



COUNCIL

All Members of the Council are
HEREBY SUMMONED
to attend a meeting of the Council to
be held on

Wednesday, 22nd May, 2019

at 7.00 pm

in the Council Chamber, Hackney Town Hall,
Mare Street, London E8 1EA

Tim Shields
Chief Executive

Contact: Tess Merrett
Governance Services
Tel: 020 8356 3432
governance@hackney.gov.uk

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

MEETING INFORMATION

Future Meetings

26 June 2019
30 October 2019
22 January 2020
26 February 2020
20 May 2020

Contact for Information

Tess Merrett, Governance Services
Tel: 020 8356 3432
governance@hackney.gov.uk

Location

Hackney Town Hall is on Mare Street, bordered by Wilton Way and Reading Lane. For directions please go to <http://www.hackney.gov.uk/contact-us>

Facilities

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in the Assembly Halls, rooms 101, 102 & 103 and the Council Chamber. Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	INDICATIVE TIMINGS:
1	The Speaker's Welcome	5 minutes
2	Presentation of the I Love Hackney Mayor's Civic Awards	30 minutes
3	Election of the Speaker	5 minutes
4	Vote of Thanks to the Outgoing Speaker	15 minutes
5	Election of Deputy Speaker	5 minutes
6	Apologies for absence	2 minutes
7	Declarations of Interest	5 minutes
8	Minutes of the previous meeting	5 minutes
9	Speaker's Programme for 2019/20	10 minutes
10	Elected Mayor's Statement	20 minutes
11	Establish Committees and Sub-Committees (and Commissions) and Appoint Members And Nominate the Appointments of Chairs and Vice Chairs	5 minutes
12	Appointments to Outside Bodies	2 minutes
13	Elected Mayor's Report to advise on Composition of the Cabinet and Establishment of Cabinet Sub-Committees and Champions And Mayor's Scheme of Delegation	5 minutes
14	Programme of Meetings 2019/20	2 minutes

Council Agenda

CEREMONIAL PROCEEDINGS

- 1 The Speaker's Welcome
- 2 Presentation of the I Love Hackney Mayor's Civic Awards
- 3 Election of the Speaker for the Municipal Year 2019/2020
- 4 Vote of thanks to the Outgoing Speaker
- 5 Election of The Deputy Speaker for the Municipal Year 2019/2020

AGM BUSINESS

- 6 Apologies for Absence

- 7 Declarations of Interest

This is the time for Members to declare any disclosable pecuniary or other non-pecuniary interests they may have in any matter being considered at this meeting having regard to the guidance attached to the agenda.

- 8 Minutes of the Council Meeting, 27 February 2019 (Pages 1 - 44)
- 9 The Speaker's Programme for the Municipal Year 2019/2020
- 10 Elected Mayor's Statement
- 11 Establish Committees and Sub-Committees (and Commissions) and Appoint Members and Nominate the Appointments of Chairs and Vice Chairs (Pages 45 - 62)
- 12 Appointments to Outside Bodies (Pages 63 - 64)
- 13 Elected Mayor's Report to advice on Composition of the Cabinet and Establishment of Cabinet Sub-Committees and Champions. Mayor's Scheme of Delegation (Pages 65 - 72)
- 14 Programme of Meetings for the Municipal Year 2019/2020 (Pages 73 - 80)

RIGHTS OF PRESS AND PUBLIC TO REPORT ON MEETINGS

Where a meeting of the Council and its committees are open to the public, the press and public are welcome to report on meetings of the Council and its committees, through any audio, visual or written methods and may use digital and social media

providing they do not disturb the conduct of the meeting and providing that the person reporting or providing the commentary is present at the meeting.

Those wishing to film, photograph or audio record a meeting are asked to notify the Council's Monitoring Officer by noon on the day of the meeting, if possible, or any time prior to the start of the meeting or notify the Chair at the start of the meeting.

The Monitoring Officer, or the Chair of the meeting, may designate a set area from which all recording must take place at a meeting.

The Council will endeavour to provide reasonable space and seating to view, hear and record the meeting. If those intending to record a meeting require any other reasonable facilities, notice should be given to the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting and will only be provided if practicable to do so.

The Chair shall have discretion to regulate the behaviour of all those present recording a meeting in the interests of the efficient conduct of the meeting. Anyone acting in a disruptive manner may be required by the Chair to cease recording or may be excluded from the meeting. Disruptive behaviour may include: moving from any designated recording area; causing excessive noise; intrusive lighting; interrupting the meeting; or filming members of the public who have asked not to be filmed.

All those visually recording a meeting are requested to only focus on recording councillors, officers and the public who are directly involved in the conduct of the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will ask any members of the public present if they have objections to being visually recorded. Those visually recording a meeting are asked to respect the wishes of those who do not wish to be filmed or photographed. Failure by someone recording a meeting to respect the wishes of those who do not wish to be filmed and photographed may result in the Chair instructing them to cease recording or in their exclusion from the meeting.

If a meeting passes a motion to exclude the press and public then in order to consider confidential or exempt information, all recording must cease and all recording equipment must be removed from the meeting room. The press and public are not permitted to use any means which might enable them to see or hear the proceedings whilst they are excluded from a meeting and confidential or exempt information is under consideration.

Providing oral commentary during a meeting is not permitted.

ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS

Hackney Council's Code of Conduct applies to **all** Members of the Council, the Mayor and co-opted Members.

This note is intended to provide general guidance for Members on declaring interests. However, you may need to obtain specific advice on whether you have an interest in a particular matter. If you need advice, you can contact:

- The Director of Legal;
- The Legal Adviser to the committee; or
- Governance Services.

If at all possible, you should try to identify any potential interest you may have before

the meeting so that you and the person you ask for advice can fully consider all the circumstances before reaching a conclusion on what action you should take.

1. Do you have a disclosable pecuniary interest in any matter on the agenda or which is being considered at the meeting?

You will have a disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter if it:

- i. relates to an interest that you have already registered in Parts A and C of the Register of Pecuniary Interests of you or your spouse/civil partner, or anyone living with you as if they were your spouse/civil partner;
- ii. relates to an interest that should be registered in Parts A and C of the Register of Pecuniary Interests of your spouse/civil partner, or anyone living with you as if they were your spouse/civil partner, but you have not yet done so; or
- iii. affects your well-being or financial position or that of your spouse/civil partner, or anyone living with you as if they were your spouse/civil partner.

2. If you have a disclosable pecuniary interest in an item on the agenda you must:

- i. Declare the existence and nature of the interest (in relation to the relevant agenda item) as soon as it becomes apparent to you (subject to the rules regarding sensitive interests).
- ii. You must leave the room when the item in which you have an interest is being discussed. You cannot stay in the meeting room or public gallery whilst discussion of the item takes place and you cannot vote on the matter. In addition, you must not seek to improperly influence the decision.
- iii. If you have, however, obtained dispensation from the Monitoring Officer or Standards Committee you may remain in the room and participate in the meeting. If dispensation has been granted it will stipulate the extent of your involvement, such as whether you can only be present to make representations, provide evidence or whether you are able to fully participate and vote on the matter in which you have a pecuniary interest.

3. Do you have any other non-pecuniary interest on any matter on the agenda which is being considered at the meeting?

You will have 'other non-pecuniary interest' in a matter if:

- i. It relates to an external body that you have been appointed to as a Member or in another capacity; or

- ii. It relates to an organisation or individual which you have actively engaged in supporting.

4. If you have other non-pecuniary interest in an item on the agenda you must:

- i. Declare the existence and nature of the interest (in relation to the relevant agenda item) as soon as it becomes apparent to you.
- ii. You may remain in the room, participate in any discussion or vote provided that contractual, financial, consent, permission or licence matters are not under consideration relating to the item in which you have an interest.
- iii. If you have an interest in a contractual, financial, consent, permission or licence matter under consideration, you must leave the room unless you have obtained a dispensation from the Monitoring Officer or Standards Committee. You cannot stay in the room or public gallery whilst discussion of the item takes place and you cannot vote on the matter. In addition, you must not seek to improperly influence the decision. Where members of the public are allowed to make representations, or to give evidence or answer questions about the matter you may, with the permission of the meeting, speak on a matter then leave the room. Once you have finished making your representation, you must leave the room whilst the matter is being discussed.
- iv. If you have been granted dispensation, in accordance with the Council's dispensation procedure you may remain in the room. If dispensation has been granted it will stipulate the extent of your involvement, such as whether you can only be present to make representations, provide evidence or whether you are able to fully participate and vote on the matter in which you have a non pecuniary interest.

Further Information

Advice can be obtained from Suki Binjal, Director of Legal, on 020 8356 6234 or email suki.binjal@hackney.gov.uk



FS 566728

This page is intentionally left blank

**London Borough of Hackney
Council
Municipal Year 2018/19
Date of Meeting Wednesday, 27th February, 2019**

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

**Councillors in
Attendance:**

Mayor Philip Glanville, Cllr Brian Bell, Cllr Polly Billington,
Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble, Cllr Jon Burke,
Cllr Sophie Cameron, Cllr Robert Chapman,
Cllr Ajay Chauhan, Cllr Mete Coban, Cllr Sophie Conway,
Cllr Feryal Demirci, Cllr Michael Desmond,
Cllr Humaira Garasia, Cllr Margaret Gordon,
Cllr Michelle Gregory, Cllr Katie Hanson, Cllr Ned Hercock,
Cllr Clare Joseph, Cllr Christopher Kennedy, Cllr Aron Klein,
Cllr Michael Levy, Cllr Anna Lynch, Cllr Yvonne Maxwell,
Cllr Clayeon McKenzie, Cllr Sem Moema, Cllr Guy Nicholson,
Cllr Harvey Odze, Cllr Deniz Oguzkanli, Cllr M Can Ozsen,
Cllr Sam Pallis, Cllr Benzion Papier, Cllr Sharon Patrick,
Cllr James Peters, Cllr Emma Plouviez, Cllr Clare Potter,
Cllr Steve Race, Cllr Tom Rahilly, Cllr Ian Rathbone,
Cllr Rebecca Rennison, Cllr Anna-Joy Rickard,
Cllr Caroline Selman, Cllr Nick Sharman, Cllr Gilbert Smyth,
Cllr Peter Snell, Cllr Simche Steinberger, Cllr Vincent Stops,
Cllr Jessica Webb, Cllr Carole Williams,
Cllr Caroline Woodley and Cllr Penny Wrouth

Apologies:

Cllr Kam Adams, Cllr Soraya Adejare, Cllr Sade Etti,
Cllr Susan Fajana-Thomas, Cllr Ben Hayhurst,
Cllr Richard Lufkin and Cllr Patrick Spence

Officer Contact:

Tess Merrett, Governance Services

Councillor Clare Potter[Speaker] in the Chair

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Adams, Etti, Fajana-Thomas, Hayhurst, Lufkin and Spence.
- 1.2 Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Moema and Pallis.

