

**Councillors in  
Attendance:**

Mayor Philip Glanville, Cllr Kam Adams, Cllr Soraya Adejare, Cllr Brian Bell, Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble, Cllr Laura Bunt, Cllr Jon Burke, Cllr Sophie Cameron, Cllr Robert Chapman, Cllr Feryal Demirci, Cllr Michael Desmond, Cllr Tom Ebbutt, Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas, Cllr Margaret Gordon, Cllr Michelle Gregory, Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr Ben Hayhurst, Cllr Ned Hercock, Cllr Abraham Jacobson, Cllr Richard Lufkin, Cllr Yvonne Maxwell, Cllr Clayeon McKenzie, Cllr Jonathan McShane, Cllr Sem Moema, Cllr Patrick Moule, Cllr Sally Mulready, Cllr Ann Munn, Cllr Guy Nicholson, Cllr Harvey Odze, Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli, Cllr Benzion Papier, Cllr Sharon Patrick, Cllr James Peters, Cllr Emma Plouviez, Cllr Clare Potter, Cllr Tom Rahilly, Cllr Ian Rathbone, Cllr Rebecca Rennison, Cllr Anna-Joy Rickard, Cllr Rosemary Sales, Cllr Caroline Selman (Independent Member), Cllr Ian Sharer, Cllr Nick Sharman, Cllr Peter Snell, Cllr Simche Steinberger, Cllr Vincent Stops, Cllr Geoff Taylor (Deputy Speaker) and Cllr Carole Williams

**Apologies:**

Cllr Dawood Akhoun, Cllr Will Brett, Cllr Barry Buitekant, Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Sophie Conway, Cllr Sade Etti, Cllr Christopher Kennedy, Cllr M Can Ozsen and Cllr Jessica Webb

**Officer Contact:**

Emma Perry, Governance Services

---

**Councillor Soraya Adejare [Speaker] in the Chair**

**1 Apologies for Absence**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Etti, Buitekant, Kennedy, Webb and

**2 Speaker's Announcements**

21. The Speaker told Council of the upcoming half marathon on 20<sup>th</sup> May, at which Mayor Glanville would be partaking.

### 3 **Declarations of Interest**

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

### 4 **Minutes of the previous meeting**

**RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2018 be approved, subject to amendment to minutes 4.1, as follows:

‘The Prime Minister had given assurance to the 3 million European people who are here that they will be welcome here after Brexit.’

and to minute 3.1 clarifying that having declared an interest in agenda item 6.1 Councillor Sem Moema left the room during consideration this item.

### 5 **Petitions for debate - Walford Road area closures consultation**

Lucy Harbor presented the petition on behalf of William Patten Primary School Parents Groups. The parents of the children attending William Patten Primary School objected to the proposals for the closure of Walford and Brighton Roads as this would lead to an increase in traffic passing the school, a decrease in air quality which would have negative health impact on children.

William Patten School was one of the top 50 polluted schools in London with NO<sub>2</sub> levels in excess of the EU legal limit. The proposals would increase the levels of traffic at the school making the air quality worse for the school children. Research had supported the findings that air pollution affected children’s health in particular their cognitive development

Ms Harbor requested that the error in the consultation literature be corrected, secondly that the mayor fulfil his pledge on air quality and abandon the proposals and finally reduce pollution level at schools by taking action.

Ms Harbor stated that all children had the right to walk to school free from pollution and requested that the Council find a solution that would benefit all groups.

Cllr Stops expressed his support for the proposals emphasising that the Council had a long term strategy to improve air quality through its cycling and walking initiatives, which intended to discourage people from driving. Moreover, road closures would reduce traffic in the borough and decrease air pollution.

Cllr Steinberger supported the petition expressing concern at the high levels of pollutions at schools. He believed that the proposals would not address pollution but re-route the traffic to nearby roads increasing traffic on some roads. It was important to listen to residents objections and review schemes that were unsuccessful and save public money.

Cllrs Fajana- Thomas and Hercock welcomed the measures to tackle high levels of air pollution at schools in Hackney and the need to work with the William Patten parent group to address their concerns.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

Although Cllr Jacobson expressed sympathy with the parent's group he believed that the proposals would encourage parents and children to walk to school.

Cllr Demirci responded that ..

*The petitioner asked for 3 outcomes which were not in the original petition.*

*1. The council admitted that the statistics around air pollution outside the school were wrong and misleading.*

*2. The council scrapped the scheme and started afresh.*

*3. The council would never do anything to increase the pollution around the school.*

*Cllr Demirci responded*

1. She disagreed that the statistics were misleading or wrong and she was happy to meet with the petitioner to discuss the statistics.
2. The council would not scrap the scheme but a decision had not yet been made and the statistics were still being analysed and a decision would be made in June.
3. Doing nothing would increase air pollution around the school and the current situation was not in breach of the EU pollution limits. The Council was undertaking in depth modelling of the pollution around the school and the results would be available in June.

She said something about parents being satisfied with the results but she will have to add that in as I think it begs the question of what will the council do if parents are not satisfied.

Ms Harbor welcomed the offer to work with Cllr Fajana –Thomas on this issue.

## **6 Deputations**

6.2. Proposals to change Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) Funding Arranging

The deputation was introduced by Cllr Margaret Gordon.

6.3 Lisa Kelleher told Council that she was present to represent the Parents and Carers from the SEN Campaign Group. She herself had four children in Hackney Schools and two of these children received SEN support. She told Council of the Group's concern at the proposals to change Special Educational Needs and Disabilities funding arrangements and its' effect on these children. She asked Council to reconsider (1) the proposed 5% cut to SEND spending (2) not to vary the provisions of the service as required by the Children's Act. (3) To take a long term strategic approach to SEND. Lisa Kelleher considered that the Council should look at the demographics and consider what can be provided. For instance, she highlighted the difficulties that would be caused through a 5% cut to the visually impaired together with cuts to specialised teaching. She expressed concern that the 'circle of friends' was to receive large cut.

Lisa Kelleher went on to say that there had been a significant drop in SEN service provision with more than 5% cuts. She expressed concern about reduced support to children's playgrounds and special schemes and highlighted the danger of driving children out of mainstream schools. She told Council that £3.8m was going to out of Borough schools where costs were high with no control.

6.4 Councillor Simche Steinberger expressed concerns about changes to SEND funding arrangements and asked what assurances had been received about the service. He told the group that the Conservative group would do all it could to support.

6.5 Councillor Sharer told Council that he was the grandfather of a Downs Syndrome child and expressed concern that the most vulnerable in society would be affected by the proposals.

6.6 Councillor James Peters told Council that he was a governor of a special school and that there was likely to be a decrease in specialist provision in the Borough and that his school could only maintain the service for a short time. He expressed concern that since 2011 there had been no increase in Central Government funding for these services, despite there being an expansion in the Council's statutory duties in this area. He expressed concern about the consultation on changes to SEND funding and the Conservative Party's austerity.

6.7 Councillor M Can Ozsen thanked the group for coming to Council to make representations on this issue and referred to the consultation around SEND funding as being very stark and that cuts would be severe. He expressed concerns about the morality of a bankrupt society.

6.8 Deputy Mayor Bramble strongly expressed her concerns about the fact that the funding of SEND was in a state of crisis. 100m was being cut from services to children with special needs across London. Government Funding to Hackney was to be cut by 1m. The Council was using current financial resources to sustain spending in this area in the future. Deputy Mayor Bramble referred to ongoing Government lobbying in opposition to the changes in funding. She herself had written to the responsible minister outlining concerns and had given evidence in Parliament. She stated that the Government had taken half of the existing funding out of the Borough and the Council now faced many difficult choices. Deputy Mayor Bramble told Council that as a teacher she had worked with parents and children with a range of special needs and

that of central importance was the need to protect children. She asked all concerned to lobby Government against the cuts.

## 7 Questions from Members of the Public

### 7.1 Question from Mr Christopher Sills to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Housing Need:

What steps do you propose to take to eliminate the use of bed and breakfast accommodation during the next administration both on financial and social grounds and would you agree with me that blaming the Government is no excuse for inaction?

Councillor Rennison explained that traditionally, the London Borough of Hackney has not been reliant on bed & breakfast accommodation as part of its provision of temporary accommodation. The Council retained a significant hostel stock portfolio to use as emergency accommodation and has in the past largely been able to source adequate numbers of properties from private landlords on the open market, therefore placing a family in bed & breakfast accommodation (B&B) has always been the last resort when all other options have been exhausted.

However, a combination of rising rents and welfare reform is driving a rapid rise in homelessness. This has significantly increased demand on our current temporary accommodation (TA) stock whilst simultaneously reducing our ability to secure additional affordable housing. Subsequently it has been necessary to make more of usage of B&B accommodation and for longer periods.

The Council has taken a number of steps both to increase supply of alternative accommodation and to prioritise the families placed in B&B into moving into alternative temporary accommodation.

These steps include:

- Expanding our directly managed hostel offer; we now have 34 temporary accommodation hostels providing 814 bed spaces, the highest in London. Work is ongoing on a new 148 bed space hostel, which is expected to be available shortly and plans are being drawn up for a further hostel in Kingsland Road which will deliver 321 additional units.
- In addition to expanding our hostel stock, we have made extensive use of void stock pending regeneration work. To date this has delivered another 300+ properties. All void properties marked for future phases of the Councils regeneration scheme have been brought back into use and utilised for TA households.
- Work is being undertaken to bring a derelict building back into usage, with building works set to commence April. The space surrounding this hostel, has been recently surveyed with a view to delivery of additional TA units through the use of modular housing. A specification is now being sought.
- 20 above shop units have been secured from Housing on yearly leases suitable for small families, whilst we have purchased 4 properties to be used as Temporary Accommodation;
- Registered Social Landlords have been asked to identify properties they own but do not use, that could become Temporary Accommodation. From this work the service have obtained a 6 unit property, plus two additional three bedroom houses which are being refurbished and repurposed for TA use.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

- Increasing use is being made of out-of-borough accommodation with nearly 1000 households currently placed outside the borough.
- Repurposing the Councils Housing Supply team to obtain more private rented units from landlords both inside and outside London, while a new TA Move-On team has been established to facilitate those households who have been in TA the longest into secure permanent accommodation.
- The Council are also working with the West London Housing Partnership to obtain properties under Assured Shorthold Tenancies. The West London Housing Partnership has offered other London Local Authorities the chance to utilise their Out of London Housing Service, and Hackney have taken up this offer of Housing Supply as a vehicle through which to procure properties in Bradford and West Yorkshire into which the Council can discharging homeless duty. We are actively seeking to acquire suitable private sector properties in the West Midlands, as well as closer to London.
- A review of the current incentives and how they might be improved is being undertaken with a view to making our offer more attractive to landlords.
- We deliver formal "Tenancy Training" for all households who are looking to obtain or have secured an Assured Shorthold Tenancy in the Private Rented Sector.
- Despite this aggressive expansion of TA stock, demand continues to exceed supply and will do so unless we can source a significant number of affordable properties into which families in TA can be permanently housed. In recognition the extent of the problem the Council have implemented a new TA placement and discharge policy, which allows placement and discharge of duty outside of London in appropriate circumstances.

Since bringing these changes online we have seen a notable decrease in both the number of households in B&B accommodation but also in the number of families whose stay exceeds 6 weeks.

