and leaseholders for this.

**Wednesday, 27th January, 2016**

A programme of work had been undertaken to rectify the difficulties, with a development day and an independent review of the service, involving residents. Improvements had been made to the service, including, upgrades to IT, joined up management across the two management areas, the implementation of the call back system and email integration. He told Council that figures for December 2015 showed that 95% of calls to the Repairs Centre had been answered.

(Due to time constraints questions 7.7 and 7.8 were not taken at the meeting and the Speaker advised that Members would receive a written response. These responses are attached as Appendix One.)

## **8 Elected Mayor's Statement (standing item)**

- 8.1 Mayor Pipe referred to the calculation of the Council Tax base and explained that, with regret, the Council would be increasing Council Tax for the first time in over 10 years. The Council had to increase Council Tax in order to include a 2% precept for adult social care and to cover cuts in Government grants. Mayor Pipe advised that the Mayor of London had reduced the GLA precept despite continuing to make cuts to policing.
- 8.2 Mayor Pipe explained that the Council had previously absorbed some of the costs, in order to freeze Council Tax. However it had not been possible to continue to make up the short fall in Government funding. Mayor Pipe advised that the Council would continue to lose a further £38million in Government funding over the next 4 years and was expected to make further savings of £58million by 2020.
- 8.3 Responding to the Mayor's statement, Councillor Steinberger on behalf of the Conservative Group, suggested that the Council could have made savings over the past 10 years to enable a further freeze in Council Tax. Councillor Steinberger identified a number of projects proposed by the Mayor of London where savings could be made.
- 8.4 Mayor Pipe thanked Councillor Steinberger for his contribution and explained that there may be a misunderstanding regarding the Mayor of London's projects, which were policy based decisions and the Mayor of London had chosen to fund a number of cycling initiatives, in consultation with the cycling commissioner. Mayor Pipe referred to the required savings of £58million by 2020 and explained that this could not be achieved by one off savings and the Council needed to identify alternative ways of saving money.
- 8.5 Mayor Pipe added that some residents may look critically at the Council if it continued to freeze Council Tax but had to cut other services. The Council had one of the fifteen lowest Council Tax bills in the UK. There were a number of other Councils that would be adding an adult social care precept to their Council Tax base.

## **9 Report from Cabinet: Calculation of Council Tax Base and Local Business Rates Income 2016/17**

- 9.1 Councillor Taylor introduced the report and commended it to Council.

**RESOLVED:**

- i) That in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, the amount calculated by Hackney Council as its Council Tax Base for 2016/17 shall be 66,624 Band D equivalent properties adjusted for non-collection. This represents an estimated collection rate of 95%.
- ii) That in accordance with The Non-Domestic Rating (Rates Retention) Regulations 2013 Hackney's non-domestic rating income for 2016/17 is £81,328,917, subject to completion of NDR1. This comprises three elements.
  - £40,664,459 representing 50% of the amount at 3.4 which is payable in agreed instalments to Central Government
  - £16,265,783 representing 20% of the amount at 3.4 which is payable in agreed instalments to the Greater London Authority
  - £24,398,675 representing 30% of the amount at 3.4 which is retained by Hackney Council and included as part of its resources when calculating the 2016/17 Council Tax requirement.

**For:** Mayor Pipe and Cllrs Adams, Adejare, Bell, Bramble, Buitekant, Burke, Cameron, Chapman, Coban, Demirci, Desmond, Ebbutt, Etti, Fajana-Thomas, Glanville, Gordon, Gregory, Hanson, Hayhurst, HercocK, Kennedy, Linden, Lufkin, McKenzie, McShane, Mulready, Nicholson, Oguzkanli, Ozsen, Patrick, Peters, Plouviez, Potter, Rathbone, Rennison, Sales, Selman, Sharman, Snell, Stops, Taylor, Thomson, Webb and Williams (45)

**Abstentions:** Cllr Odze (1)

**Against:** (0)

**Not Present:** Cllrs Akhoon, Brett, Bunt, Jacobson, Levy, Muir, Munn, Papier, Rahilly, Rickard, Sharer and Steinberger (12)

**10 Report from Corporate Committee: Senior Manager Pay Policy Statement 2016/17**

10.1 Gifty Edila, Corporate Director, Legal, HR & Regulatory Services, introduced the report and commended it to Council.

**RESOLVED** that the Pay Policy Statement for 2016/17 be approved.

**11 Report of the Corporate Director Director Legal, HR and Regulatory Services: Hackney Homes Transition - Changes to Hackney Council's Constitution**

11. Gifty Edila, Corporate Director, Legal, HR & Regulatory Services introduced the report and commended it to Council.

**RESOLVED** that the changes to Hackney Council's Constitution, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed.

**12 Report of the Corporate Director Legal, HR and Regulatory Services: Changes to the Council's Constitution**

12.1 Gifty Edila, Corporate Director, Legal, HR & Regulatory Services, introduced the report and commended it to Council.