2 Speaker's Announcements

- 2.1 The Speaker
- 2.2 The Mayor was very sorry to hear about the death of former Councillor Dan Kemp, in late January. The Mayor was pleased to announce that Dan's father Ken, his brother Mat, along with his sister-in-law and niece were present at the

meeting and that his thoughts were also with Dan's mother Wendy and the rest of his friends and family that he leaves behind.

- 2.3 Dan was a long-serving Hackney Councillor and an active member of Overview and Scrutiny since his early years on the Council. Dan was the vice chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Board and remained in this role until 2012/13. The role carried the responsibility of being the Labour Group's lead Member for the Overview and Scrutiny function.
- 2.4 Dan also held 2 notable positions as vice chair first for the Regeneration and Social Inclusion Scrutiny Commission in 2005/06 then moving to be vice chair of the Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission from 2006/07 - 2012/13.
- 2.5 The Mayor also paid tribute to Richard Bruce, who was a Councillor from 1982 to 1990, representing Dalston ward. During this time he was the Chair of Housing. He has been described by many as a real character, and an absolute stalwart of the Labour Group of the time. An individualist, but always had something useful to say and had to be listened to.
- 2.6 Respects were given by the Mayor to Eric Cato and his family. The Mayor shared that Eric was always very community minded being a Governor at St Mary's Church of England Primary School, Skinners School for Girls, Homerton Hospital, and Chair of the African Caribbean centre.
- 2.7 Eric was also the driving force behind Friends of Grenada Hospital Association, and through this was involved with arranging exchange visits between Homerton staff and St George's hospital in Grenada, and Grenada and Haifa in Israel. In 2003, his efforts led to the Council formally twinning with St George's in Grenada.
- 2.8 In recent years, Eric had helped the Council celebrate Grenadian Independence Day each February with a reception in the Speaker's Parlour. Sadly, Eric's ill health meant that an event wasn't held this year, but the Speaker is planning a reception next month to celebrate the borough's twinning links with Grenada, and to celebrate Eric's life and his contribution to Hackney.
- 2.9 The Mayor also paid tribute to John Calderon, a local resident, trade unionist, and housing activist who died unexpectedly last month.
- 2.10 John had a tremendous passion for local housing issues and particularly the rights of council tenants. He was a key player in the previous Hackney Tenants' & Residents' Convention, was active in the national Defend Council Housing campaign and was a founder member of Downs Estate TMO. John was also a very active member of the local Labour Party, including secretary of the Shacklewell Ward.
- 2.11 John approached life with commitment and energy and many knew him for his dry sense of humour.
- 2.12 Deputy Mayor Bramble echoed many of the Mayor's comments she added that Eric was a vibrant and lively character who would sadly be missed by many.

2.13 Councillor Chapman also paid tribute to those individuals who had sadly passed away. Councillor Chapman spoke of Richard Bruce with whom he had worked closely with in the 80s. Richard Bruce had been a remarkable individual and great asset to the labour group, who had been very capable, and one of those people you had to listen to as he always had good information and views. It was added that he would be missed dearly along with the other individuals who had been spoken of this evening.

3 Declarations of Interest

3.1 Councillor Gordon declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 7, specifically questions 7.1 to 7.3.

3.2 Mayor Glanville and Councillor Hercock declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 13 as both highlighted that they were private renters.

4 Minutes of the previous meeting

4.1 Councillors Odze, Steinberger and Hercock requested the following amendments to the minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2019:

- Page 24, the finish time of the meeting be changed to 21:57 hours.
- Pages 1 and 2, on the list of Councillors in Attendance, Cllr was to be placed before Penny Wrouth's name.
- Page 3, to read: Councillor Odze asked when equipment would be available to record future Council meetings.
- Page 16, second bullet point, 2018/19 to be changed to 2019/20.
- Page 17, Paragraph 11.3, insert reliably before take cyclists' registration details.
- Page 17, Paragraph 11.4, insert probably before lead to violent demonstrations outside the Town Hall and riots on the streets.
- Page 17, Paragraph 11.4, Councillor Burke's comments raised at the meeting were to be re-inserted into the minutes.
- Page 15 Paragraph 8.15, to read: that Councillor Steinberger and colleagues were invited to 10 Downing Street. Reference would be made in the minutes to objections to the meeting being held on Saturday because members of the Jewish community were unable to attend. It was recommended that the meeting be held on Sunday.
- Paragraph 12.11, removal of with, so the following was to now read as follows: '...from that of shared prosperity he was describing'.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 23rd January 2019 be approved as a correct record subject to amendments.

4.2 Councillor Burke raised an objection to comments by Councillor Odze to remove the word violent from page 17 of the 23rd January 2019 minutes. After a short divergence of opinion between members of the majority party and the opposition, the Speaker concluded that the reference to violent from page 17 of the 23rd January 2019 minutes would not be removed.

4.3 Councillor Odze raised a point of order. Under clause 16.1.14 of the Hackney Council procedures. The Councillor commented that such was the length of the meeting agenda in all likelihood the meeting proceedings would go up to

22.30hours that evening. The Council was recommended to pass a motion to extend the meeting up to 22:30 hours.

4.4 The motion was seconded by Councillor Peters.

4.5 Council AGREED a motion to finish the meeting at 22:30 hours.

5 Petitions for debate - No to road closures which increase traffic on Church Street

To: Hackney Council we are calling on Hackney Council to scrap road closures put forward under its Walford Road Scheme and consider other solutions that would have less harmful impacts on Stoke Newington Church Street and neighbouring roads.

Why is this important?

Hackney Council now admits its proposed road closures in the Walford Rd area could increase traffic on Stoke Newington Church Street by up to 21.8% (2,080 extra vehicles per day). That is far higher than the 5-7% "worst case" scenario stated in their consultation. Church St is a lovely road at the centre of the N16 community where people live, work and go to school. It already suffers from heavy traffic; many homes there are illegally polluted. The street is home to two schools, both of which have worrying levels of pollution, and it was home to nurseries. In places the buildings are higher than the street is wide, so pollution can get trapped. The pavements are narrow and, in addition to worsening air quality and adding to congestion, extra vehicles could lead to more accidents. The road simply cannot cope with more traffic.

5.1 The Council welcomed Matthew Dillon to the meeting. He began by explaining that this petition was being brought to Council on behalf of businesses in Stoke Newington to say no to Hackney Council's proposed road closures which would significantly worsen air quality, increase congestion in the surrounding areas that were already suffering from the worst impact of traffic. Mr Dillon added that he had come to the Council meeting on behalf of his friend Heidi Early, who had a shop on the corner of two major roads; Stoke Newington Church Street and Stoke Newington High Street. Mr Dillon explained that Heidi's staff and customers already had to contend with poor air quality and noise and there was already around 10 thousand vehicles moving slowly past and queueing outside Ms Early's shop everyday. Mr Dillon explained that this was one of the most heavily polluted areas in Hackney with Nitrogen Dioxide (No2) levels far in excess of the legal limit. Ms Early has had to close the door to her shop between three and six every day because of the gases coming through and affecting her staff. Also, running a business on the high street, Mr Dillon added, was tough and sadly one third of Church Street businesses had closed down since 2015. The trade was dependent on having a pleasant environment for people to enjoy, allowing them to walk up and browse. Mr Dillon highlighted that the Mayor's own manifesto from 2018 planned to make sure 'Hackney's High Streets and markets thrive and prosper'. Mr Dillon asked what was Hackney Council proposing to do about pollution from traffic? Mr Dillon felt that the current plans would change the Walford Road area, he cited Hackney's own figures forecasting that this would lead to 20 % more traffic into Church Street. Mr Dillon was of the view that this was already well over the legal limit. Mr

Dillon believed that many parts of the borough suffered from poor air quality but these parts, according to Hackney Council's own analysis, would remove traffic from a relatively quiet area, that had relatively good air quality to a much busier one with perhaps the worst air quality and the highest levels of congestion in the area. Mr Dillon explained that Stoke Newington Church Street and Stoke Newington High Street were the centres of his local community, they were where people shopped, socialised, bumped into one another and chatted. Mr Dillon explained that above these shops there were flats, with families at home; these were not mini roads but were densely populated residential streets and they were by far the busiest pedestrianised routes in the area. Mr Dillon was of the view that it did not have to be like this and Church Street in particular had a unique character. Hardly any of Ms Early's customers accessed her shop by car, so if Church Street and the High Street were to have some investment in traffic-calming measures and better facilities of pedestrians they could be two of the most picturesque streets in London. Mr Dillon suggested as an alternative, that there should be investment in making Church Street and the High Street more people-friendly and liveable instead and make life a little better, not worse, for a high number of local people who were already suffering the effects of traffic the most. Mr Dillon added that Hackney Council should ask his fellow local traders, who were at the Council meeting, how they felt about this issue. Mr Dillon explained, that the petition to abandon the Walford Road closures, was signed by almost every business on Church Street. Mr Dillon added that almost every single one of them took the view that the proposed road closures were bad for business and the community. Local traders were calling for the Walford Road closures to be abandoned and to be replaced by a traffic calming scheme that embraced the whole area and was good for the whole of the local community including the residents of the Walford Road. Mr Dillon was of the view that some Councillors would respond by talking about the air quality model work that is under way and about how decisions had been made with the fullest possible evidence. Mr Dillon re-iterated that the measure would add over 20 % more traffic into an already heavily polluted, congested and narrow community and that the situation would be made worse not better for those who were already the most disadvantaged by pollution from traffic. Mr Dillon asked that the Mayor and his fellow Council Members, on behalf of their constituents, made the decision on the Walford Road closures with their hearts as well as their heads and to think about the potential impact of those already most affected by pollution and who would suffer even more. Mr Dillon urged that Hackney Council used its power and funds at its disposal to not go ahead with the proposed road closures and to do something else instead, something more ambitious. The Council needed to unite the local community rather than divide it. Mr Dillon concluded that steps should be taken to help those on this busiest street and benefit the many rather than the few.