Since peaking in the middle of 2016, the number of families has been reduced by 25%, whilst those who have been in B&B over six weeks has been cut by nearly 40%; this is quite an achievement given the current market and the increasing pressure on homeless services. We cannot say that B&B accommodation will be eliminated but members can be assured that every effort is being made to minimise their usage.

The Council had been campaigning for the local housing allowance to reflect Hackney and London costs.

In response to a supplementary question, Cllr Rennison assured Mr Sills that the Council was support families in Bed and Breakfast or temporary accommodation and working to decrease the number of households in B&B accommodation. However this was dependent on increasing the availability of housing accommodation and changes to the local housing allowance for London.

## 7.2 Question from Mr Les Kelly to the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement

In light of the many major music and cultural events in parks on Hackney's borders, what measure is the Council taking to reduce disruption and nuisance to local residents on our side of the border.

Councillor Caroline Selman told Council that Islington Council took account of the views of Hackney in arrangements for events. She reported meetings with councillors

and staff at Haringey Council where concerns were expressed about anti-social behaviour arising from events. It was agreed to increase security at events and put a security plan in place with parking restrictions in areas adjacent to the event. In relation to Victoria Park, Tower Hamlets now had new operators, with whom there would be a meeting in the coming days. Councillor Selman confirmed that work was ongoing to mitigate the problems and clear changes were being put forward on which the Council would work with residents.

Mr Les Kelly recommended to work with other parks outside Hackney borders including Hounslow and Ealing.

## 8 Questions from Members of the Council

### 8.1 From Councillor Snell to the Mayor:

The 'Hackney Loves You' campaign is very popular with the very high proportion of European citizens who live in Hackney, and particularly the even higher proportion in Dalston. Can the Mayor please advise Council what has been achieved so far by this initiative and what the government should do to help the Council better support local residents living in fear of Tory Brexit policies?

#### Response:

The Mayor stated that last year, as part of our Hackney Loves You campaign, he called on the Government to give some clarity and reassurance to the 41,500 Hackney residents who are from other EU countries. They had made an enormous contribution to its civic, economic and cultural life; they were our friends, neighbours and colleagues; and their skills, expertise, creativity and energy were at the heart of our vibrant and innovative economy.

Hackney prided itself on its cultural diversity and the thousands of Europeans who had chosen to live and work here were a key part of what made the borough so special. We were proud that 78.5% of Hackney voted to Remain, the third highest remain vote in the country. The way our EU citizens were being used as bargaining chips as part of the Government's Brexit negotiations, left feeling unwanted and unsure about their future, was unacceptable. We all agree they deserved better.

The Mayor personally wrote to Brexit Minister David Davis, as well as his Labour and Lib Dem equivalents, calling for clarity and reassurance on the future rights of our EU citizens. He had also signed a joint letter to Prime Minister Theresa May, sent from the Mayor's and Leaders of London's Labour boroughs.

These actions, and the associated communications and the blue EU-theme badges were much-appreciated by our EU residents in particular. **Social Workers and Garden School.** The Council had also wrote to local businesses asking them to share their thoughts and concerns.

Prime Minister Theresa May gave our EU citizens some reassurance when she announced in December that they would have their residency rights protected. Though, there is still uncertainty about the rights of EU citizens who arrive during the transition period and the Council will continue to call for clarity around this.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

However, whereas the borough's EU residents had received some much-needed clarity, business owners in the borough were still in the dark about what Brexit may mean for them, and the future of their businesses, their staff and the communities they serve.

Hackney was one of London's most thriving and innovative boroughs. It had experienced more than 40% business growth since 2010, creating thousands of new jobs and opportunities, particularly in the tech, hospitality and creative industries.

Hackney had a world-renowned community of digital entrepreneurs in Tech City at the forefront of the fourth industrial revolution, and a rich mix across the borough of bars, pubs and restaurants, makers and manufacturers, artists and creatives, and innovative start-ups in many fields. Hackney's success in these sectors was intrinsically linked to trade with the EU as well as the skills and enterprise of the EU citizens who live and work here.

Unfortunately, many of Hackney's business owners are now questioning their future in the borough. Some were already feeling the fall-out from Brexit, whether it was from the devaluation of the pound or some of their staff leaving London, and others were fearful about what kind of trade deal, if any, would be struck with the EU.

As made clear by research published recently by the GLA, a hard Brexit would put Hackney's growing economic success in jeopardy, something expressed every day from our diverse business owners, many of whom fear it would lead to them having to close down or leave the UK. The Cambridge Econometrics report estimated that 'no deal' would result in 87,000 fewer jobs in London by 2030, with Hackney's share of the loss being 2,100.

And maintaining Hackney's successful local economies isn't just about business, they're at the heart of helping us deliver on a huge range of wider socioeconomic aspirations to improve the lives of our residents.

So, the Council's focus now had shifted to our business community. Theresa May needed to show leadership and deliver on sensible trading arrangements which would secure jobs, growth and prosperity in Hackney, London and throughout the entire UK.

Some practical steps the Council was taking to maintain pressure on the Government and support our business community included submitting a response to an LGA call for evidence on the impact of Brexit; keeping businesses informed about developments and offering support and guidance where possible; using Hackney Works and Employment and Skills officers to explore how we could address any potential future skills gap; and we were looking to organise a conference for businesses about Brexit, explaining some of the issues, what it may mean to them and how the Council can work together to support our local economies.

The borough had one of the best SEND provision.

In response to a supplementary question, the Mayor emphasised that they were liaising with all partners in the public sector including health authorities regarding workers from the EU.

What is being done with the regards to the ongoing situation with defective Gerda doors installed in Hackney Homes street properties?

Response:

Councillor McKenzie explained that between 2004 to 2013 under instructions from both the Council and Hackney Homes, Gerda installed around 16,000 flat entrance doors in Council properties.

These doors were primarily designed to provide residents with additional security. During this period the crime figure for break-ins on the borough's estates dramatically reduced.

It subsequently became apparent from 2007 onwards the coating on these doors were not fit for purpose, particularly in exposed conditions, and in many cases the coating began to peel off. Hackney Homes raised this with Gerda who promised to replace defective doors. This has unfortunately involved some tenants waiting considerable periods for defective doors to be replaced.

Since the return of the housing stock to the Council, Gerda had been pursued under the terms of the warranty on the doors and Gerda again agreed to replace the problem doors. To date, approximately 1300 doors had been replaced. However, because of delays in the replacement programme and a slow time scale for the replacement the Council had now instructed external solicitors, Sharpe & Pritchard, to progress the matter with Gerda.

Approximately 284 defective doors still require replacement.

In response to a supplementary question, Councillor McKenzie apologised to the residents affected by the defective doors and that the Council had listened to residents concern and learnt from its mistake.

#### 8.7 From Councillor Harvey Odze to the Mayor:

In the Mayor's opinion what are the most important strategic actions that he can take to alleviate the current housing crisis in Hackney.

Mayor Glanville stated that the best way to alleviate the current housing crisis was to have a labour government, failing that to convince the government to end the damaging welfare reform, have proper regulation of the private rented sector, investment in social housing – giving local government the same freedoms that any Housing Association would have. With this the Council could build so many properties by 2025.

Turning to what we are doing now

Last month, the Council unanimously adopted a new Hackney Housing Strategy with 35 actions. This was an ambitious programme setting out what the Council will do in relation to:

- Building high quality, well designed and genuinely affordable new homes in the borough
- Making best use of our new and existing homes
- Addressing poor standards and affordability in the private rented sector
- Meeting people's housing needs and helping tackle housing-related health and support needs

- Helping promote employment and sustainable communities

He stated that the housing market was broken. The Council needed the financial freedoms to enable it to expand its housebuilding programmes, for example by raising the artificial cap on Council borrowing and allowing the Council to retain full receipts from its Right to Buy sales. The Council was seeking changes to private renting, such as inflation-capped rent increases and the stable, longer term tenancies that would improve the sector for both tenants and landlords.

Mayor Glanville reminded Council of what the Council had done since 2010 including building 300 new council homes and started work on hundreds more, increased numbers of Ha's and Managing the biggest increase in visible and invisible homelessness it had ever seen. Further it had set out plans to introduce licensing and had set up a housing company.

The Council's Housing Strategy sets out the huge challenge before us and the actions the Council and its partners will take over next five years to help meet those challenges.

Further updates will of course be in our manifesto, I'll make sure he gets a copy.

## 8.2 From Councillor Stops to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, Transport and Parks:

It's good to read that all of Hackneys plastics are re-processed in the UK. Can you tell members the reprocessing company by material, percentage fraction and what these materials are used for? Can you also tell members what happens to the rest of the materials?

### Response:

Councillor Demirci explained the arrangements for the sorting and processing of plastics collected in Hackney, which were managed by the North London Waste Authority (NLWA). Plastics from Hackney were sent with other mixed dry recyclables to the Bywaters materials recycling facility (MRF) at Bow and to the Biffa facility at Edmonton. The two facilities had slightly different sorting equipment, but plastic containers were separated into different polymers and made into pellets or flakes (mostly in the UK) that the manufacturers of new plastic products can use.

The NLWA had provided a breakdown of plastic material by type and destination processed through both MRFs which showed that in the first six months of 2017/18 almost 83% of plastics went to UK reprocessors. The remaining 17% of materials were sold to other MRFs in the UK or to brokers and at this stage onwards they could be processed overseas or in the UK depending on the best price attainable at that time for the quality and type of material.

With regards to the types of material and their use, the plastics are:

- **PET (Polyethylene terephthalate):** typically used in the production of new drinks bottles and various other grades of food packaging.
- **HDPE/PP (High density polyethylene/Polypropylene):** typically found in milk jugs, plastic bags and refillable plastic bottles. In addition to plastic lumber and plastic furniture, recycled HDPE is used to manufacture lawn and garden products, buckets, crates, office products and automobile parts.
- **LDPE (Low density polyethylene):** typically used in bin bags, agricultural film (like the type you may see spread over a field) or irrigation pipe.

And the other materials are:

- **Metal tins and cans** are sorted into steel and aluminium. The metal can be converted back into new metal products.
- **Glass:** The final product is either used for fibre optics, insulation, bottle manufacturing or aggregate in road construction.
- **Paper/ Card** is turned into new paper and card products.