**RESOLVED** that:

- i) the establishment of an independent statutory Channel Panel be approved and that its terms of reference and a change to the Proper Officer Functions, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed.
- ii) the revised Planning Sub-Committee terms of reference, as attached at Appendix 2 to the report, be approved.
- iii) the revised Contract Standing Orders, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report, be approved.
- iv) an amendment to the Access to Information Procedure Rules, as detailed in paragraph 3.7 of the report, be approved.

For: Many  
Against: 1 (Cllr Steinberger)  
Abstentions: 0

**13 Report of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission and Executive Response: Female Genital Mutilation (FGM)**

13.1 Councillor Thomson introduced the report and commended it to Council. Councillor Thomson stated that the issue of FGM had been talked about nationally and at community level far more than ever before.

13.2 The Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee had decided to hold a one day investigation into FGM in Hackney. The overall aim of the investigation was to raise awareness and understanding of FGM in Hackney amongst Members, in the context of a number of changes having been made locally over the last year to improve multi agency working.

13.3 Councillor Thomson advised that the Hackney Learning Trust (HLT) data from an enrolment survey in 2014 had estimated that there were just over 3,100 girls in primary and secondary schools in Hackney who may be at risk. The main recommendations that the Commission would like to make were detailed within the report. Councillor Thomson thanked everyone that had been involved in the commission.

13.4 Councillor Bramble responded to the report and stated that she had joined the one day investigation into FGM. She stressed the importance of education of this matter and the need to address this at primary school level.

13.5 Councillor McShane responded to the report and referred to Recommendation 1 – Leadership and the development of a shared action plan and joint protocol between partners. Councillor McShane added that as Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, he regularly updated the board on this action plan.

- 13.6 Councillor Fajana-Thomas also responded to the report and thanked the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission for raising the issue. Councillor Fajana-Thomas added that FGM was an embedded practice in a number of cultures and it was important to raise awareness of this issue and also look at ways of providing support through partnership working. She suggested that the Council should nominate a community champion for FGM.

**RESOLVED** that the Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission report and executive response on the Investigation of Female Genital Mutilation be noted.

## 14 Motion

(During the debate Councillor Chapman moved under Council procedure Rule 16.1 (xiv) to extend the meeting beyond 10pm. This was duly seconded by Councillor Patrick and agreed unanimously by Council).

- 14.1 Councillor Selman introduced the motion and explained that the Housing and Planning Bill had an extremely wide ranging remit, most significantly, the Government was proposing that local authorities dispose of some or all of its 'high value' Council homes as they became empty. This could result in the loss of up to 700 Council homes in Hackney over the next five years, resulting in people having to stay in temporary accommodation for longer periods of time and often being placed in accommodation outside of the Borough.
- 14.2 Councillor Potter seconded the motion and referred to the Kings Crescent Estate and how the Housing and Planning Bill would adversely impact the residents living there. Councillor Potter advised that some tenants' rents could increase by 300% through the introduction of a Pay to Stay scheme.
- 14.3 Councillor Odze responded to the motion and suggested that the Housing and Planning Bill would give 1 million more people the stability of owning their own home, so he opposed the motion. Councillor Steinberger was also in opposition to the motion.
- 14.4 Councillor Taylor stated that more people were aspiring to own their own homes as they could not risk renting when rents were rising so rapidly. Property prices in the Borough had increased by 63% in the last 5 years, pulling up rents with them. He stressed that something needed to be done to control rents.
- 14.5 Councillor Burke raised the issue of right to buy and how around 50% of these properties purchased were owned by private landlords, therefore taking these properties away from residents in need.
- 14.6 Councillor Glanville reiterated the concerns expressed by Members regarding right to buy and people having to stay in temporary housing for longer periods of time. He stated that homes were not being re-provided and the majority of starter homes were unaffordable. He added that the impact of the Housing and Planning Bill would be most felt by the lowest paid in the borough. Mayor Pipe also agreed that the majority of starter homes were unaffordable for those that needed them and required an income of £71,000.

**RESOLVED** that:

'This Council notes:

The Housing and Planning Bill currently being debated in Parliament, will (if it receives Royal Assent) have significant, far reaching and adverse implications for local residents, the supply of truly affordable housing and the Council, specifically:

- A requirement for the Council to sell 'high-value' council homes on the open market;
- The imposition of a levy or 'housing tax' on the Council to fund Housing Association right to buy tenant discounts, which could be anywhere in England;
- A requirement that the Council charges market or near market rents where households renting from the Council have an annual income of £40,000 or more;
- A new restriction on the Council to offer 5 year or shorter tenancies for new tenants;
- The introduction of 'starter homes' as new form of 'affordable' housing tenure.