Response to the petition

- 5.2 Councillor Stops responded that Hackney shared with other London boroughs some of the worst air quality in Europe. Councillor Stops had said this as far back as 2002. The Councillor added that issues of air quality and the environmental impact of cars was nothing new, however, Hackney had done more than any other London borough, by a long way, to address the negative environmental and socio-economic impact of private cars. Councillor Stops accepted that Hackney Council could and should do more. He explained that what was happening on Walford Road needed to be considered in the wider

context of the generation of work that Hackney had done. Councillor Stops explained that there had been thousands of interventions which had included Church Street, and which had put various measures in place such as speed humps and controlled parking and bus lanes. The Councillor added that there had been 130 roads closed in the borough and they had created area-wide liveable neighbourhoods that benefited all of the residents and all of the schools. All those schemes, the Councillor said, would have led to local impacts. Councillor Stops said that overall these schemes would have reduced motor traffic, and Church Street and every other high street would have benefited. Councillor Stops highlighted that three schools would have benefited directly from the Walford Road closure. The Councillor concluded that it would not be beneficial to reverse this road closure scheme. Work should continue on the road closure programme. The Councillor acknowledged that those adjacent to the road closures would be affected more than any others but the solution was not to re-divert traffic through residential streets.

- 5.3 Councillor Cameron began by thanking Mr Dillon, his fellow petitioners and Councillor Odze for bringing this matter to Council. The Councillor said she was disappointed that the analysis data on traffic levels was not available to scrutinise at Council and also that the results had not been available for publication last month. The Councillor said that the Council had and would continue to listen to residents, the Council had invested in further air quality monitoring and new entrances for affected schools. The Council would continue to invest in measures to improve air quality in the borough. Councillor Cameron added that she had some reservations about the Walford Road closure scheme, however subject to the outcome of the additional monitoring of air quality, instead of taking less action, as the petition urged, Councillor Cameron suggested the Council needed to take more action faster. The Councillor had pushed for more action to be taken in the Stoke Newington area with proposals being put forward such as a cycle lane and diesel buses being replaced by electric ones. The Councillor said, that these and other proposals, were taking place in partnership with Transport for London (TfL) and other local authorities. She acknowledged, however, that this was a slow process, adding that the Council wanted to reduce local traffic overall. The Councillor extended an invitation to the petitioners to discuss further the issues that they had raised. The Councillor highlighted that the main pollutants in the Church Street area were buses and businesses, and that the Council was seeking additional initiatives to help businesses reduce emissions. Councillor Cameron highlighted the 'last mile of delivery' campaign to help delivery vehicles reduce their omission levels in Church Street. The Councillor added that she would also like to see car free days. The Councillor said that the Walford Road closure scheme was part of an ongoing set of measures and the reduction of traffic overall was essential for the whole community.
- 5.4 Councillor Coban concurred with the comments raised by Councillor Cameron. The Councillor thanked Mr Dillon for bringing the petition to Council and added that the Council was passionately advocating for improving air quality in the borough.
- 5.5 Councillor Hercocock echoed the comments of his fellow Councillors and added that more needed to be done for Church Street not less. The Councillor thanked local residents for bringing the petition to the Council meeting and that he and his fellow Council members were striving for vibrant and welcoming

- local streets. He added that Hackney was an ambitious borough and should continue the push back against the dominance of the car and that he personally wished for this conversation to long continue.
- 5.6 Mr Dillon thanked the Councillors for their offers of help which he would take them up on. Mr Dillon was disappointed by Councillor Stops' response. He said that the Walford Road closure scheme was the issue at stake and it was about what could be done now, not about what had happened in the past. Mr Dillion stressed that the petition was not advocating for the re-opening of closed roads. He and his fellow petitioners were asking that the Council take a holistic view and considered the impact of their proposed road closure scheme on local areas. Mr Dillon believed that the best scheme was one that looked at traffic numbers and air quality improvements for the whole area. Mr Dillon explained that the Council's scheme made it into a situation of Church Street versus Walford road. He said that the petition had been brought to Council because petitioners wanted a scheme that encompassed the whole area and united the community behind a scheme that made it better for everyone.
- 5.7 Deputy Mayor Demirci began by thanking Mr Dillon for bringing the petition to Council and also those Council members who had spoken about the work Council was doing. The Deputy Mayor explained that Hackney was a busy, inner-London borough with a high volume of traffic, much of which came from other parts of the capital. Deputy Mayor Demirci felt it was not acceptable that cars, vans and trucks used Hackney's residential streets as a 'rat run'. Deputy Mayor Demirci said that Hackney Council was determined to stop this and reclaim local neighbourhoods for the people that lived there. The Deputy Mayor explained that by doing this, through the promotion of walking and cycling, this would encourage residents to be healthier and reduce the dominance of the car. The Deputy Mayor added that this would improve air quality in those areas where people spent most of their time.
- 5.8 Deputy Mayor Demirci continued by explaining that Hackney Council was one of London's leading councils on tackling poor air quality and was determined to protect local residents from its harmful effects. The Deputy Mayor highlighted that in the Mayor's manifesto there was a commitment to reduce harmful NO2 levels and emissions. Deputy Mayor Demirci also highlighted that Hackney Council had one of the most extensive school air quality monitoring and support programmes of any London borough, one of the greenest vehicle fleets, a growing School Streets programme, an ever-expanding network of electric charging points and an extensive programme to support businesses to switch to low or zero emission vehicles. Deputy Mayor Demirci added that Hackney Council cannot solve London's air quality problem alone. Hackney Council had lobbied Transport for London (TfL) successfully to extend the Ultra-Low Emission Zone to cover the whole borough by 2021, which would ensure that older, polluting vehicles pay a price for driving through it. Deputy Mayor Demirci explained that Hackney Council would also continue to lobby for regional and national solutions and explore all the funding options available to improve air quality. Last year, in line with these ambitions, Hackney Council had consulted on traffic-calming measures in the Walford Road area. Deputy Mayor Demirci explained that this had followed local residents' and businesses' concerns about the increased numbers of vehicles that were 'rat-running' along residential roads in the Walford Road area. Deputy Mayor Demirci added that this would be exacerbated if planned changes to the Stoke Newington gyratory

were to go ahead. Hackney Council's proposals were aimed at reducing the volume of traffic travelling through the area, improving safety for cyclists and pedestrians along the Cycle Superhighway 1 (CS1), while still allowing residents to access their homes. The Deputy Mayor explained that this would make the area safer and more pleasant for everyone, especially pedestrians and cyclists. It would improve air quality and create healthy, safe and attractive neighbourhoods for people to enjoy.

- 5.9 Deputy Mayor Demirci highlighted that Hackney Council had consulted on two options. These were as follows:
- Option A - Permanently closing Barbauld Road at its junction with Albion Road and Allen Road at its junction with Shakespeare Walk
 - Option B - Permanently closing Nevill Road between Osterley Road and Walford Road; Clonbrock Road at its junction with Nevill Road; and, Allen Road at its junction with Nevill Road.
- 5.10 The Deputy Mayor highlighted that both of these options would remove 'rat-running' traffic from the Walford Road area. Deputy Mayor Demirci added that during last year's consultation, some residents became concerned about the effect the proposals could have on air quality on Stoke Newington Church Street because the traffic was moved away from residential roads and back onto the main roads.
- 5.11 Deputy Mayor Demirci explained that, in response to these concerns, Hackney Council had commissioned a detailed independent air quality research from Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants (CERC), one of the country's leading air quality research organisations, to examine what the proposals would mean for the Stoke Newington area. Deputy Mayor Demirci added that Hackney Council was now working with the CERC to finalise this modelling.
- 5.12 Deputy Mayor Demirci acknowledged that this process had taken much longer than the Council would have expected or wished for and the Council apologised for the frustration that this had caused to residents, businesses, ward Councillors and council officers. The Deputy Mayor explained that the Air Quality modelling had been undertaken to a detailed level and the consultants had had to put a lot of work into setting up the model, which included the area bounded by Stoke Newington High Street, Stoke Newington Church Street, Albion Road and the Crossway. Deputy Mayor Demirci explained that having set up the model they had had to use extensive air quality data, collected by Hackney Council, both at William Patten School and at other air quality monitoring sites across the area to ensure that the Council's model represents the actual air quality situation that exists within the area. Deputy Mayor Demirci said that only when the Council was satisfied that the correlation between the modelling and the recorded results was acceptable, that the council would be able to start modelling the impacts of the proposed schemes.
- 5.13 Deputy Mayor Demirci informed members that Hackney Council's Cabinet was due to make a decision on the proposals in the spring. The air quality modelling, the Deputy Mayor explained, would be published, alongside air quality modelling, 28 days ahead of the Council's Cabinet meeting so residents had the chance to review this information ahead of the decision. Deputy Mayor

Demirci said that the Council was happy to meet residents once they had had a chance to examine the information.