HACKNEY BYWATERS			
COMPANY	Q1	Q2	TOTAL
Bolton Bros	24.59	15.27	<b>39.86</b>
Vanden Recycling Ltd	24.57	23.03	<b>47.60</b>
Oatley Resources Ltd	15.77	48.06	<b>63.83</b>
99P RECYCLING LIMITED	17.21	0.00	<b>17.21</b>
Ruse and Co Ltd	8.56	14.97	<b>23.53</b>
Monoworld Limited	10.05	8.95	<b>19.01</b>
Love Waste Limited	49.72	0.00	<b>49.72</b>
Vanden Recycling Ltd	0.00	44.29	<b>44.29</b>
Bolton Bros	10.46	7.22	<b>17.68</b>
Loop Management Services Ltd	0.00	0.10	<b>0.10</b>
Loop Management Services Ltd	0.30	0.00	<b>0.30</b>
Viridor	75.90	72.25	<b>148.15</b>
Paper Link International FZCO	11.36	0.00	<b>11.36</b>
Vanden Recycling Ltd	0.00	10.47	<b>10.47</b>
Monoworld Ltd	0.00	5.73	<b>5.73</b>
Bolton Bros	5.75	5.80	<b>11.55</b>
Clean Tech Europe Ltd	286.22	320.97	<b>607.20</b>
Veolia ES (UK) Ltd	6.21	0.00	<b>6.21</b>
J & A Young (Leicester) Ltd	66.78	30.50	<b>97.27</b>
Vanden Recycling Ltd	5.28	0.00	<b>5.28</b>
Bolton Bros	0.00	5.23	<b>5.23</b>
MLM Ltd T/A ACN Europe	0.00	24.01	<b>24.01</b>

618.73    636.85    1255.58

PERCENTAGE SPLITS			
Q1	Q2	TOTAL	
3.84%	2.40%	3.12%	MRF
3.84%	3.62%	3.73%	RECYCLER
2.47%	7.55%	5.00%	BROKER
2.69%	0.00%	1.35%	BROKER
1.34%	2.35%	1.84%	BROKER
1.57%	1.41%	1.49%	RECYCLER
7.77%	0.00%	3.89%	RECYCLER
0.00%	6.95%	3.47%	RECYCLER
1.63%	1.13%	1.38%	MRF
0.00%	0.02%	0.01%	BROKER
0.05%	0.00%	0.02%	BROKER
11.87%	11.35%	11.61%	RECYCLER
1.78%	0.00%	0.89%	BROKER
0.00%	1.64%	0.82%	RECYCLER
0.00%	0.90%	0.45%	RECYCLER
0.90%	0.91%	0.90%	MRF
44.75%	50.40%	47.57%	RECYCLER
0.97%	0.00%	0.49%	MRF
10.44%	4.79%	7.62%	RECYCLER
0.82%	0.00%	0.41%	RECYCLER
0.00%	0.82%	0.41%	MRF
0.00%	3.77%	1.88%	BROKER

HACKNEY BIFFA			
COMPANY	Q1	Q2	TOTAL
Biffa Polymers	0.59	0.00	<b>0.59</b>
Biffa Polymers	3.02	0.00	<b>3.02</b>
Love Waste Ltd	0.46	0.00	<b>0.46</b>
WR Fibers UK Ltd	0.85	0.00	<b>0.85</b>
Viridor Waste Kent Ltd	2.04	0.00	<b>2.04</b>
WR Fibers UK Ltd	1.45	0.00	<b>1.45</b>
Monoworld Ltd	0.15	0.00	<b>0.15</b>
Clean Tech UK Ltd	12.19	0.00	<b>12.19</b>
J & A Young Ltd	0.15	0.00	<b>0.15</b>

20.91    0.00    20.91

PERCENTAGE SPLITS			
Q1	Q2	TOTAL	
0.09%	0.00%	0.05%	RECYCLER
0.47%	0.00%	0.24%	RECYCLER
0.07%	0.00%	0.04%	RECYCLER
0.13%	0.00%	0.07%	EXPORTER
0.32%	0.00%	0.16%	RECYCLER
0.23%	0.00%	0.11%	EXPORTER
0.02%	0.00%	0.01%	RECYCLER
1.91%	0.00%	0.96%	RECYCLER
0.02%	0.00%	0.01%	RECYCLER

639.63 636.85 1276.49

RECYCLED IN UK		
Q1	Q2	TOTAL
83.97%	81.05%	82.52%

## 8.6 From Councillor Ian Sharer to the Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Enforcement

What measures are being taken to reduce violent crime in the borough.

### Response:

Councillor Selman replied that over the rolling 12 months LBH had seen a 39.7% increase in robberies with a 29.2% increase in mobile phone related robberies. As already indicated a third of knife crime offences involved robberies. The most prevalent robbery offence type was street related robberies with a significant number being associated with moped related crimes.

Partnership Response to Robbery included:

- A police led robbery action plan has been implemented involving close working with LBH enforcement Officers.
- A process to remove abandoned mopeds is close to being implemented by LBH.
- A robbery response plan exists including all robberies being monitored by a Detective Inspector.
- All outstanding suspects for robbery are monitored at the weekly offender management meeting.
- Forensic hits are expediently progressed and monitored at the weekly offender management meeting.
- A review of CCTV coverage connected to robbery hotspots to maximise evidence capture.
- Safer schools officers have developed a “gateway” where pupils can report allegations of this crime to a teacher or mentor.
- Moped robberies are to be personally monitored by a Detective Inspector.

Hackney is also experiencing a spike in gang related violence across the Borough but in particular N16. It was important to say that this conflict involved many gangs with many of the victims being in the adult category.

Having had no murders for two years the Borough had unfortunately experienced four murders from 13<sup>th</sup> November 2017 to 8<sup>th</sup> January 2018. Although the motive for this increased tension was unclear it was thought to be linked to a power struggle within the area for control of crime markets. Gangs analysis and intelligence sharing informs partnership deployments.

Partnership Response to Gang Violence included:

- Increased proactive policing in those affected areas. This includes the deployment of the IGU, TSG (Police) and outreach teams (Young Hackney).
- The implementation of temporary Section 60 powers. LBH has seized the most knives in London.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

- The development of an intelligence collation plan- Superintendent Crawley leading.
- Deployment of Trojan firearms assets in the vicinity.
- Co-ordinating Gold Groups to jointly respond to the challenge with communication links to better inform communities.
- It must be stressed that the Borough has seen a reduction in firearm offences over the rolling 12 months.
- Commissioning of diversionary activities including Mentivation (outreach and 121 sessions), Parents Voice (to better inform parents), St Giles (breaking the cycle of gang involvement through providing training, support and education). Empower London (working with girls at risk of child sexual exploitation). Hackney CVS (bid to lottery fund to better undertake mentoring and parental support within the Borough).

Knife crime has increased 17% in the financial year and 28.9% in the calendar year. Over 58% of knife crime incidents do not result in injury with only 4.5% resulting in moderate to severe injuries.

The predominant crime associated with knife crime was street robbery, which accounted for 29% of the total offences. Offensive weapons accounted for 22% of offences with harassment result in 16% of those crimes.

Unfortunately, LBH had recently witnessed three separate murders and a number of serious stabbings and shootings predominantly in the N16 area. These offences were believed to be gang related involving a number of gangs in the Hackney area.

The main hotspots for knife crime are- N16, Dalston, Hackney Central, Brownswood, Haggerston and Shoreditch.

Partnership Response to Knife Crime included:

- A CSP Knife Crime Action Plan has been developed and is being implemented.
- Operation Sceptre involving enhanced police and partnership patrols is continuing with LBH routinely attracting this resource. Currently being deployed in N16.
- Operation Winters Nights has focus onto Knife Crime hotspots and the knife seizure in our Borough is one of the highest across London.
- Trading Standards continue to undertake test purchase operations across the Borough with warning being given to a minority of store keepers.
- Much youth related outreach activities have been and are continuing to be delivered in schools, on the street and other venues with prevention in mind.
- Many Knife Crime weapon sweeps have been undertaken directed by the LBH weekly tasking process. With Community led sweeps being planned for the future.
- Enhanced patrols and enforcement in the N16 area together with the proportionate use of Section 60 stop and search powers.

The function of the quarterly Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) Strategic Board was to lead an effective co-ordinated community response model in Hackney to VAWG, including identifying and addressing strategic issues and risks, overseeing the VAWG strategy and making appropriate recommendations to other relevant strategic boards on the issues of VAWG.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

Membership of the Board consisted of Safer Communities, Children and Families, Public Health, Adult Services, Housing Needs and Benefits, Neighbourhood Services, Hackney CVS, VAWG Specialist Providers Group, Police, Probation, Hackney Clinical Commissioning Group and East London Mental Health Trust.

The last meeting was held on 18 October 2017 and the following issues were discussed:

- Feedback on discussions at the VAWG Operational Group held on 7 September 2017 on Hackney's work relating to Modern Day Slavery and Human Trafficking- training will be held on this topic in early 2018.
- Hackney Women's Haven (HWH) gave a brief overview of the work they undertake. This is a four year project funded by the Big Lottery Fund Women and Girls Initiative. HWH primarily works with older women living with domestic violence (DV), women of faith, Rastafarian women and women and girls of African heritage affected by DV and abuse of female genital mutilation (FGM). The programme has been running for a year and has already exceeded their targets in terms of outreach and community awareness.
- Update on Domestic Homicide (DHR) Reviews- three DHR Reports are yet to be published. One was published and then withdrawn due to the family raising issues. This is now being edited and will be sent back to the Home Office; one is still with the Home Office; and the third has recently been submitted to the Home Office for final approval.
- Update on MARAC - MARAC hears about 20 cases per fortnight. There was a big increase in Q2 (Jul-Sep), which was consistent with the same period last year and a similar picture in the Domestic Abuse Team. An area of concern highlighted was that no referrals come through from the Jewish Community. Jewish Women's Aid have also highlighted that they have difficulty reaching out to the Orthodox Community. This is being followed up through the MARAC Steering Group.
- Update on perpetrator work - DAIS will be bringing the perpetrator assessment and intervention work delivery under the Troubled Families Programme in-house in 2018, taking over from RISE.
- A summary of the thematic report about Local Authorities' Response to Children Living with Domestic Abuse was presented. This related to a multi-agency inspection undertaken by HMIP, HMICFRS, CQC and Ofsted. The report calls for a national public health initiative to raise awareness of domestic abuse and violence and calls for a greater focus on perpetrators, better strategies for the prevention of domestic abuse and services that repair the damage caused by domestic abuse. Learning from the report will be reflected in the VAWG Action Plan. The possibility of holding a joint event with the Adult and Children's Safeguarding Boards is being explored to consider learning from the report and any local actions that may be useful to pursue.

#### Night Time Economy (NTE)

- The night time economy (NTE) strategy was monitored at the Weekly tasking meeting attended by key stakeholders. For example we have taken enforcement action including test purchase operations at a number of high risk premises.
- In collaboration with the police we are supporting a night time economy team who are directed to key hotspots through NTE analysis.
- Our enforcement officers are deployed in Shoreditch and other NTE hotspot areas on a weekly basis and have issued many FPNs for urination and litter.

- Our trading standards team have undertaken many test purchase operations involving Police Cadet and Principle Enforcement Officers.
- A bid has been made to extend CCTV in the Shoreditch area our main NTE area.
- The licensing team have also undertaken licensed premise visits and have also provided a number of warnings and advice to licensees.
- LBH have supported the police to deliver operation Winter Nights aims at reducing NTE and other forms of violence.
- LBH has recently provided detailed consultation updates to MOPAC concerning the Mayor of London's strategic aim to move to 24/7 NTE.

8.12 From Councillor Harvey Odze to the Mayor:

Once the current situation with the senior coroner for North London is resolved, what action does the Mayor propose to take to ensure that Hackney Council has full control over expenditure incurred, which is ultimately paid for by Hackney ratepayers, by public servants that affect the residents of the borough in order to prevent the borough incurring unnecessary huge legal bills.

Mayor Glanville told council that he had written to the London Coroner on this matter and awaited a reply. He understood that judicial review was issued in January this year. He said that it was seeking the Senior Coroner to maintain a policy to prioritize deaths from certain communities on religious grounds and provide an extended out of office coronial service for deaths occurring over the weekend. The substantive hearing of the judicial review was set for 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> March 2018.