The Council has been involved in providing detailed evidence to the Housing & Planning Bill Committee, submitting amendments and suggested new clauses to the Bill, receiving evidence from a range of concerned organisations through its Living in Hackney Scrutiny review, with the objective of highlighting the adverse impact this Bill will have on Hackney through the loss of social rented and truly affordable accommodation in the borough.

The Bill in its current form will...

- undermine the Council's ability to comply with its statutory homeless obligations resulting in families staying longer in temporary accommodation.
- place further pressure on the Council's overall temporary accommodation budget.
- result in additional Council expenditure to administer and enforce the Government's pay to stay proposals.
- result in 'starter homes' being built in place of social housing which will be unaffordable to Hackney families and young people on ordinary incomes.
- further reduce the supply of affordable housing by undermining section 106 requirements on private developers to provide affordable homes.
- undermine and put at risk the Councils housing regeneration

programme.

- provide no guarantee that the truly affordable social rented, homes the Council is forced to sell will be replaced like-for-like in Hackney.
- undermine local democracy and decision making by taking 32 new wide and open-ended powers for the Secretary of State over councils,
  - including the power to override locally agreed plans,
  - to mandate rent levels for social tenants,
  - to impose a housing levy on stock-holding councils, violating the terms of the housing revenue account self-financing deal Councils agreed with the government.

Whilst the Bill takes forward some of the measures the Council has been recommending in its private rented sector 10 Steps campaign, it does not address the affordability, poor conditions and insecurity issues in the private rented sector in Hackney– and as such will do nothing to help arrest the recent rise in homelessness.

This Council resolves:

- To make clear its opposition to the Housing and Planning Bill and continue to warn the Government and others of the impact of the Housing & Planning Bill on Hackney particularly with respect to the likely damage of housing tax or levy, the extension of right-to-buy and the 'starter homes' requirement on the local availability of affordable homes.
- To ask the Cabinet Member for Housing to write to the Secretary of State with the Council's concerns about the Bill;
- To ask the Cabinet Member for Housing to write to Hackney's Members of Parliament with the Council's concerns about the Bill;
- To continue to support Living in Hackney's work to scrutinise the impact of the forced sales of Council homes and the expansion of right to buy;
- To continue with the Hackney Estate Regeneration Programme and other housing schemes to build new truly affordable housing for rent and to buy in Hackney;
- To work with Housing Associations that share Hackney's commitment to truly affordable homes through the Better Homes Partnership to ensure resources that can be used to build truly affordable homes stay in Hackney;
- To continue to ensure the Council's concerns about the Bill, are widely known by publishing information on the council's website, organising a meeting to brief Hackney Homes tenants and leaseholders, as well as using the local press to explain the impact.'

For: Many  
Against: 2  
Abstentions: 0

**15 Appointments to Committees (standing item)**

15.1 **RESOLVED** that the appointment of Anne Canning (Director of Education at the Hackney Learning Trust) to the Health and Wellbeing Board in their interim capacity as the Council's statutory officer for Children's Services, be agreed.

**Duration of meeting:** 7:00 – 10:10pm



## Appendix One

### 7.7 From Councillor Patrick to the Cabinet Member for Housing:

“In light of the Prime Minister's recent commitment to invest in the rebuilding of 100 housing estates across the country, can the Cabinet Member for Housing update members on the support the Government currently provides to delivering good quality social housing here in Hackney and what work is taking place not just to rebuild but upgrade existing housing stock?”

#### Response from Councillor Glanville:

The Prime Minister announced on 10<sup>th</sup> January his intention to establish a national £140m fund to ‘jump start regeneration’ on 100 ‘sink’ estates in the country. The Prime Minister’s announcement was rather short on detail about how the scheme would work, however his core funding announcement began to unravel almost as soon as it had been trailed. His pledge could mean less than £1.4m per estate, or approximately £4,500 per home, on an average sized estate of 300 homes. This is clearly insignificant in the context of the housing investment and regeneration challenges facing councils, and inadequate in the context of the investment this Council has made and continues to make in its own regeneration programmes, largely from its own resources.

This council has made hard choices to deliver a programme to build new housing for social rent, shared ownership as well as private sale to pay for them in the absence of government funding. The scale of the programme in Hackney demonstrates the total insignificance of the funding announced by the Prime Minister. I also feel given the lack of information, as well as the regeneration naivety displayed in the announcement, that it would be very unlikely that Hackney would want to take part, indeed there are no plans to expand the existing regeneration programme to include more estates.