- 5.14 Deputy Mayor Demirci concluded, that when making its decision, the Cabinet would consider the benefits of improved walking and cycling in the area, the consultation results from last year, the independent air quality modelling of the proposals, which would address concerns about air quality on Stoke Newington Church Street, and TfL's proposals for the Stoke Newington gyratory. The Deputy Mayor explained that Hackney Council was actively exploring further options to improve air quality on Stoke Newington Church Street and Crossway.
- 5.15 Deputy Mayor Demirci highlighted that Hackney Council was a leader in tackling London's poor air quality:
- The Council had one of the most extensive schools' air quality monitoring programmes in London. This monitored 89 schools and nurseries in areas of high pollution. The Council used this data to support schools to mitigate air pollution by providing funding for plant walls, which blocked harmful pollutants at schools, as well as offering bespoke advice and supporting them to carry out more air quality monitoring.
 - The Council had successfully lobbied TfL for the Ultra-Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ) to be extended to 2021 to cover the whole of Hackney
 - The Council was one of the first local authorities to introduce emissions-based parking permits, charging diesel and polluting vehicles.
 - The Council was running a fleet of over 40 electric vehicles, with a large proportion of the rest of the Council's fleet running on biofuels, which would reduce harmful emissions. The Council had also long worked to be London's leading borough for cycling, as it had reduced the number of cars on the road;
 - The Council had introduced the pioneering School Streets scheme to reduce air pollution outside school gates and to help children to walk and cycle to school. The Council's Zero Emissions Network (ZEN) supported businesses to switch to low or zero emissions vehicles.

6 Deputation

Regent Estate Freeholders' Service Charge

6.1 Councillor Odze introduced the deputation.

Freeholders of Brownlow Road who are being incorrectly charged for works to tenants' properties want this sorted out. Freeholders would like the council to refund the last ten years of service charges during which time they have been charging us for things which we should not be paying for.

6.2 The Speaker welcomed the spokesperson for Regents Estate, Tony Burton, to speak on the matter.

6.3 Mr Burton stated that he and other residents had received a demand to pay £374 in service charges. However it was felt that this sum should have been taken through permits and fines, not just from the residents of Regents Estate. Residents had also been asked to make a payment of £562, residents expressed that they had been struggling with the payments.

6.4 Mr. Burton explained that he had been a resident in Regents Estate for the past 13 years and not once had they had a consultation in relation to their service charges and works carried out. The Council were advised of some of the repairs works which the estate had been charged for;

- Removal of section of wall in the play area £1000,
- Repair playground £2300,
- Planting £484,
- Renewal of notice board £1500.

Mr Burton explained that there were many more charges for the Regents Estate at extortionate prices. He explained that some residents had even been charged for works outside of their estate.

6.5 Mr Burton explained that he had contacted the Mayor in relation to the issues, however as requested by residents the Mayor had not been to visit. Mr Burton on behalf of the estate requested the Mayor's assistance and suggested some dates for him to come and visit.

6.6 Councillor Steinberger thanked Mr Burton for his petition, he explained that he had been working on the case for many years, but unfortunately there had been no progress. Mr. Burton was questioned by Councillor Steinberger – Is it true that if someone blocked their drain or smashed a door that you get billed for it. Mr Burton explained that yes this was the case.

Response from the Cabinet Member of Housing Services:

Hackney Council charged freeholders a proportion of the total cost of carrying out communal repairs to the Regent Estate. The charging method used by Hackney involved a share of costs being apportioned to all properties which comprised the estate – whether freehold, leasehold or tenanted. The share of costs which applied to Regents Estate tenants should not be charged to freeholders.

Hackney's formula for apportioning costs across all estate properties was called a 'living space factor' (LSF) which was based on the size of each property. Each leasehold, freehold and tenanted property on an estate was assigned a living space factor (LSF) based on the number of bedrooms.

Each property's share of service charges was calculated by dividing the LSF of each dwelling by the total LSF of the estate.

This approach of calculating the charges was a fair and reasonable method of apportioning costs and when scrutinised by the First Tier Tribunal, which was the independent body responsible for deciding on some other landlord/leaseholder disputed matters, this charging method had not been found to, in any way, be unreasonable.

Brownlow Road formed part of the Regent Estate and in accordance with the legal agreement which Regents Estate freeholders have in place with the Council, freeholders were required to pay a share of the cost of the Council repairing and maintaining the communal parts of the estate.

The legal agreement which was in place required the Council to maintain the estate and for Regent Estate freeholders to pay their share of the costs associated with the Council doing so. Examples of the type of communal repairs which the Council was responsible for carrying out were to estate roads, footpaths and the drainage system which served the estate.

However, in response to enquiries received from Regent Estate homeowners in recent months, Housing Service were in the process of reviewing its records of each property which formed part of the estate to ensure that all Regent Estate properties were accounted for and that the living space factor for each property were correct.

This exercise involved checks being carried out on both Hackney's and The Land Registry's records. Once completed, if these checks established that there were any anomalies or inaccuracies in the Council's records which had resulted in overcharging this would be corrected and credits applied to freeholder's service charge accounts. Once the review had been completed Council officers would write to all leaseholders and freeholders to confirm the outcome and whether there were any service charge implications.

7 Questions from Members of the Public

Councillor Odze raised a point of order; under Council procedure 10.5.3, questions 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 appeared to the Councillor to be on the same subject. The Council noted this and the Chair of the Pensions Committee would respond to all three questions together.

7.1 Question from Alastair Binnie-Lubbock to the Chair of the Pensions Committee:

Reports from firms like Morgan Stanley Capital International (MSCI) show you can divest from the top 200 oil, coal and gas companies whilst maintaining the same, or better returns. Why would Hackney choose to continue investment in these companies that aggravate climate change, commit human rights abuses worldwide and put profits before people?

7.2 Question from Trish Roberts to the Chair of the Pensions Committee

Hackney committed to decarbonising 50 percent of its fossil fuel investments in 2016. In light of the UFGCC report on 12 years of action left to prevent the

worst climate change, Labour Green New deal, councils passing climate emergency motions and Southwark, Lambeth and Islington Council divesting, when will Hackney divest?

7.3 Question from Beatrix Pitel to the Chair of the Pensions Committee:

What is the rationale for decarbonising but not divesting from fossil fuels 50 percent of your investments?

Response to 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3:

Councillor Chapman replied that Hackney Council took climate change extremely seriously and considered it as one of a number of key financial risks to the fund. Councillor Chapman explained, that in 2016, the Pensions Committee set a target to reduce the pension fund's exposure to fossil fuel reserves by 50% over six years, aligning the fund with the two degrees scenario set out in the Paris Agreement. Councillor Chapman added that this represented an initial step in managing the Council's exposure to fossil fuels, and reflected its long term ambition to move away from these investments. Councillor Chapman said he was mindful that although reducing the Council's exposure could help it manage financial risk, it would not prevent the emission of CO₂, as the assets were purchased by other investors. The Pensions Committee must therefore make decisions about fossil fuel exposure on the basis of the risks posed to the fund.

Councillor Chapman added, that in addition to reducing Hackney Council's exposure to fossil fuels, the Pensions Committee also ensured that, where Hackney Council did retain actively managed fossil fuel holdings, that Council managers engaged in ongoing dialogue with investee companies to help manage risk. The Pensions Committee would also work together with other local authority pension funds to engage with the Council's investee companies to drive behaviour change. The Local Authority Pension Fund Forum (LAPFF), of which Hackney is a member, helped local authority funds collaborate, as the UK's largest group of asset owners, on shareholder engagement and responsible investment more generally. The Pensions Committee was also increasing Hackney Council's involvement in the work of the LAPFF and it was also currently reviewing its approach to engagement to ensure this remained effective as the Pensions Committee pooled Hackney Council's assets with other London local authority funds.

Councillor Chapman explained that the Pensions Committee had already taken significant action to help meet the Council reach its target. In May 2018, the Pensions Committee completed a significant restructure of the Council's equity portfolio, including nearly £840m of assets. The Pensions Committee had invested 10% (approximately £150m) of assets in Blackrock's newly created MSCI Low Carbon Target Fund, reducing the fund's exposure to fossil fuels and carbon emissions while still offering access to a wide range of global markets. The move was funded by significantly reducing exposure to the FTSE Allshare Index, which represented the fund's most significant exposure to fossil fuel companies. Councillor Chapman added that a further 13% of assets (approximately £195m) was invested in RBC GAM's Global Sustainable Equity strategy via the London Combine Investment Vehicle (CIV). This strategy

aimed to invest in companies with long term, sustainable revenues, with a strong focus on environmental, social and governance factors.

7.1 Supplementary question:

Does the Head of the Pensions Committee see no inconsistencies between the Council signing up to the UK 100 pledge and its continuing to invest and lend legitimacy to businesses that profit from climate change and its breakdown e.g. the Arms industry fuelling and profiting from climate breakdown. Does the Councillor see any complications arising from that and also from the fact that militaries worldwide are exempt from the Paris Agreement? How does the head of the Pensions Committee see that going carbon free?

Response to supplementary question:

Councillor Chapman replied, regarding the UK 100, that he saw no inconsistencies in what the Council was doing in its preparations that it had made. The Councillor added that Councillor Burke maybe able to elaborate on this further in his response to questions 8.5 and 8.10. Councillor Chapman highlighted that the Pensions Committee was precluded by fiduciary responsibilities to take decisions based directly on political or moral grounds and, the Council understood fully the financial implications of this, as ably set out by the questions this evening. Councillor Chapman re-iterated that the Pensions Committee had been consistent with what it was doing.

7.2 Supplementary question:

In light of the current climate crisis and the actions of the other councils, previously mentioned, and the Mayor's recent message on social media admitting to a climate emergency, when will Hackney Council set out a public statement and action plan to become carbon neutral by 2025 which includes a commitment to fully divest investment from fossil fuels?