He told Council that local authorities had a statutory responsibility to provide and pay for coroner's statutory services. Hackney was part of a consortium with three other Councils, Camden, Islington and Tower Hamlets, that shares the statutory responsibility for the Inner North London coroner. This included legal costs liability for court action against the Coroner, if legal costs are incurred. The London Borough of Hackney, as a member of the Consortium, would be liable to pay one quarter of the Coroner's legal fees, if she seeks legal advice and assistance, and possibly one quarter of Adath Ysroel Burial Society costs if the Coroner defends the claim and loses. At this stage it is not known whether the Coroner will defend the claim or adopt a neutral stance. The Council has no control over how the claim is handled by the Coroner and is a matter for her and the Chief Coroner. It is not expected that the Coroner's legal fees will be significant particularly when split between the four authorities.

In response to Councillor Harvey Odze supplementary question on whether the Mayor would support the much needed change in the law for coroner services.

Mayor Glanville confirmed that a reply from the London Coroner was awaited. He had sympathy for this and emphasised that there may be a need for a London Coroner ? He concluded that there was a need for a cross party dialogue on the matter.

(Due to time constraints questions 8.3, 8.4, and 8.8 to 8.11 were not taken at the meeting and the Speaker advised that members would receive a written response. These responses are attached at Appendix 1.

### **8.3 From Councillor Rickard to the Mayor:**

***'Could the Mayor update us on the current Guinness Trust plans for the regeneration of the Northwold estate?'***

Council officers and I have been in contact with the Guinness Partnership over the last 18 months to emphasise the importance of effective resident consultation regarding their regeneration proposals. The Council wants to ensure that Northwold residents are central to any consultation and decision-making processes about the scope and nature of any possible regeneration programme on the Northwold estate. Most recently, I wrote to Guinness just before Christmas to reiterate my concerns about what I believed to be the lack of meaningful resident consultation to date.

I have been in contact with residents and campaigners – working with you, Cllr Moema and Cllr Desmond as well as local Labour activists.

Took part in an open public meeting late last year.

I set out some clear red lines:

- There was no deal with Guinness
- There could be no net loss of social rented homes
- There should be a look at local management, repairs and investment
- Residents must be fully involved
- They must have access to independent advice
- Right to return and leaseholder offers must be broadly in line with the councils approach
- That any further discussion on use of the Council's CPO powers or land were dependent on the above.

Over the past 18 months, Guinness has put forward four different options for regeneration of the estate. These were not supported by residents, and I am disappointed that residents have not been fully kept up to date and informed about all of the decisions that could have affected their estate.

At the end of January this year, Guinness wrote to residents with new outline proposals for an infill development, which would create 100 additional homes, but only affect two existing homes. I am pleased that Guinness has now communicated its proposed intentions with regard to development of the estate, as well as providing commitments regarding improvements to existing homes and a new, improved community centre. However, the Council was not consulted on this latest proposal in advance, and it also appears to be dependent on the sale of Council land to Guinness – something I reiterate the Council has not agreed to, and would require significant reassurance on – especially on the level of social housing built as part of the plans. For instance on similar sites we achieve 70% affordable.

Guinness must now keep residents fully updated on future detailed proposals for development of the estate, and must take full account of residents' views in making decisions that affect residents and their aspirations for the estate. New work with Mancunian Way

I am sure like me you will continue to show a great deal of interest.

### **8.4 From Councillor Ebbutt to the Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources**

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

***“Can the Cabinet Member responsible for equalities tell me what support the council gives to members of staff who are parents of premature babies?”***

The Mayor and I have been involved in conversations with other Boroughs at our London Council meetings on this issue. Whilst our human resource policies are already flexible in this regard, I agree that it is appropriate that we offer something additional that is concrete and specific to employees going through such a traumatic event. Officers have therefore prepared a report that will offer parents of hospitalised premature babies additional leave at full pay. The details of the scheme will be similar to that recently introduced at Waltham Forest and I envisage it being presented for approval at Corporate Committee on 27 March 2018, and it being effective for babies born from 1 April 2018.

#### **8.8 From Councillor Gordon to the Mayor:**

***“Hackney Almshouse Charity wants to build 30 flats at social rent for local residents and is looking for a suitable site. Could the Mayor update us on the progress of the asset management Strategy in respect of land and property owned by the Council?”***

#### **Response**

[Note: Cllr Gordon is on the Board of Trustees for the charity]

The Council is committed to working with Registered Providers (RPs) and other local housing providers to develop new genuinely affordable housing in the borough to help meet the needs of Hackney households on low and medium incomes. As you have highlighted, Hackney Almshouse Charity has had initial discussions with the Council in respect of its wish to build 30 homes for social rent within the borough.

The charity aims to support people aged over 55 and in financial need, and already provides good quality, affordable housing for this group within the borough. Following discussions with officers, I am pleased that the Council agreed the Charity's application for inclusion on the 'List of Approved Registered Providers' last October. This was in recognition of the Charity's track record in housing provision and their plans to develop new genuinely affordable housing in the borough. Inclusion on the Approved List will help facilitate the process of developing new housing through future discussions with the planning service and, if necessary, with funders.

Furthermore, as many of you may be aware, last summer I launched the Mayor of Hackney Housing Challenge, which enables 30% of the development costs of new homes to be funded through surplus right to buy (one-for-one replacement) receipts that the Council is unable to use towards the construction of new truly affordable homes, due to Government restrictions. Officers have spoken to representatives of the Charity in order to explore the opportunity to work together under this initiative.

The Charity has also approached the Council regarding the possible availability of sites for this purpose. The Council is in the process of developing a Housing Asset Management Strategy and Asset Review process that will, amongst other things, identify and review the future use of council-owned sites that are potentially available for development, either by the Council itself or by other providers. The Asset Management Strategy will be developed during 2018/19, based on new HRA stock condition data and a refresh of the 30-year HRA business plan.

**8.11 From Councillor Dawood Akhoon to the Mayoral Adviser for Private Renting and Housing Affordability:**

***The rent under the London Mayor's living rent scheme costing approximately £1,000 a month, does the Mayor consider this "affordable" for struggling families in Hackney?***

Hackney is one of the most expensive places to buy or rent a house in the country – with the biggest price rises over the last 20 years of any borough, meaning the average house price is now an eye-watering £600,000. This is unaffordable to too many of our residents and has helped contribute to a doubling in the size of the private rented sector, which now houses a third of Hackney residents. But private rent levels are also too high, at an average of £1,800 per month for a two-bedroom property. Like the Coalition Government did for five years, and the current Government has continued to do, this Council could sit back and hope this under-regulated and overheated market simply fixes itself. It could wait and see if the market delivers the social housing we need, the genuinely affordable homes we need for renters, and the low-cost home ownership options young families in Hackney desperately need. I don't think that's good enough. Not good enough for the 13,000 families on our housing waiting list. Not good enough for the 3,000 of those living in temporary accommodation. And not good enough for families facing eviction by a private landlord because their rent is rocketing to record levels. That's why this Council is taking action.

Through our housebuilding programmes, and our work with housing associations, we are doing everything we can to provide genuinely affordable social housing to help meet the need of these households – despite being hamstrung by central government. I am committed to increasing the supply of genuinely affordable housing in the borough to households on low and medium incomes. While social rented homes are the highest priority, we need a range of affordable housing solutions across tenures and price points, to work towards my aim that Hackney becomes a place for everyone. The continued economic success of the borough and our ability to recruit and retain essential public sector workers, such as nurses and teachers, depends on the availability of good quality, genuinely affordable housing for residents on medium incomes.

Our estate regeneration programme is building nearly 3,000 homes, complimented by a new programme of in-house Council development of over 400 Council homes on empty and underused land, 70% of which is for social rent and low cost home ownership.

The Mayor of London's London Living Rent is aimed at working Londoners who are priced out of housing locally, but wouldn't normally qualify for social housing. This is an example of how we can take action to help our residents, rather than standing by and hoping the market will fix itself. That's why I'm delighted we are launching our own version in Hackney. These living rents would be set at a third of average local incomes – which could be around £1,000 per month for a two-bedroom property. The average equivalent market rent in Hackney is around £1,800 per month.

These homes for living rent will help those struggling to stay in Hackney or to save for their first home – putting an extra £800 on average in their pocket every month that they can use towards a deposit.

We're building thousands of new Council homes for those most in need, and I'm proud that our Living Rent will expand our offer to help those who aren't eligible for social housing but still need a hand to find a genuinely affordable place to live.

## 9 Elected Mayor's Statement

Eleven Members will be standing down from the Council in May (9 Labour and 2 Lib Dem). Between them, they have 111 years' experience on the Council. They have all served the borough in different ways: as Cabinet members, Chairs, Vice Chairs and Members of Scrutiny Commissions, Speakers, Members of committees including Corporate, Licensing, Planning and Pensions, and of course ward councillors.

Cllr Abraham Jacobson (2010) and Cllr Dawood Akhoon (2002) are both standing down. One example of work led by Cllr Jacobson was his successful delivery of a Park and Stride scheme in the Cazenove Ward. Gaining the agreement of local businesses, this involved the opening of carpark to parents dropping their children off to school so that they could park safely and walk their children the rest of the journey.

Some infamous appearances on social media and indeed in this chamber.

Concerned about crime and Gerda doors.

But passionate, never afraid to take on me, the council or indeed his own coalition Government. We didn't always agree on the solutions to the housing crisis, but we did agree that there was one and that the private rented sector was important.

He would be missed in this chamber.

### **Dawood**

Road safety

Passionate and poignant speech

Timely

All three Members of Haggerston ward Cllrs Barry Buitekant (2006), Ann Munn (2010) and Jonathan McShane (2005) are standing down. At the last election, their pledges included making sure improvements were made to Haggerston Park, supporting cycling in the ward and ensuring Haggerston residents benefit from continued investment and improved services on local estates.

- **Cllr Munn** (2010) has been an active member of scrutiny, including:

Vice Chair of Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission 2013-2014

Chair of Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission 2014-2018

Chair of Scrutiny Chairs Group 2014-2017

Chair of Inner North East London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2014-2016 (member of INEL 2011-2018)

Cllr Munn has been incredibly adept at being a steady hand, holding the line between often fractious groups of residents, lobbyists, commissioners, providers and regulators in the area of health. Whether it was shaping the Commission to be seen as an independent arbitrator in contentious disputes such as the standards of maternity services at the Homerton or the fallout from Barts Health going into special measures, under her tenure each side eventually knew they would be given a fair hearing and that Members would then try and forge a consensus on the best way forward.

While Chair of HiH she oversaw in-depth reviews such as *Preventing anxiety and depression in working age adults* which has led to a continued focus on the need to improve the support for those with low level mental health problems, who if not attended to will end up in expensive secondary care services. She also oversaw

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

reviews on *Supporting adult carers* and on *Tuberculosis in Hackney*. The latter pushed to maintain an innovative temporary housing solution for patients undergoing the intensive 6 month treatment programme, who otherwise would be homeless, posing a health risk to the wider population.