Over the next four years, the Council, along with its partners, will build 3,000 new homes, of which half will be for social rent and shared ownership. More than 600 of these affordable homes will be developed directly by the Council. Upon completion, the programme aims to deliver 1,236 new build affordable homes, comprising 717 homes for social rent, and 519 homes for shared ownership.

The £1.4m per estate the Prime Minister has pledged, has to be viewed in the context of the level of investment the Council has made and is continuing to make to improve housing and build new homes, which will be in the region of over £500m when the existing housing regeneration programme is complete, largely funded without any government support. It is unlikely that the Prime Minister’s £140m would cover the cost of marketing these 100 so called ‘sink’ estates to investment vehicles and developers as he implied was the plan.

I would not describe any estate in Hackney in the language the Prime Minister used and I am sure you would agree that his comments demonstrate an ignorance of the vibrant, mixed and settled communities that have made their home in Hackney’s estates. It is also why through the Housing Supply Programme we will focus on delivering high quality additional homes through developing underused sites on existing estates.

**Wednesday, 27th January, 2016**

We continue to campaign for a funding and regulatory environment that would allow the council to expand upon what is already one of the UK's largest affordable housing programmes, for example by raising or abolishing the HRA debt cap. This Council will of course examine all opportunities to bid for additional finance from either central government or the GLA. However, we will not take funding at the expense of our values and longstanding commitments to residents. If funding for new housing, as I imagine this latest scheme will do, come with ideological strings attached that would force the council to replace genuinely affordable social rents with so call 'affordable' 80% market rents or 'starter homes' out of reach of all but the richest few, we would not be interested in taking part. Neither would we voluntarily accept conditions that would force us to abandon secure lifetime tenancies or charge families on the living wage a full market rent.

In addition to the Council's housing regeneration investment, a further £184m has been invested in improving tenants' homes in Hackney through the Council's Decent Homes and Hackney Investment Programme. To date, the Council has delivered 10,800 new kitchens and bathrooms, 14,753 new roofs and 16,700 new windows to tenants' homes. An additional £100m has been allocated to spend on modernising kitchens and bathrooms over the period between April 2015 and March 2024. It is estimated that over 10,000 homes will benefit from this work over the next 10 years.

**7.8 From Councillor Chapman to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Sustainability:**

"With the coldest winter in 58 years set to hit UK, can the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Sustainability set out what measures will be put in place to prepare the borough for the extreme weather?"

Response from Councillor Demirci:

The Council's Winter Service (roads) standby commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2015 and it is anticipated to end week commencing 13<sup>th</sup> March 2016 (20 weeks). There is the scope to extend this period if required. There have been four call outs to our contractors to undertake precautionary salting on the prescribed routes, once on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2016 and three times during the week commencing 18<sup>th</sup> January. Since the national problems associated with salt supplies in 2008/2009 and 2009/2010, we have increased our own salt supply. Currently the roads network has 310 tonnes of salt in stock. In addition, the Council holds approximately 500 tonnes of salt at Millfields Depot.

The Winter Service plans that deal with treating the highway network are reviewed as required. The Winter Service is provided principally by three internal service areas and one external body. Streetscene manage the service on the carriageway, Environmental Operations deal with the footways on the public highway network, Hackney Homes manage the estates, and the strategic roads (red routes) running through the borough are managed by Transport for London (TfL). In addition to these areas of responsibility, our Parks Service also deal with cycle routes that traverse areas within their control.

Hackney, along with TfL and other London boroughs, has an agreed criterion that prioritises the road network for winter treatment. The Main and Susceptible Route network that we treat has evolved and expanded over the years. It now includes all of the borough's main roads and bus routes, roads that are susceptible to freezing earlier than others, and the majority of hills and

**Wednesday, 27th January, 2016**

vehicular access routes to emergency services buildings and hospitals. Entrances to transport hubs, education establishments, school crossings, health centres, and supported living schemes/sheltered accommodation are also considered priority locations for gritting.

We currently grit as standard approximately 70km of carriageway, which equates to over 30% of the borough's entire network. It is not practically possible or financially viable to treat all of the borough's roads, therefore the roads that are treated have been assessed as meeting the greatest need in keeping as much of the network open as possible. If these roads have cycle routes on them, then they are treated every time we go out. Whilst it is these roads that will be prioritised, where residents are experiencing accessibility issues due to disabilities, we will do our best to accommodate their needs.

The rest of the borough is split into four, roughly equal sized areas which cover the North, North East, Central and South of the borough. These carriageways, which are mainly residential, quieter roads, will only be treated when the main routes are clear. Cycle routes that form part of these roads would be treated at this time.

Environmental Operations carry out snow clearance and gritting to the borough's footpaths broadly in line with the road network priorities. We will also grit side streets to allow access for refuse vehicles to carry out scheduled waste collections.