Response to supplementary question:

Councillor Chapman reported that now the London Collective Investment Vehicle (CIV), had been established and once the Chief Executive of the CIV who was due to start in a week or so was in post, he hoped the CIV would be able to facilitate Hackney Council exploring a whole range of investment opportunities.

7.3 Supplementary question:

A recent assessment of Impact Management found that the financial risks involved with fossil fuels are minimal and can be offset by replacing oil, gas and coal by turning to more environmentally attractive alternatives. Does Hackney Council expect to divest fully from fossil fuels while fulfilling its fiduciary duties and will Hackney include this possibility of divestment during its review of competitive strategies which is happening this year?

Response to supplementary questions:

On asset management, Councillor Chapman replied that Hackney Council was reducing its exposure. The Councillor explained that the Council was aiming to be carbon neutral, as that was felt to be the only way forward. Councillor Chapman informed the Council that this would be taken into consideration in the future work of the Pensions Committee. He added that the situation was much more serious now compared to when the Pensions Committee had taken its original position. Councillor Chapman concluded that currently there was nothing more on the table but the Pensions Committee would always continue to move forward on this journey.

7.4 Question from Dr Heather Mendrick to the Lead Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources

Following recent reports in our local press regarding allegations of bullying, discrimination, intimidation and victimisation in the Hackney Call Centre, what is being done to address these allegations and ensure justice is served, including attempts to resolve outstanding issues quickly?

Response:

Councillor Williams began by explaining that Hackney Council was one of only 19 authorities in the country to have reached Excellent in the local government equalities framework. Reviewers went as far as to say equality is in the “DNA of Hackney”. Councillor Williams said unequivocally that Hackney Council was a place where racism, bullying, and discrimination would not be tolerated. Councillor Williams added that Hackney Council was an anti-racist organisation, that campaigned on equality and went above and beyond what other local authorities were doing to not only instil the values of equality internally, but campaign for those values externally. Councillor Williams explained that the Council did not take that for granted, and the Councillor explained that she would not be part of an administration that took that for granted.

Councillor Williams acknowledged that the Council must always be vigilant to maintain the high standard of equality and inclusivity that this administration expected from the senior leadership of the Council. It was also understood that in an organisation of 4000 staff, there would always be poor management practices that the Council needed to stamp out.

Councillor Williams explained that this was why the Council had programmes like the fantastic Young Black Men programme. This was a ten year long programme to tackle the structural inequalities in today’s society, working with partners across the borough.

The Councillor added this was why Hackney was the first council to pass a comprehensive motion to fight for the Windrush Generation and against this government’s hostile environment policy, organising advice sessions for staff, and lobbying the government to ensure the compensation scheme encompassed the families of those affected. That was why 18 months ago Hackney Council agreed to begin a process of reviewing and improving our training programmes, policies, and guidance available for managers and staff members. That was why Hackney Council was currently working with disabled staff to make this organisation support them better, after recognising an underrepresentation of disabled staff in the Council. Hackney Council job

advertises now say that the Council will especially welcome applications from disabled people as well as continuing to offer a guaranteed interview for disabled people who meet the minimum requirements. That was why Hackney Council would be launching an inclusive leadership champions' programme this spring. Councillor Williams explained that champions from all parts of Hackney Council would be trained in the principles of inclusive leadership and then supported to train senior managers and leaders. The principles would consider self-awareness, workplace culture, leadership styles and decision making. Councillor Williams added that this was why moving forward Hackney Council would be working with ethnic minorities staff to take a look at recruitment and restructures to ensure the design and approach was as inclusive as possible.

Councillor Williams explained to the Council that Hackney Council would be launching a campaign to recruit more staff from Hackney, recognising that the staff profile needed to reflect the borough. Local recruitment had improved already, and Hackney Council had one of the highest figures of local workforce for years, but the Council wanted to do more. The Council would go hand in hand with its in-house apprenticeships that were recruiting and training local residents and breaking glass-ceilings.

Councillor Williams added that was also why, when trade union colleagues raised concerns of poor work culture, bullying, harassment and racism in Hackney Council's Repairs Call Centre, the Council launched an independent investigation, with the investigator and terms of reference jointly agreed with the trade unions.

Councillor Williams was saddened by the decision made by colleagues in the unions to withdraw their support from the independent investigation into their allegations, before it had published its findings. Councillor Williams and the Chief Executive had met with them on a regular basis, listened to their concerns, and responded with actions to ensure that the investigation was independent, and would be published and acted upon. Councillor Williams urged the unions and their members to reconsider and see an independent process that they help start through to the end.

Councillor Williams explained that the independent investigation must finish and make recommendations, so that Hackney Council could work on improving the environment for staff in that service. Councillor Williams added that the Council wanted staff members to have confidence in that process, and as many staff members as possible to take part. This was why as part of the evidence gathering process the Council had added an additional two days of interview slots on top of the six originally available.

Councillor Williams promised that the Council would get to the bottom of whatever was happening in the Call Centre. Hackney Council would fully implement any recommendations and publish the report once it was complete.

And more widely, Councillor Williams added, she knew the senior leadership had begun analysing responses to the all-staff survey and creating improvement plans. Councillor Williams took this just as seriously as investigations, and she was pleased to announce that as a result of the staff survey results, Hackney Council would be increasing the amount of mandatory training that managers must complete, including mandatory diversity and

Wednesday, 27th February, 2019

inclusive leadership training for all managers in the organisation, both new and existing. Councillor Williams said that Hackney Council would involve staff in the development of this training. This was a firm commitment from the Council to make sure that this was a supportive and inclusive workplace for everyone who worked here. Councillor Williams absolutely welcomed it.

Councillor Williams continued by highlighting that she wanted staff across the organisation to feel comfortable and confident in the Council's policies and procedures, that they could come forward and raise concerns when they had them. Councillor Williams thanked UNISON for also launching their own survey to members about bullying and harassment. Councillor Williams encouraged all of the councillors to complete that survey.

The Speaker reminded those who were not present at the start of the meeting that whilst they were entitled to record the meeting they must make it known to the Council that they were recording proceedings.

Supplementary question:

Councillor Williams, at the end there it was acknowledged that all three major trade unions, GMB, UNISON and Unite, had launched their own independent investigation. And I think that shows that trade unions do not experience a level of collaboration. What was Hackney Council going to do differently to ensure that the trade unions were on board and address the concerns they have raised and the rationale behind the joint investigation that they have not raised lightly?

Response:

Councillor Williams replied that she was certain that there was no request which had been made by the Trade Unions which had not been listened to and that the Council had not been open to. The Council had set up additional meetings, which trade unions had requested, but because of not being able to secure a diary slot the investigation had been extended by two days. Councillor Williams explained that the Council had investigated counter allegations and today it was announced that all managers would go through diversity training. Councillor Williams concluded that she was not sure what else the Council could do beyond what was already being done. The Council had listened, it had an open door and there had been many meetings face to face and had correspondence with Trade Unions.

7.5 Question from Christopher Sills to the Lead Member for Finance and Housing needs

Too many people become homeless in Hackney and are sleeping rough. Would you consider helping them to solve their problems by allowing them to use public buildings as accommodation addresses and where lack of English is part of the problem encourage them to learn English?

Response:

Councillor Rennison began by thanking Mr Sills for raising the question. The Councillor explained that at Hackney Council's annual rough sleeper count, held in November, the Council identified that the number of individuals that

night sleeping rough was 23. The Councillor outlined to Members the various support methods that Council provided to those who found themselves sleeping rough in the borough. Councillor Rennison stressed the importance of the Council's prevention work including the No Second Night Out (NSNO) scheme which focused on those who found themselves rough sleeping on the streets of London for the first time. There was also Hackney Council's street outreach work helping those people rough sleeping to get into a hostel. There was Hackney Council's Green Passport initiative which was a one-stop-shop for those who found themselves sleeping rough or were vulnerable to homelessness. There was also floating hub support services to help prevent homelessness and there were clear protocols providing extra front end support to rough sleepers particularly in cold weather. The Council was also working closely to align its services with its voluntary organisation partners. Councillor Rennison explained that it was frustrating that despite all these investments in all these initiatives, it was unlikely that Hackney Council would see any extra funding from central government.

Councillor Rennison explained that a particular area of concern was the Council's funding for Greenhouse day centre, which since 2007, had provided free healthcare, housing and welfare support to the homeless in the borough. Councillor Rennison concluded by reminding her fellow Councillors that if they saw anyone sleeping rough in the borough they should refer them to the appropriate services e.g. streetlink at www.streetlink.org.uk.

Supplementary question:

Mr Sills was of the view that with rough sleepers it was important to get them into some form of accommodation quickly because otherwise they would become a long-term problem. Mr Sills stressed that it was absolutely essential to help these people. Mr Sills recalled a story when he found a lady who he thought was 18, he had rang Children's Services and was told to phone the police, instead of them going around and making certain that the lady was okay. Mr Sills believed that this was what the problem was. This needed to change. Mr Sills acknowledged that a lot of other councils have the same problem but Hackney Council ought to take the lead on this issue.

Response:

Councillor Rennison replied by saying that she could not agree more with the comments raised by Mr Sills. The Councillor explained that it was about immediate intervention and getting vulnerable people off the streets as soon as possible and into secure accommodation. The Councillor explained that it was unusual, following the annual rough sleeper count in November that the Council would not know about someone sleeping rough. It was usually one or two people who had not contacted the Council and were engaging with its services. Councillor Rennison, acknowledged the point raised by Mr Sills, that it could often take a long time for someone sleeping rough to engage with what was available to them and get on the pathway out of rough sleeping. The Council had available a range of programmes for example programmes for those sleeping rough one to two nights or those finding themselves sleeping rough for a short period of time and the Council would identify the right pathways for those individuals. Councillor Rennison highlighted the other types of homeless persons in the borough, for example those individuals who were affected as a

result of changes in welfare or those EU citizens who could no longer access housing benefit. The Councillor re-iterated that it was unlikely that the Council would receive any funding this year to help the Council fund a wider programme to target these various groups.