She carefully balanced the need to do in-depth work with the need for HiH to always be responsive to the crises as they emerge. During her time all the key stakeholders at a senior level regularly attended and participated in the Commission's work and she engaged the local CCG, GP Confederation and the local acute Trusts in the work of the Commission in a way which many neighbouring scrutiny committees would envy.

At the Inner North East London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee her skill at steering councillors from the 4 boroughs in providing some challenge on the Transforming Services Together change programme meant that the wider NHS engaged more fully with Scrutiny than hitherto and so those change programmes were held to account. This set the template for INELs current scrutiny challenge on the STP.

The Review

Fun, authentic, hard working and never afraid to be a lone voice or indeed sometimes lone campaigner.

- **Cllr Buitekant** (2006) is a member of the Corporate, Licensing and Planning committees.

He is also a very active ward councillor, supporting lots of residents each year through casework enquiries.

**A stalwart of the planning committee**

Cllr Barry Buitekant 154

**Independently minded and a passionately socialist perhaps when it was unfashionable to be so.**

**Resolute defender of Council housing and communities of Haggerston working with some challenging characters.**

Hoxton East

Cllr Tom Ebbutt (2010)

**Cllr Ebbutt** (2010) has been a member of CYPS Scrutiny Commission from 2014-present and member of G&R from 2010-2014.

De B then Hoxton East

Tenacious committed, thoughtful and an unsung hero. Big ideas from the very start some of which may not have been fully appreciated, but a very active member of G&R.

Let's be honest not so much a critical friend of Hackney Homes as a Board Member, but a critic.

Most of all I'd like to thank him for his work on Colville Regeneration

2010, 2011 to the present day. Chair of CETRA, supportive, but vitally credible and independent when he needs to be, standing up for residents and ensuring that the regeneration truly was, is and always will be resident led.

The community and homes we are rebuilding there owe you a lot, as does the Council and myself.

Running buddies and look forward to continuing to work with you on Colville.

De Beauvoir

Cllr Laura Bunt (2014) is also standing down.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

Their pledges included improving local schools, investing in green spaces across the ward, and making sure De Beauvoir remains a safe place to live.

- **Cllr Bunt** (2014) has been a member of Health in Hackney 2017/18 and member of Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission 2014-2016.

### **Madam Speaker**

Also standing down are Cllrs Will Brett (2014) of Victoria Ward and Patrick Moule (2016), representing Stoke Newington.

- **Cllr Brett** (2014) is a member of the Corporate Committee, and was also a member of Governance and Resources Scrutiny Commission 2014-16 and Vice Chair of Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission 2016-17.

A friend, a passionate advocate for Parkside Estate, I hope one day we will find a solution to the old laundry.

Even more importantly and while he isn't here tonight, I'd like to thank him for being my agent. And coined the immortal phrase 'Building A Hackney That Works for Everyone' a full 24 hours before a version was used by Theresa May. As you may have seen tonight, I have slightly more sympathy for her conference predicament than I did back last year.

- **Cllr Moule** (2016) is a member of the Licensing and Pension Committees, was a member of CYPs Scrutiny Commission from 2016/17 and has been a member of the Working in Hackney Scrutiny Commission since 2017.

He's a passionate campaigner that has been one the significant forces behind the success of Hackney North Labour Party, supporting and organising campaigns across Hackney, London and even Slough in 2017. A fellow private renter.

**Cllr McShane** (2005), Jonathan what to say – my first ever campaign I was involved in was your by-election campaign in Hoxton. You've been a close friend and honorary member of the class of 2006.

Some of you might not know, but there was a time back in 2006 for a few years when Sem, Jonathan, Feryal and I were the bright young things, full of naïve ideas and convinced we could do it better.

Often late into the night we tried to put Hackney to rights, criticised Cabinet Members and of course Jules, second guessing and saying how we would do it differently. How we would make Hackney better.

Jonathan far earlier than I got to a chance to put his ideas into action.

He was Chair of Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission from 2008/9 – 2009/10 (2 years), and a member of the first Pan London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee that reviewed Darzi proposals for healthcare in London.

Cllr McShane then went on to become the Chair of Pan London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee for London looking at the reconfiguration of Major Trauma Services.

As Cabinet Member with responsibility for health and adult social care, Cllr McShane has helped to navigate the Council through some of the most significant and complex changes to the role of the local councils, ensuring that Hackney has been at the forefront of the changes in public health that have devolved responsibility to local government, bringing back democratic representation to this area of huge importance to the borough.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

Cllr McShane has led on this process that has seen our relationship with our health partners strengthened and allowed us all to better provide services and assistance for our residents and communities, making Hackney a healthier place to live and work.

We have all seen how tirelessly Cllr McShane has worked to get the very best deal for our residents.

He has helped manage the impact of cuts to the adult social care budget forced by central government, whilst also realigning services to focus on individuals' specific needs, shaping and leading the agenda on personalisation and ensuring home care workers receive the LLW.

It is also Cllr McShane we have to thank for Hackney Half-marathon. Since its launch in 2014 over 50k people have taken to our streets. Some have been fast, some have been a little slower (I was 40<sup>th</sup> from last amongst the men last year), but all have been impressive. The half-marathon hasn't just encouraged people to take up exercise, but has helped to display the very best that Hackney has to offer, specifically our residents, whose amazing support every year have helped many a straggler to the finishing line.

It is a testament to Cllr McShane's commitment to this borough and its health that the Hackney Half is now a firm fixture in our calendar.

I would also like to celebrate Cllr McShane's contribution nationally. For several years now he has been the spokesperson for the Local Government Agency on public health.

Through that role he has been an incredible champion for the role that local authorities play in public health. Taking brave and evidence led decisions on sexual health.

Cllr McShane has also been a remarkable and powerful champion of issues relating to sexual health.

He was an obvious and fitting candidate for the Terrence Higgins Trust when they needed a new Chair and one of the reasons he is leaving us is so that he can focus even more on such a vital area of work.

Having spoken to Aideen, I would also like to make it very clear that contrary to initial reports he is not euphemistically standing down to spend more time with his family!!!

I wish him every success in this and we thank him for his years of work here.

Finally, **Madam Speaker** the last two Members to be standing down are two of Hackney's longest serving, Cllrs Geoff Taylor (2002), from Victoria, and Sally Mulready (1998), who represents my home ward of Homerton.

- **Cllr Taylor** (2002) has been very active in his 16 years on the Council, including being Speaker, chair of Planning, active in scrutiny, and more recently the Cabinet member for Finance.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

Cllr Taylor first became a member of scrutiny in 2002/03 on its inception as a member of the Education Scrutiny Panel. He became Chair of CYPS Scrutiny in 2006/07 and 2008/09 and Vice Chair in 2010/11.

Two pieces of scrutiny work stand out in particular, and he was a powerful advocate and supporter of their subjects. First was the work in 2007/08 on youth crime in Hackney. His opening sentence of the report captures the importance Cllr Taylor placed on the borough's young people - he wrote that "The way any society treats its young people is a barometer of its health and confidence, because they are its future." The review covered difficult areas including knife crime and creating space for risk taking behaviour. It was also largely informed by Cllr Taylor's commitment to involving young people in the process of gathering evidence including through a large borough-wide consultation event in which many young people took part.

**Ideas that live on today and I hope we can renew in the coming years.**

Second was the work on Early Years in 2008/09 in which he championed the work of Sure Start and our relatively new Children's Centres. In particular Cllr Taylor did a lot to make sure that the importance of helping to develop parenting skills for new parents received the attention it warranted. Including going on a parenting course himself - despite not being a parent!

Cllr Taylor was Speaker in 2004-5, choosing to support charities that offer help and encouragement to new parents.

He has a great knowledge of local history, and wrote a book about South Hackney "A Parish in Perspective: A history of the church and parish of St John of Jerusalem South Hackney" (2002) which I think is probably the only available accessible history of South Hackney itself. He has been a historian of the area for many years, and of the town hall – helping alongside Jules to safeguard this building and tell its stories.

He has also been active in the almshouse movement in Hackney and for several years was chair of the Hackney Joint Estates Charity, looking after the properties and land given by a few Hackney families from three centuries ago, with the profits from rents being given out for the benefit of the poor through the three Hackney Parochial Charities.

More recently, from 2014 to 2017, Cllr Taylor has been Cabinet member for Finance, and played a crucial role in helping manage the Council's finances during a very challenging period for public finances in the UK.

He is a calm, thoughtful and savvy political operator, always full of sound advice. He's an incredible orator and debater in this chamber, which sits alongside his other love of singing in one of our local choirs.

He was the first Cabinet Member I rang after being selected as Labour's candidate for Mayor asking him to stay on, he had some conditions which I won't go into now, but he was also very very clear that his was a supportive role and that ultimately it was the Mayor's Budget – sobering and clear advice and timely given the next item on the agenda.

**Madam Speaker**

- **Cllr Mulready** (1998) is the longest serving Member to be standing down at these elections, having been a Councillor in Hackney for 20 years.

Cllr Mulready is a renowned campaigner and has dedicated her political life to challenging prejudice and discrimination towards minority communities and marginalised people. She has been involved in a number of high-profile international campaigns, and has campaigned for a change in the law on pension rights for victims of miscarriages of justice.

She co-wrote the best seller Cruel Fate following her campaign work on the Birmingham Six, which is now used as a reference book in miscarriage of justice cases. In 2000 she was appointed by the British Home Secretary to the Royal Court of Justice's Miscarriage of Justice Advisory Group.

In January 2012, Sally Mulready was one of the seven appointments of Michael Higgins, President of Ireland, to his advisory body, the Council of State.

Sally is Director of the Irish Elderly Advice Network, a charity where she has worked since 1993. The charity has helped combat the poverty and isolation of thousands of older Irish people in London including Hackney, aiding them, among other ways, by securing millions in unclaimed welfare and pensions benefits.

She has made a huge contribution to the Irish emigrant community in Britain over many decades. Sally was involved in securing the Irish Government's agreement for the creation and funding of five Survivor Outreach Services in Britain, at a time when no such services existed. She also founded the Irish Women's Survivors Network in 2002, in order to provide support, advice and companionship to women who had spent time in Irish Institutional Care.

Like Cllr Taylor, Cllr Mulready has served the residents of the borough in many different capacities whilst on the Council:

Cllr Mulready served as Cabinet Advisor for Equalities from 2006 to 2008.

She was Speaker in 2010/11, and raised funds for Homerton Hope.

She has been on a number of scrutiny commissions, including CSSI from 2012-2013, CYPS from 2013-2014, and Health in Hackney from 2014-2015.

Cllr Mulready also spent a period as Chair of Licensing, as well as Chair of the Council Joint Committee. She has made an enormous contribution to the borough over two decades, created a mini political dynasty and been a loyal and supportive friend.

I'd like to warmly thank Abraham, Dawood, Ann, Barry, Tom, Laura, Will, Patrick, Jonathan, Geoff and Sally for their contributions to their wards, this Council and to Hackney.

All of them have been part of Hackney's transformation and as they stand down as councillors in a few months safe time can do so safe in the knowledge Hackney is better place through their work.