8 Questions from Members of the Council

8.1 Question from Cllr Klein to the Councillor Selman

In the year November 2017 to November 2018 the Council collected £414,758 late night levy from licensees selling alcohol between midnight and 06:00. Of this, more than quarter of a million pounds came from four wards, with more than 60% of this being collected from licensees in Hoxton East and Shoreditch. More than £300,000 of this total remained unspent at the end of the year, whilst only £56,068 was spent on Council Enforcement Officer patrols.

In light of these facts what is going to be done to ensure that the vast majority of this surplus, as well as ongoing income, will be spent on enhanced Police and Council Enforcement Officer patrols in order to protect residents and licensees in those areas and to enhance the experience of Hackney for all concerned?

Response:

Councillor Selman thanked Councillor Klein for his question. Councillor Selman began by highlighting that this matter was considered by the Licensing Committee at its meeting on 16th January 2019. The report to the committee highlighted that the Police were initially unable to commit dedicated resources funded by the levy during year one. Councillor Selman explained, however, that the police have since given an initial forecast of £170K to be spent in Year 2. Councillor Selman added that it was expected that this would be used to fund an additional Sergeant and four Constables giving greater flexibility to provide resource to the various Night Time Economy (NTE) areas including those outside the busiest areas of Shoreditch and Dalston.

Councillor Selman explained that as part of the set-up of the scheme the Council established a local Management Board as recommended by the Home Office. It was this Board that was responsible for overseeing how the revenue was spent. Councillor Selman added that £170K was to be spent by the Police. Furthermore the Management Board had already committed resources to fund the following activities in year two:

- The appointment of a Night Time Economy Manager with duties including coordination of activities associated with the Levy. Officers were in the process of shortlisting candidates for this post.
- An additional Public Space Surveillance Officer was deployed over the course of the festive period. This Officer was in place to monitor/operate mobile Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) from 21:00 hours to 05:00 hours up to and including New Year's Day.
- A new Safer Socialising Campaign was to be developed with the Media and Communications Service.
- Additional Enforcement Officer patrols had been undertaken on top of the existing provision until 05.00 hours on Fridays and Saturdays.

- The Management Board had requested that officers investigate if additional portable toilet provision or the introduction of pop-up toilets could be deployed in key NTE areas.

Councillor Selman commented that it was regrettable that such a large surplus remained after the first year of the scheme. The Councillor added that the focus of the Board was now to ensure that the money was used to deliver the most effective initiatives offering the best value for money. Specific focus would be on measures to promote the licensing objectives, in order to protect Hackney residents and businesses and create a safe and welcoming night-time economy across the borough.

8.2 Question from Cllr Odze to the Cabinet member for Housing Services:

Why has it taken nearly three years for the Stamford Hill Neighbourhood Panel to receive an answer, that including the job description in a Communal Repairs Report is not possible because of the difficulties in redacting personal data, is this yet another example of the Council wasting money on software systems that are not fit for purpose?

Response:

Councillor McKenzie replied that over the last three years the approach to communal repairs had greatly improved by planned works being undertaken by the Council's external partner contractors, rather than the works being mixed in with the main stock investment contracts, for example those relating to kitchens and bathrooms.

The Communal Works team within the Building Maintenance Service kept detailed records of works programmes from the Resident Led Improvement Budget (RLIB) walkabouts, which included before and after photographs. These were updated and a report was sent to each local panel prior to their monthly meetings. This included Stamford Hill Panel.

Councillor McKenzie explained that Communal Works Officers also kept detailed logs of repairs that they identified, but these were generally not circulated to the panels because communal repairs were also reported by Housing Officers and by residents direct to the Repairs Call Centre (RCC) and so these logs would not be a comprehensive list of all communal repairs reported.

Councillor McKenzie added that when repairs were raised by the RCC, be they communal or not, they had the tenant's name and a contact number on the job ticket so that the DLO or Contractor could contact the resident if necessary. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to share the job ticket details which provided details of the works that needed to be done with the panels.

Councillor McKenzie explained that that the Council had now mobilised the new IT system earlier this year, which although had been initially designed for another part of the repairs service, it had functionality that could be rolled out for other purposes. The interfaces developed for the "Repairs Hub", as it was called, were reusable to extract repairs data and present it in various formats and this could exclude personal data in future.

Councillor McKenzie concluded, that this 'Agile' approach to developing IT solutions, being adopted across the Council, involved IT designers working directly with staff so

that the solutions provided what was required. This had proved far more efficient than investing large sums of money in expensive off-the-shelf systems that may not meet Council needs and those of Hackney residents.

Councillor McKenzie explained that the Council was about to commence the next phase of the “Agile” project, Raise a Repair. This would be linked to the new Estate Inspection software - which the Council would be trialling with Housing Management Teams from April of this year.

Councillor McKenzie added that once all this was completed and evaluated, panels would be able to have information not only on the planned programme but on any repairs relating to their estate raised by anyone, the personal data having been filtered out. Also, Officers on site would not only be able to raise repairs there and then, but query works already reported, all from their Ipad. This would be introduced during the next 12 months.

Councillor McKenzie added that the new Repairs Hub system had been praised by Hackney’s peers in other local authorities and the Repairs Hub had reduced by more than half, the time necessary for key tasks to be undertaken. Hackney Council had also been shortlisted as a finalist in the UK Housing Awards 2019 in the “digital landlord of the year category”. The next phases, which had started already, would achieve improvements to residents’ experiences, improve the efficiency of working and access to the right information, for the right people at the right time, whilst protecting personal data.

8.3 Question from Cllr Odze to the Deputy Mayor Demirci:

What was the Council doing to ensure that the service it provides to vulnerable residents, over the age of 55, who come under the remit of it's Housing with Care scheme, is par excellence, specifically, including the additional cost of the retrofit of proper controls over and above what would have been the cost if they had been in place originally, to ensure that the service is taken out of special measures and gains an outstanding rating from the Care Quality Commission (CQC)?

Response:

Deputy Mayor Demirci replied that the Council had taken the outcome of the recent CQC inspection of the Housing with Care service very seriously and in response had developed a detailed action plan to address the specific concerns raised by the CQC and to support the service to receive a ‘good’ or ‘outstanding’ rating when it was next inspected by the CQC. The action plan had also been shared with the CQC who had said that they had confidence in the management of the service to deliver the improvements required. Deputy Mayor Demirci added that progress against the action plan was monitored on a weekly basis by the senior management team in Adult Services.

Deputy Mayor Demirci concluded that to ensure the action plan was delivered on time, and to the highest quality, additional resources had been made available to the service. This included:

- Four additional social workers had been allocated to support with care plans and risk assessments. All Housing with Care staff had been invited to work

- overtime and, where possible, at weekends. The response had been positive as staff were determined to secure the reputation of the service for the future.
- Our experience with other provider organisations that have been supported through similar improvement processes showed that it was vital to engage additional external advice. We have engaged someone on a short-term basis with expertise in CQC regulation and service improvement to advise and oversee the service's improvement plan.
 - Two Occupational Therapists were completing moving and handling risk assessments, and an Occupational Therapy Assistant was supporting with personalised care plans.
 - Two members of staff from Safeguarding were also supporting with risk assessment delivery.
 - Project Management resource had been made available to support the service to coordinate the delivery of the improvement plan and monitor progress effectively.

8.4 Question from Cllr Stops to Deputy Mayor Demirci

So far council has only seen the concept drawings for the 10 million pounds Highway scheme in Hackney Central announced by TfL in November 2017. Can the Deputy Mayor share with members how the council has involved residents in developing this scheme in line with council's manifesto commitment in May 2018?

Response:

Deputy Mayor Demirci replied that local residents, businesses and other stakeholders would be fully involved in further developing the Council's proposals. Hackney Council would be undertaking a Hackney Central Conversation in a similar way to that recently carried out for the Dalston area. Hackney Council would be inviting comments on its initial concept proposals as submitted to TfL in November 2017. This consultation, which was planned to start in May 2019, would give local people the opportunity to guide the council's thinking and help it to develop its ideas for the town centre.

Deputy Mayor Demirci explained that as part of the conversation, the Council were also planning workshops that would consider transport issues in more detail. There would be further opportunities for comment later in 2019 as part of the next stages in developing the project.

8.5 Question from Cllr Moema to Cabinet Member for Energy Sustainability and Community Services

In the light of the International Panel on Climate Change report, indicating that the human race only has until 2030 to act to avoid the worst climate change, could the Cabinet Member for Sustainability update members on the council's progress to meet its manifesto commitments on climate?

Response:

Councillor Burke replied that one of Hackney Labour's manifesto commitments on climate concerned the Hackney Pension Fund; Hackney Labour had pledged to support the Pensions Committee to reach its target of reducing exposure to fossil fuel reserves by 50% by 2022, aligning the fund with the goals of the Paris Agreement on climate change. Councillor Burke added that the council was pleased to say that the

Pensions Committee had already taken significant action to help meet the target, with a significant restructure of the fund's equity portfolio taking place during 2018.

Councillor Burke added that the fund had invested 10% (approx. £150m) of assets in Blackrock's newly created MSCI Low Carbon Target Fund, reducing the fund's exposure to fossil fuels and carbon emissions while still offering access to a wide range of global markets. The move was funded by significantly reducing exposure to the FTSE Allshare Index, which represented the Fund's most significant exposure to fossil fuel companies. A further 13% of assets (approx. £195m) was invested in RBC GAM's Global Sustainable Equity strategy via the London CIV. This strategy aimed to invest in companies with long term, sustainable revenues, with a strong focus on Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) factors. Councillor Burke added that the Pensions Committee had also recently agreed a £160m allocation to two private debt mandates to be funded from the fund's equity portfolio, which would reduce exposure still further.

8.6 Question from Cllr Sharman to the Mayor

In light of the suggestion that deprivation would be removed as a factor in distributing local authority funding, can the Mayor explain what the likely implications are for Hackney of the emerging Fair Funding proposals?

Response:

Mayor Glanville replied that the fair funding review, which the Mayor assumed the government named ironically, risks being one of the greatest Tory stitch-ups of local government funding since they came into power. The Mayor was of the view that it looked like an attempt to quell the angry Tory county leaders who had also been heavily impacted by austerity and had struggled to keep their budgets balanced. The Mayor cited Northamptonshire as an example of this and the government knew it would see more councils going bust unless they did something. The mayor queried what was the government's answer to this? Diverting money away from cash-strapped cities into cash-strapped counties.

Mayor Glanville believed that this failed to recognise that central government's priority should be sustainable funding for ALL councils from counties to cities, from parishes to boroughs. It also failed to recognise the increasing demand on council services, in part thanks to cuts to other public services and welfare reform.

Mayor Glanville added that the consultation revealed that the government were considering removing 'deprivation' and homelessness from their funding formula. How the government could erroneously assume that deprivation and homelessness had no added impact on council services was beyond belief.

The Mayor believed that it was more of an insult that the government wanted to replace deprivation and homelessness from funding formulas with an area cost adjustment that included travel times and remoteness. The Mayor commented that there was no evidence so far to suggest travel times had a big enough impact to replace 'deprivation' with.

The Mayor explained that he had already responded to the first consultation stage on behalf of the Council, and he had written to the Secretary of State expressing Hackney's deep concern that the Council's budget would be disproportionately

affected - continuing the tradition that cuts hit Labour held areas harder. The Mayor pledged that the Council would do a lot more, sticking to its promise to be a campaigning council to stop this Tory stitch-up.

8.7 Question from Cllr Adejare to Cabinet Member for Family, Early Years and Play

What progress was being made on the Council's manifesto promises of being a child friendly borough, so that every child in Hackney gets a good start in life.

Response:

Councillor Kennedy began by stating there was a general and a specific response to this question. In general Hackney Council was already giving all its young people the best start in life and there were many aspects of the Council's policies and services that were child-friendly:

- The comprehensive early help and support on offer through the Council's excellent Children's Centres and available through the Council's Children and Families Service
- Six outdoor gyms, 62 Multi-Use Game Areas (MUGAs) 170 playgrounds on Hackney estates
- 58 parks and green spaces, 25 of which have green flags
- There were eight adventure playgrounds, five of which had recently been awarded improvement money totalling over a quarter of a million pounds
- 40 registered play streets
- The brilliant school streets project which, it was hoped, would see more additions to its numbers soon.

Councillor Kennedy added, that for the specific response it helped to understand something of the history of the term "child-friendly". The Councillor explained that it was first coined and widely used by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) in the phrase "child-friendly cities" in its bid to encourage cities in developing nations to have due regard to the needs of children and young people, specifically in built up environments. Councillor Kennedy added that these aspirations had been successfully transferred to the developed world and there had been seen broad interpretations of the idea. From play 'audits' in Wales, through design guidance in Toronto on incorporating play space to Tower Blocks to a Child Friendly Leeds, which included a wonderful initiative where in the summer time posters appear all round the city wishing all children and students good luck in their exams!

Councillor Kennedy highlighted that the leading UK expert in child-friendly initiatives, Dinah Bornat, was a Hackney resident and it was at a conference, that she convened at Haggerston Community Centre, that Mayor Glanville accepted a challenge from her to make Hackney a Child Friendly Borough by the end of this electoral term. What that might look like, Councillor Kennedy explained, had become much clearer following a study, entitled, Neighbourhood Design, Working with Children Towards a Child-friendly City. Councillor Kennedy explained that this looked at how young people used, moved through and associated around the public space on the De Beauvoir Estate. Councillor Kennedy quoted from the Mayor's foreword to the study: "This report inspires me to believe that it is possible for Hackney to bring forward design guidance which can include young people's needs and voices at every stage of the planning and regeneration process."

Councillor Kennedy explained that Deputy Mayor Bramble was assisting him in the delivery of this manifesto promise and through conversations with Cabinet colleagues, the Mayor, Dinah Bornat, and the third sector organisation, A New Direction, Hackney Council had come to share the Mayor's inspiration. They were working with council officers, aiming towards becoming the first borough in the country to produce Supplementary Planning Design (SPD) guidance requiring builders and developers of large schemes to have regard to younger people throughout all stages of the planning and development process. Councillor Kennedy explained, that to be successful an SPD required "hooks" in the planning documents that sat above it from which it could hang. Councillor Kennedy added that early scoping had identified these both in the draft London Plan and it also shows that Hackney Council has these in abundance in its own draft Plan, LP33:

- **PP1 Public Realm:** States that development should 'Create multi-functional shared public space for users of all ages, allowing opportunity for informal play and recreation as well as for sitting and lingering.'
- **LP8 Social and Community Infrastructure:** talks about contributing towards creating child-friendly places including youth facilities, community, cultural, educational and leisure facilities.
- **LP9 Health and wellbeing:** New development must be designed to promote mental and physical activity and wellbeing
- **LP41 Liveable Neighbourhoods:** states that all new development must 'Contribute to the *Healthy Streets* approach to improve air quality, reduce congestion and goes on to state that development must 'Tackle poor air quality, seeking to reduce NOx emissions to achieve the National Air Quality objective and in particular reduce the exposure of children and vulnerable people to transport-related air pollution.'
- **LP50 Play Space:**
 - A. The Council will protect existing play and recreation facilities and support the development of new formal and informal play facilities. New major residential developments and mixed-use schemes that are likely to generate a child yield of 10 or more are required to provide 10sqm of dedicated play space per child on-site.
 - B. New play spaces should:
 - i. Be well located and easily accessible by pedestrian, cycling or bus routes, and
 - ii. Be inclusive to all, and
 - iii. Provide a range of different types of play facilities and experiences for children of different abilities, and
 - iv. Be sustainable and easy to maintain.

Councillor Kennedy concluded by stating that a Child-Friendly SPD could supplement all these strands within the Council's Local Plan by pulling them together in one place, reminding developers and planners alike of the importance of keeping consideration of young people to the fore. Councillor Kennedy added that 'the stars must be aligned' because, Unicef UK had recently moved their offices to the Olympic Park. Councillor Kennedy commented that he and Deputy Mayor Bramble would shortly be meeting with Unicef's Programme Support Officer for Child Friendly Cities and Communities.

Councillor Kennedy, in reply to Councillor Adejare's question about what progress was being made on this manifesto commitment, Councillor Kennedy replied that good progress was being made.

8.8 Question from Councillor Race to Deputy Mayor Demirci

Residents in Hoxton East are concerned about the implications of the East London Health Community Partnership estate plans, that had been announced without any prior consultation nor any engagement with Hackney residents. Did Hackney Council share Councillor Race's concerns, and could the Cabinet member provide an update on how these plans will impact health services in Hackney, especially the services at St Leonards site in my ward?

Response to follow.

8.9 Question from Cllr Coban to the Lead Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources

What is the Council doing about promoting diversity and inclusion as an employer, especially by creating pathways to leadership for council employees?

Response:

Councillor Williams replied that Hackney Council was undertaking several measures to promote diversity and inclusion as an employer including:

- Promoting a diverse workforce had been an explicit council priority since last year, and this was reflected in the Single Equality Scheme which was adopted last November.
- Hackney Council was taking a dual approach to achieve positive change in the workforce where it identified positive actions to ensure that its workforce was more reflective of the community it serves and also that it took action to ensure its leaders were thinking and working in an inclusive way and creating an inclusive culture
- Looking at the workforce profile, Hackney Council had an under representation of disabled staff in its workforce compared with the community overall. The Council's middle and senior management was also not reflective of Hackney's Black and ethnic minority community.
- Although difficult to measure, Hackney Council also assumed that it was more difficult for people from lower socio-economic groups to progress into leadership, based on wider societal disadvantages.
- Hackney Council was taking a range of actions because it recognised that different barriers required different solutions.
- Hackney Council was currently working with disabled staff and managers to identify improvements to disabled staff's experience. For example, in response to staff feedback, Hackney Council job adverts now said that the Council would especially welcome applications from disabled people as well as continuing to offer a guaranteed interview for disabled people who meet the minimum requirements.
- Hackney Council was launching an inclusive leadership champions' programme this spring. Champions from all parts of the Council would be trained in the principles of inclusive leadership and then supported to train senior managers and leaders. The principles would consider self-awareness, workplace culture, leadership styles and decision making. Hackney Council would assess the

- impact by asking staff about how inclusive their leaders were in the Council's next staff survey and in focus groups.
- Hackney Council had identified a range of actions to improve the representation of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) staff at managerial and leadership levels. This work was beginning next month and was based on staff insight from the Council's staff survey and focus groups as well as good practice from elsewhere. Hackney Council would be working with BME staff as the Council improved and deepened its understanding of its workforce profile, beyond the current published profile. Hackney Council would also be talking to BME staff in different parts of the organisation to gain a deeper understanding of what is going on, to understand their experience of different institutional barriers. Hackney Council would be launching a campaign to raise the profile of senior staff from diverse backgrounds, that celebrated their success but also acknowledged difficulties they may have had to overcome in their career. Hackney Council would be working with BME staff to take a look at recruitment and restructures to ensure the design and approach was as inclusive as possible. The Council would also be considering what positive actions could be taken to support leadership development for BME staff, allowing them to examine their own experiences, views and perceptions and which supported them to build their leadership skills.