## 10 **Budget And Council Tax Report 2018/19**

Mayor Glanville opened by telling Council that this was a budget for the many, not the few in both word and deed. It was his second budget and he thanked the Group Director for Finance and Resources, Ian Williams and his team for their tireless work in its preparation. He went on to thank his colleagues in the Cabinet, Scrutiny and Backbenches, who have worked through the various options and Councillor Rebecca Rennison for taking on the finance brief.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

Mayor Glanville told Council that setting this year's budget had been the toughest in many years, finishing the year with an overspend and a very vivid reminder from Northamptonshire on what can happen without strong leadership and financial management. The last such Council to have a section 114 notice issued against it was Hackney Council in 2000, a time characterised by political crisis and a weak Tory/LibDem coalition that took the Council to the brink of collapse, something left out of former Cllr Sills' letter to the Gazette. He told Council that it was only saved by the hard work of some of the Councillors he had paid tribute to earlier, former Mayor Pipe and the Labour party. He was sure that voters in the May elections would remember this. As he had reminded an earlier Council the impact wasn't just stark in terms of peoples job's, day to day services, it was part of a period that damaged the boroughs' reputation.

Mayor Glanville told Council that Hackney was at breaking point with Council's across the country experiencing the same pressures. Hackney's Government grant had shrunk with an expected cut of 45%, since 2010. The Borough had seen the biggest funding cut per head of population of any London borough at £512 per capita. The Mayor confirmed that not all of the Boroughs had the advantages of Hackney. The Borough still received some Government funding. It has some of the best staff in local government, with sound political leadership, a record of innovation and land values that could be levered to generate income and resources. Mayor Glanville spoke of the Hackney factor and that the Borough was a fantastic place to live, to work and to do business. He referred to the stunning green spaces, a world-famous cultural offering, a strong community spirit and some of the best schools in the country. He told Council that he was proud of the excellent services the Council provided, but that it was getting harder and harder to fund these services. More and more people were turning to the Council for support, with less and less money available to help them. The Council was now at the stage where it was running out of options.

Mayor Glanville told Council that in spite of these funding reductions, increasing demands and cost pressures, this year's budget would continue to sustain and deliver the vital services the Council provides and on which the most vulnerable residents rely. The Council was having to think outside the box in order to deliver new, much-needed facilities. For example, the Britannia project, which would see an improved leisure centre replace the crumbling existing one. A new secondary school and Council housing for social rent and shared ownership, was to be funded by the sale of new homes also built on the site.

The Council had looked at how it uses buildings and services, by renting them out and marketing commercial services to make money that can be invested directly into services. It was also investing in economic development and looking at how the council worked locally with business.

Mayor Glanville stated that the Councils' approach aimed to bring together three areas of economic development – access to employment and opportunities; place based economic development; and improving the Council's relationship with business. He confirmed that access to employment and opportunities remained one of his key priorities together with ensuring that economic growth created real, meaningful and high quality employment opportunities at the heart of everything the Council is doing. The overarching aim was to provide residents with a range of different employment pathways including work placements, volunteering, apprenticeships and ring-fenced job opportunities.

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

The Council was making that investment in this budget as well as continuing to reap the benefits of being aggressive insources – which saves money, improves pay and conditions, creates opportunities to collaborate across the Council, across borough boundaries and across different sectors.

Mayor Glanville told Council that work continued with health colleagues to improve services around physical and mental health and make best use of scarce resources through close working arrangements and progressing innovative the integrated commissioning model.

Mayor Glanville told Council that in 2018/19, the recommended Hackney's Council Tax increase was to be 3% raising around £2.2m. He said that increasing Council Tax was not an easy decision and that all efforts had been made to keep it as low as possible. However, he considered that the decision was the right one. He acknowledged that the rising cost of living and the worsening housing crisis continued to affect all but that this extra contribution would help fund services like social care, looked after children, day care, streetscene and meet some of the costs of housing those in need. Decisions to make cuts in CTRS to SEND had been equally tough. The Council had listened and reflected and changed its minds, where it thought it was right.

Despite the challenges, Hackney remained a place to be proud of. The Council was investing £500m in building 3,000 homes. The Borough had libraries, a museum and youth services that were the envy of London. By working as a community it was possible to produce a rich cultural programme to bring residents from all walks of life.

Mayor Glanville told Council that the Borough was making prudent assumptions about responding to the tragedy of Grenfell and its impact on resident safety here in Hackney – investing in sprinklers, removing cladding, creating a new post of head of resident safety and delivering the day in day out job of implementing our now published FRAs. He thanked Michael Scorer for his work on this.

The budget was true to the Councils' values. It sought to make the most of increasingly limited resources while prioritising frontline services and helped the Council to keep exploring innovative ways to raise income. Not only were the lights kept on, the streets clean and the bins empty, so much more had been done, each year becoming more ambitious not less.

The Mayor concluded by stating that the Council was looking at bringing in reserves in the later night levy. Resources were being put into community safety. Public health funding was to be increased to fund areas such as drug abuse in the Borough. He stated that knife crime in the Borough was lower than in other areas of the country. Work was underway to take knife crime of the streets.

The Mayor recommended the last budget of this administration to Full Council.

Deputy Mayor Bramble spoke of the year on year reduction of local government funding in areas such as youth justice, housing for under 25s and area based grants cuts and that that was the context within which the Budget was formulated.

Councillor Abraham Jacobson referred to the cuts to local government funding. He told council that in absolute terms knife crime had increased in the Borough with people murdered on the streets.

Councillor Jon Burke told Council that he welcomed initiatives in the Borough to tackle crime. He referred to the high quality of street cleaning in the Borough which he considered to be the best in inner London.

Councillor Caroline Selman referred to the public health model in the Borough and that it was rethinking its approach. Partnership working was ongoing with social workers and community safety to consider issues around crime in the round. She confirmed that there had been a decrease in violent crime in the Borough but that work was being undertaken in a challenging environment with cuts to police numbers.

Councillor Sharon Patrick stressed the need to have increased police officers on the ground in the Borough.

Councillor Simche Steinberger introduced the Conservative party budget. The Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget was seconded by Councillor Papier. He thanked Group Director for Finance and Resources for his work in preparing the budget. He told Council that he disagreed with the proposed Labour party budget. He asked that in the preparation of future Council Budgets that all parties discuss this and attempt to find common ground. He identified areas of saving such as Hackney Today and controlled parking.

Mayor Glanville responded in relation to Dalston that the proposal would result in an increase in pollution. Stopping Hackney Today would cost money with reduced investment. Further, the Mayor submitted that cutting the scrutiny function would be a cut to democracy.

Councillor Peter Snell stated that ...? Dalston would be a false economy. It was a critical hub for the area. He stated that conservative policy did not serve the people of Central Hackney.

Councillor Rosemary Sales told Council that the Conservative Party made no attempt to make Stamford Hill safer.

Councillor Ian Rathbone stated that the Conservative Party did not look to find solutions for the Borough of Hackney and did not consider the effects of pollution or have a regard for ward forums or Hackney residents. He added that the conservative budget did not have adequate costing.

Councillor Simche Steinberger considered that money was wasted on Hackney today. He referred to the need to for a zebra crossing in Stamford Hill West and that the 73 most could not now go to ?

Councillor Ian Sharar introduced the Liberal Democrat party's alternative budget. The Liberal Democrat Group's alternative budget was seconded by Councillor Jacobson

The Speaker invited Council to vote on the Liberal Democrat Group alternative budget proposals.

**For:** Cllrs Levy, Odze, Papier and Steinberger (4)

**Against:** Mayor Glanville and Cllrs Adams, Adejare, Akhoon, Bell, Bramble, Bunt, Burke, Cameron, Chapman, Demirci, Desmond, Ebbutt, Fajana-Thomas, Gordon, Gregory, Hanson, Hayhurst, Hercock, Lufkin, Maxwell, McKenzie, McShane, Moema, Moule, Mulready, Munn,

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

Nicholson, Oguzkanli, Patrick, Peters, Plouviez, Potter, Rahilly, Rathbone, Rennison, Rickard, Sales, Selman, Sharer, Sharman, Snell, Stops, Taylor and Williams  
(45)

**Abstentions:** None (0)

*Not Present: Councillors Akhoon, Buitekant Brett, Coban, Conway, Etti, Kennedy, Ozsen and Webb (9)*

**The vote was not carried.**

The Speaker invited Council to vote on the Liberal Democrat Group alternative budget proposals.

**FOR:** Councillors Jacobson and Sharer

**Against:** Mayor Glanville and Cllrs Adams, Adejare, Akhoon, Bell, Bramble, Bunt, Burke, Cameron, Chapman, Demirci, Desmond, Ebbutt, Fajana-Thomas, Gordon, Gregory, Hanson, Hayhurst, Hercock, Lufkin, Maxwell, McKenzie, McShane, Moema, Moule, Mulready, Munn, Nicholson, Oguzkanli, Patrick, Peters, Plouviez, Potter, Rahilly, Rathbone, Rennison, Rickard, Sales, Selman, Sharer, Sharman, Snell, Stops, Taylor and Williams  
(45)

**Abstentions:** None (0)

*Not Present: Councillors Akhoon, Buitekant Brett, Coban, Conway, Etti, Kennedy, Ozsen and Webb (9)*

The Speaker then invited Council to vote on the recommendation in the substantive report.

**For:** Mayor Glanville and Cllrs Adams, Adejare, Akhoon, Bell, Bramble, Bunt, Burke, Cameron, Chapman, Demirci, Desmond, Ebbutt, Fajana-Thomas, Gordon, Gregory, Hanson, Hayhurst, Hercock, Lufkin, Maxwell, McKenzie, McShane, Moema, Moule, Mulready, Munn, Nicholson, Oguzkanli, Patrick, Peters, Plouviez, Potter, Rahilly, Rathbone, Rennison, Rickard, Sales, Selman, Sharer, Sharman, Snell, Stops, Taylor and Williams  
(45)

**Against:** Councillors Jacobson, Levy, Odze, Papier, Sharer and Steinberger (6)

**Abstentions:** None (0)

*Not Present: Councillors Akhoon, Buitekant Brett, Coban, Conway, Etti, Kennedy, Ozsen and Webb (9)*

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. To bring forward into 2018/19 the Council's projected General Fund balances of £15.0m and to note the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) balances of £10.2m**
- 2. To agree for approval the directorate estimates and estimates for the General Finance Account items set out in Table 1, below.**
- 3. To note that the budget is a financial exposition of the priorities set out within the Corporate Plan.**
- 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:**

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

*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 2018/19 and that in light of the economic uncertainty they should not fall below this level. This view takes account of the reserves included in the Council's latest audited Accounts as at 31 March 2017, 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 to maintain the balance at £10.2m by 31 March 2018 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.*

*The General Fund estimates are sufficiently robust to set a balanced budget for 2018/19. This takes into account the adequacy of the level of balances and reserves outlined above and the assurance gained from the comparisons of the 2017/18 budget with the projected spend identified in the December 2017 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 7 for implementation from 1st April 2018.*
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, such as Top Up Grant changes, or expenditure requirements.*
7. *To note the summary of the HRA Budget and Rent setting report agreed by Cabinet on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018.*
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 2018/19 Non-Housing capital schemes referred to in Paragraph 24 and Appendix 6.*

*The allocation of resources to the 2018/19 Housing indicative capital programme referred to in Paragraph 24 and Appendix 6, including the HRA approvals previously agreed by Cabinet on January 22 2018.*

10. *To note that the new capital expenditure proposals match uncommitted resources for the year 2018/19.*
11. *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 Management Prudential Indicators for 2018/19 as set out in paragraph 25, and Appendix 3*
12. *To confirm that the authorised limit for external debt of £600m agreed above for 2018/19 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.*
13. *To continue to support the approach of using reserves to manage emerging risks and liabilities and to note the latest reserve position.*
14. *To note that at its meeting on 24 January 2018 the Council agreed its Council Tax Base for the 2018/19 financial year as 71,145 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.*
- 15(1) *To agree that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2018/19 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Localism Act 2011.*
  - (i) *The authority calculates the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (2) of the Act)*

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

- (a) **£1,120.781m 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) **£nil 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.**

**16(2) The authority calculates the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (3) of the Act)**

- (a) **£1,042.013m 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) **£3.9m 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.**
- 17. £76.868m 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.**
- 18. £1,080.44 being the amount at (3.2.17) divided by the amount at (3.2.14) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31A of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year**
- 19. 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 2018/19 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.**

VALUATION BANDS							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
720.30	840.34	960.39	1080.44	1320.54	1560.62	1800.74	2160.88

- 20. That it be noted that for 2018/19 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							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
196.15	228.85	261.54	294.23	359.61	425.00	490.38	588.46

21. ***That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3.2.19 and 3.2.20 above, 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 2018/19 for each of the categories of dwellings as shown below.***

VALUATION BANDS							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
916.45	1069.19	1221.93	1374.67	1680.15	1985.62	2291.12	2749.34

***Note: Subject to GLA confirmation of precept on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018***

22. ***To agree, subject to the decision of Members on recommendations 3.2.15 to 3.2.17 that Hackney's Council Tax requirement for 2018/19 be £76.868m which results in a Band D Council Tax of £1,080.44 for Hackney purposes and a total Band D Council Tax of £1,374.67 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.***
23. ***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 2018/19 as shown at Appendix 8 is not excessive (6% or above) and therefore does not require the Council to hold a referendum.***
24. ***To agree the Treasury Management Strategy for 2018/19 to 2020/21, set out at Appendix 3.***
25. ***To agree the criteria for lending and the financial limits set out at Appendix 3. .2.1 To bring forward into 2018/19 the Council's projected General Fund balances of £15.0m and to note the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) balances of £10.2m***
26. ***To agree for approval the directorate estimates and estimates for the General Finance Account items set out in Table 1, below.***
27. ***To note that the budget is a financial exposition of the priorities set out within the Corporate Plan.***
28. ***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 2018/19 and that in light of the economic uncertainty they should not fall below this level. This view takes account of the reserves included in the Council's latest audited Accounts as at 31 March 2017, 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 to maintain the balance at £10.2m by 31 March 2018 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. The General Fund estimates are sufficiently robust to set a balanced budget for 2018/19. This takes into account the adequacy of the level of balances and reserves outlined above and the assurance gained from the comparisons of the 2017/18 budget with the projected spend identified in the December 2017 OFP. The overall level of the corporate contingency has been set at £2m.***
29. ***To approve the proposed General Fund fees and charges as set out in Appendix 7 for implementation from 1st April 2018.***

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

30. **To continue the policy requiring the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources to seek to mitigate the impact of significant changes to either resources, such as Top Up Grant changes, or expenditure requirements.**
31. **To note the summary of the HRA Budget and Rent setting report agreed by Cabinet on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018.**
32. **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.**
33. **To approve:**  
**The allocation of resources to the 2018/19 Non-Housing capital schemes referred to in Paragraph 24 and Appendix 6.**  
**The allocation of resources to the 2018/19 Housing indicative capital programme referred to in Paragraph 24 and Appendix 6, including the HRA approvals previously agreed by Cabinet on January 22 2018.**
34. **To note that the new capital expenditure proposals match uncommitted resources for the year 2018/19.**
35. **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 Management Prudential Indicators for 2018/19 as set out in paragraph 25, and Appendix 3**
36. **To confirm that the authorised limit for external debt of £600m agreed above for 2018/19 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.**
37. **To continue to support the approach of using reserves to manage emerging risks and liabilities and to note the latest reserve position.**
38. **To note that at its meeting on 24 January 2018 the Council agreed its Council Tax Base for the 2018/19 financial year as 71,145 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.**
- 39 (1) **To agree that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2018/19 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Localism Act 2011.**
  - (i) **The authority calculates the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (2) of the Act)**
  - (a) **£1,120.781m 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) **£nil 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.**

39(2) *The authority calculates the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (3) of the Act)*

- (a) *£1,042.013m 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) *£3.9m 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.*
40. *£76.868m 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.*
41. *£1,080.44 being the amount at (3.2.17) divided by the amount at (3.2.14) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 31A of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year*
42. *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 2018/19 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.*

VALUATION BANDS							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
720.30	840.34	960.39	1080.44	1320.54	1560.62	1800.74	2160.88

43. *That it be noted that for 2018/19 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							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
196.15	228.85	261.54	294.23	359.61	425.00	490.38	588.46

44. *That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3.2.19 and 3.2.20 above, 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 2018/19 for each of the categories of dwellings as shown below.*

VALUATION BANDS							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
916.45	1069.19	1221.93	1374.67	1680.15	1985.62	2291.12	2749.34

**Note: Subject to GLA confirmation of precept on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018**

44. *To agree, subject to the decision of Members on recommendations 3.2.15 to 3.2.17 that Hackney's Council Tax requirement for 2018/19 be £76.868m which results in a Band D Council Tax of £1,080.44 for Hackney purposes and a total*

Wednesday, 21st February, 2018

*Band D Council Tax of £1,374.67 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.*

45. *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 2018/19 as shown at Appendix 8 is not excessive (6% or above) and therefore does not require the Council to hold a referendum.*
46. *To agree the Treasury Management Strategy for 2018/19 to 2020/21, set out at Appendix 3.*
47. *To agree the criteria for lending and the financial limits set out at Appendix 3.*
48. *To approve the MRP statement setting out the method of calculation to be used, as set out in Appendix 3*
49. *To approve the MRP statement setting out the method of calculation to be used, as set out in Appendix 3*

## 11 **Report of the Chief Executive: Changes To The Constitution - Data Protection Officer**

11.1 Tim Shields introduced the report as set out.

### **RESOLVED:**

To approve the amendments to the constitution as set out in appendix 1 of the report with effect from the start of the 2018/19 municipal year.

## 12 **Group Director of Finance And Corporate Resources : Audit Committee Annual Report 2017/18**

12.1 Councillor Nick Sharman introduced the Annual Audit Committee report. He told Council that all the Committee's major tasks had been achieved and that its' key role was to ensure that new risks were mitigated against, a role that was growing in importance as risk increased. He referred to the toxic mix of Government cuts and the increase in demands for local government services.

A Health matrix had been developed to compliment the scrutiny function and an early warning system for risk assessment had been devised. He stated that universal credit and housing provision were the biggest risks facing the Borough. The Committee now had oversight of risk in capital projects in the Borough. Spend in this area was increasing from 300m a year to 500m. Councillor Sharman referred to the dramatic improvements in performance reporting alongside in internal audit and treasury management. In the case of the Anti-Fraud service there had been savings in excess of £3m as of 31 December 2017. A key responsibility of the Audit Committee was the oversight of the Council's Treasury Management function and that given financial uncertainty around Brexit it was important to ensure that this key function continued to perform strongly.

Councillor Sharman that the Mayor had met with the Audit Committee and a way forward was agreed?. He referred to the need for a broader role for the Committee with new ways of working. He concluded by paying tribute to members of the

Committee and to the role that the Finance and Resources Directorate had in making improvements, referring to it as exemplary.

12.2 Councillor Rebecca Rennison told Council that she would be meeting with Councillor Sharman to discuss the exciting new plans.?

**RESOLVED:**

To note the annual report of the Audit Committee as set out in appendix 1.

**13 Report of the Chief Executive: Gender Pay Gap Report**

Cllr Williams introduced the report on gender pay gap and emphasised that the data showed on average women earned more than men at the council.

The Council would be publishing the data in March 2018 within the Workforce Profile report available on the Council's website.

**RESOLVED:**

To note the report.

**14 Report of the Chief Executive: Community Safety And Social Inclusion Scrutiny Commission - Reach And Accessibility Of Council Services To Vulnerable Migrants**

12.1 In the absence of Councillor Sade Etti, Councillor Ben Hayhurst introduced the report of the Scrutiny Commission on 'Reach and Accessibility of Council Services for Vulnerable Migrants. He reported that 4 % of migrants had been born outside the Borough.? For some the experience had been positive while others had felt vulnerable. The Commission had decided to look at accessibility to services for migrants. This group had less access to services and the Commission made recommendations around a more joined up approach with improved information and signposting. A full time officer had been appointed to the role. However funding for the post was soon to end.

12.2 Councillor Carole Williams thanked the Commission and Labour members for their work on integration. There had been increased access to networking and signposting together with the provision of guidance on entitlement. Work was carried out with the voluntary sector to ensure that organisations had the capacity to support this group

**RESOLVED:**

To note the Commission's report and the response to it from the Executive.

**15 Motion**

**Motion 1 – Women's Suffrage**

Councillor Williams proposed and introduced the motion:

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

This Council notes that 2018 marks one hundred years since the Representation of People Act 1918, a turning point in political history, when some women were able to vote in local and national elections and to stand for election to Parliament for the first time.

The enfranchisement of women came as a response to the tremendous efforts made by the women of this country in the war effort between 1914 and 1918, and because of the heroic efforts made by the women's suffrage campaign and their supporters, both male and female.

This council notes with pride the involvement of local women in the war effort and also, the local activists and politicians who had fought for universal suffrage before 1914. In particular we note the contribution of Mary Wollstonecraft, a writer, editor, campaigner, adventurer, mother and 'founder of modern feminism'; the Women's Freedom League, which provided employment in a toy factory in south Hackney for women put out of work as dress-making suffered a drop in demand; Henry Fawcett, husband of Millicent Fawcett, who was MP for Hackney from 1874 until his death in 1884; and those Hackney residents who signed the 1866 women's suffrage petition demanding women should have the same political rights as men.

The council also notes the voices of intersectional feminists, past and present such as Sojourner Truth and Kimberle Crenshaw who have paved the way for contemporary British writers, academics and social policy analysts, to continue to make an invaluable contribution to our understanding of the experiences of women from marginalised communities.

The Council resolves that, on the centenary of women's suffrage, we unanimously commit to ensuring that the sacrifices and achievements of those local heroines and heroes who fought for equal suffrage is celebrated locally and that barriers are removed to enable all women electors to vote according to their own opinions and to vote in secrecy without harassment or intimidation."

Councillor Demirci responded to the motion.

If it wasn't for the fight for universal suffrage that started 100 years ago, I wouldn't be able to stand here today and second this motion. So it is with pride that we remember the sacrifices and achievements of those women, both locally and nationally, and I would echo the importance of carrying on their struggle in 2018 to challenge injustice and inequality to ensure a fairer society for all.

A century on from the 1918 People's Act, Hackney's cabinet contains more women than men. But the fight towards equality isn't just about better representation – it's also about issues like housing, transport and crime, and having a more diverse outlook on these issues by having different types of people involved in decision making.

While nationally there are on average 33% women councillors in local authorities, in Hackney the figure is 42%. The borough has led the way in equality, and our council makeup is one of the most diverse in the UK in terms of sexuality, gender, class and ethnic background. But we still have work to do. That is why we are marking this momentous occasion and sharing stories of the past to galvanise a new generation into community action to help make positive changes over the next 100 years.

The Council is celebrating this 100 year anniversary through an exhibition at Hackney Museum, Making Her Mark which looks at a century of female activism in Hackney

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

including the inspiring stories of women who made a difference in the borough and beyond, across issues ranging from education, workers' rights, and healthcare to domestic violence, the peace movement, and police relations.

On 3 March, Well Street Market is celebrating our female led businesses by hosting a celebration day hosting all women entrepreneurs at its stalls. For the third year, Young Hackney is hosting its inspiring young women's event on 6 March to coincide with international women's day (8 March). A careers event where local women come to inspire and empower the next generation of young Hackney women to broaden their horizons and aspirations, smash glass ceilings, and think outside the career box.

Alongside this and other events to be announced later in the year the Council is looking for 100 inspiring Hackney women who are driving change and making a difference in their community, which will be nominated by residents. We have also produced a limited edition #Votes100 I Love Hackney badge.

I would encourage my colleagues to join these events and show your support.

## **RESOLVED:**

That, on the centenary of women's suffrage, we unanimously commit to ensuring that the sacrifices and achievements of those local heroines and heroes who fought for equal suffrage is celebrated locally and that barriers are removed to enable all women electors to vote according to their own opinions and to vote in secrecy without harassment or intimidation."

## **Motion 2 – Anti Semitism**

Councillor Odze presented the amended motion.

In light of the fact that Hackney has one of the highest percentages of Jewish residents (6.28% according to the 2011 census) of any borough in the United Kingdom, this council expresses alarm at the rise in antisemitism in recent years across the UK. This includes incidents when criticism of Israel has been expressed using antisemitic tropes. Criticism of Israel can be legitimate, but not if it employs the tropes and imagery of antisemitism.

We therefore welcome the UK Government's announcement on December 11th 2016 that it will sign up to the internationally recognised International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) guidelines on antisemitism which define antisemitism thus:

"Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities."

The guidelines accompanying the definition provide that: "to guide IHRA in its work, the following examples may serve as illustrations: Manifestations might include the targeting of the state of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collectivity. However, criticism of Israel similar to that levelled against any other country cannot be regarded as antisemitic. Antisemitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity,

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

and it is often used to blame Jews for “why things go wrong.” It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits.

Contemporary examples of antisemitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the religious sphere could, taking into account the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.
- Making mendacious, dehumanizing, demonizing, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.
- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.
- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).
- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.
- Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.
- Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour.
- Applying double standards by requiring of it behaviour not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
- Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterize Israel or Israelis.
- Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
- Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.”

This Council welcomes the cross-party support within the Council for combating antisemitism in all its manifestations. This Council hereby adopts the above definition of antisemitism as set out by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance and pledges to combat this pernicious form of racism.”

This Council welcomes the cross-party support within the Council for combating antisemitism in all its manifestations. This Council hereby adopts the above definition of antisemitism as set out by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance and pledges to combat this pernicious form of racism.”

Councillor Jacobson seconded the motion and stated that the Jewish community were immigrants that had settled in England and his grandfather had emigrated in 1901.

There had been a rise in antisemitism in London and nationwide but his family still felt safe living in Hackney free from hate and thanked Labour Councillors for supporting the motion.

Councillor Sales expressed her support for the motion and believed that it was important to have a definition of antisemitism and for everyone to work together to combat and condemn antisemitism.

Festival ....celebrate work against antisemitism.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Council welcomes the cross-party support within the Council for combating antisemitism in all its manifestations and hereby adopts the definition of antisemitism as set out by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance and pledges to combat this pernicious form of racism.

**16 Draft Programme Of Meetings 2018-19**

**RESOLVED:**

To note the draft programme of meetings 2018-19

**Duration of the meeting:** 7.00-10.30pm

**APPENDIX 1**

**8.3 From Councillor Rickard to the Mayor:**

***'Could the Mayor update us on the current Guinness Trust plans for the regeneration of the Northwold estate?'***

Council officers and I have been in contact with the Guinness Partnership over the last 18 months to emphasise the importance of effective resident consultation regarding their regeneration proposals. The Council wants to ensure that Northwold residents are central to any consultation and decision-making processes about the scope and nature of any possible regeneration programme on the Northwold estate. Most recently, I wrote to Guinness just before Christmas to reiterate my concerns about what I believed to be the lack of meaningful resident consultation to date.

I have been in contact with residents and campaigners – working with you, Cllr Moema and Cllr Desmond as well as local Labour activists.

Took part in an open public meeting late last year.

I set out some clear red lines:

- There was no deal with Guinness
- There could be no net loss of social rented homes
- There should be a look at local management, repairs and investment
- Residents must be fully involved
- They must have access to independent advice

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

- Right to return and leaseholder offers must be broadly in line with the councils approach
- That any further discussion on use of the Council's CPO powers or land were dependent on the above.

Over the past 18 months, Guinness has put forward four different options for regeneration of the estate. These were not supported by residents, and I am disappointed that residents have not been fully kept up to date and informed about all of the decisions that could have affected their estate.

At the end of January this year, Guinness wrote to residents with new outline proposals for an infill development, which would create 100 additional homes, but only affect two existing homes. I am pleased that Guinness has now communicated its proposed intentions with regard to development of the estate, as well as providing commitments regarding improvements to existing homes and a new, improved community centre. However, the Council was not consulted on this latest proposal in advance, and it also appears to be dependent on the sale of Council land to Guinness – something I reiterate the Council has not agreed to, and would require significant reassurance on – especially on the level of social housing built as part of the plans. For instance on similar sites we achieve 70% affordable.

Guinness must now keep residents fully updated on future detailed proposals for development of the estate, and must take full account of residents' views in making decisions that affect residents and their aspirations for the estate. New work with Mancunian Way

I am sure like me you will continue to show a great deal of interest.

#### **8.4 From Councillor Ebbutt to the Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources**

***“Can the Cabinet Member responsible for equalities tell me what support the council gives to members of staff who are parents of premature babies?”***

The Mayor and I have been involved in conversations with other Boroughs at our London Council meetings on this issue. Whilst our human resource policies are already flexible in this regard, I agree that it is appropriate that we offer something additional that is concrete and specific to employees going through such a traumatic event. Officers have therefore prepared a report that will offer parents of hospitalised premature babies additional leave at full pay. The details of the scheme will be similar to that recently introduced at Waltham Forest and I envisage it being presented for approval at Corporate Committee on 27 March 2018, and it being effective for babies born from 1 April 2018.

#### **8.8 From Councillor Gordon to the Mayor:**

***“Hackney Almshouse Charity wants to build 30 flats at social rent for local residents and is looking for a suitable site. Could the Mayor update us on the progress of the asset management Strategy in respect of land and property owned by the Council?”***

#### **Response**

[Note: Cllr Gordon is on the Board of Trustees for the charity]

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

The Council is committed to working with Registered Providers (RPs) and other local housing providers to develop new genuinely affordable housing in the borough to help meet the needs of Hackney households on low and medium incomes. As you have highlighted, Hackney Almshouse Charity has had initial discussions with the Council in respect of its wish to build 30 homes for social rent within the borough.

The charity aims to support people aged over 55 and in financial need, and already provides good quality, affordable housing for this group within the borough. Following discussions with officers, I am pleased that the Council agreed the Charity's application for inclusion on the 'List of Approved Registered Providers' last October. This was in recognition of the Charity's track record in housing provision and their plans to develop new genuinely affordable housing in the borough. Inclusion on the Approved List will help facilitate the process of developing new housing through future discussions with the planning service and, if necessary, with funders.

Furthermore, as many of you may be aware, last summer I launched the Mayor of Hackney Housing Challenge, which enables 30% of the development costs of new homes to be funded through surplus right to buy (one-for-one replacement) receipts that the Council is unable to use towards the construction of new truly affordable homes, due to Government restrictions. Officers have spoken to representatives of the Charity in order to explore the opportunity to work together under this initiative.

The Charity has also approached the Council regarding the possible availability of sites for this purpose. The Council is in the process of developing a Housing Asset Management Strategy and Asset Review process that will, amongst other things, identify and review the future use of council-owned sites that are potentially available for development, either by the Council itself or by other providers. The Asset Management Strategy will be developed during 2018/19, based on new HRA stock condition data and a refresh of the 30-year HRA business plan.

### **8.11 From Councillor Dawood Akhoun to the Mayoral Adviser for Private Renting and Housing Affordability:**

***The rent under the London Mayor's living rent scheme costing approximately £1,000 a month, does the Mayor consider this "affordable" for struggling families in Hackney?***

Hackney is one of the most expensive places to buy or rent a house in the country – with the biggest price rises over the last 20 years of any borough, meaning the average house price is now an eye-watering £600,000. This is unaffordable to too many of our residents and has helped contribute to a doubling in the size of the private rented sector, which now houses a third of Hackney residents. But private rent levels are also too high, at an average of £1,800 per month for a two-bedroom property. Like the Coalition Government did for five years, and the current Government has continued to do, this Council could sit back and hope this under-regulated and overheated market simply fixes itself. It could wait and see if the market delivers the social housing we need, the genuinely affordable homes we need for renters, and the low-cost home ownership options young families in Hackney desperately need. I don't think that's good enough. Not good enough for the 13,000 families on our housing waiting list. Not good enough for the 3,000 of those living in temporary accommodation. And not good enough for families facing eviction by a private landlord because their rent is rocketing to record levels. That's why this Council is taking action. Through our housebuilding programmes, and our work with housing associations, we are doing everything we can to provide genuinely affordable social housing to help meet the need of these households – despite being hamstrung by

**Wednesday, 21st February, 2018**

central government. I am committed to increasing the supply of genuinely affordable housing in the borough to households on low and medium incomes. While social rented homes are the highest priority, we need a range of affordable housing solutions across tenures and price points, to work towards my aim that Hackney becomes a place for everyone. The continued economic success of the borough and our ability to recruit and retain essential public sector workers, such as nurses and teachers, depends on the availability of good quality, genuinely affordable housing for residents on medium incomes. Our estate regeneration programme is building nearly 3,000 homes, complimented by a new programme of in-house Council development of over 400 Council homes on empty and underused land, 70% of which is for social rent and low cost home ownership. The Mayor of London's London Living Rent is aimed at working Londoners who are priced out of housing locally, but wouldn't normally qualify for social housing. This is an example of how we can take action to help our residents, rather than standing by and hoping the market will fix itself. That's why I'm delighted we are launching our own version in Hackney. These living rents would be set at a third of average local incomes – which could be around £1,000 per month for a two-bedroom property. The average equivalent market rent in Hackney is around £1,800 per month. These homes for living rent will help those struggling to stay in Hackney or to save for their first home – putting an extra £800 on average in their pocket every month that they can use towards a deposit. We're building thousands of new Council homes for those most in need, and I'm proud that our Living Rent will expand our offer to help those who aren't eligible for social housing but still need a hand to find a genuinely affordable place to live.