8.10 Question from Cllr Smyth to Cabinet Member for Energy, Sustainability and Community Services

Can the Cabinet member for Energy, Sustainability and Community Services please update members on what's being done by the council to work towards a clean energy system?

Response:

We have been examining ways to introduce higher levels of renewables at no extra cost. We have been discussing changes with our electricity suppliers. It was our ambition to procure 100% renewably sourced electricity for our electricity offering by 2020/21 and in future years.

We have commissioned an options appraisal report, which has been delivered with recommendations. We have appointed a project manager and set up a Project Delivery Board to take forward the recommendations. The inaugural meeting of the Board had been scheduled for 25 February 2019. We were planning to take the Business Case for setting up the Company to Cabinet by April 2019.

We have prepared the Gap Analysis Report on the development of the energy management system and ISO 50001 certification with clear recommendations. We have been developing the activities recommended for implementation into an action plan. We have also been working to learn from organisations who have implemented ISO 50001.

We have reached agreement with our electricity suppliers to ensure that 50% of our electricity supply requirements for 2019/20 were supplied from renewable sources. We were also currently working with all other Councils in London to procure a framework agreement that would ensure all our electricity requirements were from renewable sources by 2020.

We submitted our new Local Plan (LP33) to the Secretary of State on 23 January 2019. In accordance with the manifesto commitments, LP33 included a series of new

policies to reduce carbon emissions and mitigate climate change. The new policies would help enable us to become a low carbon and carbon resilient borough, and included a requirement for major commercial development to generate at least 10% of their energy needs from renewable sources on site or in the local area. The Local Plan would now be subject to an examination in public by an independent Planning Inspector before we were able to proceed to fully adopt the Plan, which was likely to be towards the end of 2019/early 2020.

8.11 Question from Cllr Patrick to Deputy Mayor Demirci

Could Cllr Demirci update the Council on the preparation to spend Sport England monies and how has the local community being involved in drawing up spending plans?

Response:

Deputy Mayor Demirci replied that she was sure that all members at the Council meeting would appreciate the opportunity to be updated on what was happening with the Sport England Local Delivery Pilot, following the exciting announcement that in November 2017, Hackney had been selected as one of 12 pilot schemes to receive investment from Sport England. This investment was aimed at making it easier for people to access sport and physical activity, particularly those who were the most inactive.

At the time of the announcement, Sport England confirmed their intention to invest around £100million of National Lottery funding in 12 pilot schemes across England over four years. Deputy Mayor Demirci explained that the aim of this investment was to create innovative partnerships that enable better collaboration between a wide range of local organisations, including voluntary groups, social enterprises, local authorities, faith organisations, schools, GPs and parenting groups. The pilot areas also needed to ensure that local people were involved at all stages of the pilot.

Deputy Mayor Demirci explained, that in March 2018, Sport England announced their intention to award up to £1m of development funding to each of the pilot areas to progress the following:

- Establish a pilot staff team
- Appoint an evaluator for the duration of the pilot
- Appoint an insight and co-design partner for the duration of the pilot
- Other basic costs relating to establishing the pilot, i.e. marketing and communications, and initial stakeholder engagement and activities.

The Council had appointed a Programme Manager in February 2018, who was tasked with establishing initial contact with residents and partners, as well as working closely with Sport England and other council officers to progress key elements of setting up the pilot, including identifying a base in the ward.

The full staff team (a team of four) came into post in October 2018 and comprised the following roles:

- Lola Akindoyin - Head of Programme, Sport England Local Delivery Pilot
- Michelle Taylor - Programme Manager, Sport England Local Delivery Pilot
- David Toombs - Community Development and Partnerships Manager

- Aaron Cooper - Apprentice, Sport England Local Delivery Pilot

Some initial grassroots insight activity took place in September and October 2018 and involved close to 300 residents. The activities were delivered by 12 local partners. Feedback from the activities highlighted the following:

- An interest in activities that could be done with others (with a particular demand for family activities)
- Activities that would enable residents to reduce their stress
- A request for community spaces that offered activities to support residents to be more active
- Particular interests in swimming and dancing
- A strong (but sometimes conflicting) sense of community spirit

Over the last four months, the team had continued to engage with residents and community partners in King's Park, whilst also developing an appropriate governance structure for the pilot, which was required by Sport England and was good practice for schemes of this nature.

Deputy Mayor Demirci explained that the governance framework that she had seen provided assurance that residents would be involved in informing decisions about investment priorities for the pilot.

The governance arrangements included an oversight board with ring fenced places for residents and community partners which the Deputy Mayor would also be a member of. A community partnership was also being established and that would bring together a wide range of stakeholders to drive the direction of the pilot.

Deputy Demirci explained that the Council's team were in the process of completing a procurement process to appoint an insight partner, who was tasked with working in the community, with residents, and supporting their involvement in the co-design of the pilot.

Deputy Mayor Demirci also updated members on the updated investment guidance received from Sport England in December 2018, regarding next steps to draw down any further investment, beyond the £1m development award received to date.

Officers had highlighted key points from the guidance, which confirmed Sport England's intention to move away from a typically linear approach of a set amount of funding over a fixed period of time to one of 'test and learn' and an iterative approach to investment. The guidance was also explicit about the importance of maintaining robust engagement with local communities throughout all stages (ensuring the community 'voice' was heard).

Deputy Mayor Demirci explained that over the next six months, the team would need to develop a more detailed investment proposal for consideration by Sport England in order to secure any further investment. The initial deadline for this proposal was 1st August 2019, but this was on the basis that the team had gathered sufficient community insight to submit a robust proposal from Hackney. Deputy Mayor Demirci assured members that she would be reviewing progress with the development of this proposal on a regular basis.

Deputy Mayor Demirci explained that the good news was that the Council can negotiate with Sport England regarding the time period to deliver the pilot. Officers had explained that whilst the investment guidance confirmed that Sport England would need to allocate and agree all investment proposals by March 2021, pilot areas would in fact, have until approximately 2025 to deliver the pilot.

Deputy Mayor Demirci concluded, that with the insight partner and evaluator about to start work in the area, the team would be working closely with the local community and a range of stakeholders, including elected members and officers, to identify investment priorities that would ensure that residents gained maximum benefit from this opportunity to tackle physical inactivity in Hackney.

9 Elected Mayor's Statement

- 9.1 Mayor Glanville began by explaining, that at the last Hackney Council meeting, he was proud to see the Council overwhelmingly pass a motion in favour of avoiding a 'no deal' Brexit (Great Britain's exit from the European Union). The Mayor was of the view that this was a bigger potential disaster than this government itself. Leaving the EU, Mayor Glanville said, with no deal would be a disaster for the country, for London, and for Hackney's residents, not to mention the 41,500 residents from other EU member states. The Mayor added, that following the council's motion, he was pleased to see Labour's position move to not only fully oppose a 'No Deal Brexit', but support a People's Vote.
- 9.2 The Mayor had said previously that there was no left-wing Brexit, and that he believed there was no Brexit that benefits working people more than it harms them. The Mayor was of the view that this was as true in remain voting Hackney as it was in remain voting Swindon or Sunderland. The Mayor was of the view that it would establish another hard border to European countries, damage our economy, cause unemployment, and damage the public funds available for vital services. The Mayor felt that as a Council reliant on business rates for revenue as we will see in our budget later, a damaged economy and a flight or closing of businesses in the borough would hit Hackney Council particularly hard. Mayor Glanville felt that Hackney Council was a step closer to stopping this mess, but the Council must continue to stand up for its values and its residents and he said he looked forward to being on the next March on 23rd March.
- 9.3 Mayor Glanville, speaking on activism, felt that he and his fellow labour councillors and the Hackney Labour Party did not need a reminder about the challenge of air pollution and climate change. The Mayor explained that it was at the heart of the Council's manifesto. Mayor Glanville was reminded of the unseasonable heat wave and the Extension Rebellion Protest at the start of February.
- 9.4 Mayor Glanville believed Brexit was a massive distraction from the even bigger issue; climate change. February was the hottest February on record, compared to one of the coldest last February. The Mayor commented, that as much as an early spring sounded like good news, this should be a warning sign to all of the Council. The Mayor was of the view that extreme weathers were not freak occasions, but the direct result of global warming that was only getting worse.

The Mayor added that the 20 hottest years on record have all happened within the past 22 years; the five hottest were the last five. The Mayor highlighted that on Monday 25th February the temperature hit 20.3C in west Wales: the first time the thermometer had reached 20C in winter.

- 9.5 The Mayor commented that the opposition would like to ignore these facts, shout shame and deny climate change, the Mayor added that he would give the opposition the opportunity to say otherwise. The Mayor was of the view that this issue was the greatest risk to the planet and human existence.
- 9.6 Mayor Glanville highlighted, as mentioned earlier on during the Council meeting, the various measures the Council had taken to tackle climate change including sustainable procurement practices, new water fountains, recycling awareness programmes in schools, a Hackney Energy Strategy, Municipal Energy Company delivering renewable energy, half the Council's energy supply was from renewable sources this year. The Mayor also highlighted that a cabinet member was bringing other local authorities on board to recognise that our collective purchasing power of energy is more powerful than just Hackney alone. The Mayor believed that Hackney Council was going above and beyond to tackle climate change, taking a lead with London Mayor Sadiq Khan, others in local government, all in the absence of national and international leadership.
- 9.7 Mayor Glanville felt that this not enough. The Mayor was of the view that more needed to be done, and a government that responds in words not necessary deeds, because it was gripped by internal Brexit division. The Mayor declared that, without a doubt, this was a climate emergency. The Mayor said that he looked forward to continuing to take action and bringing forward a motion with his colleagues in due course.
- 9.8 Mayor Glanville next turned to focusing on the passing of the 2019/20 budget at the Council meeting. The Mayor was of view that it highlighted another crisis under the current government's watch. The Mayor felt sure the opposition would again deny the financial crisis facing local authorities across the country. The Mayor continued by highlighting that the government passed another £1.3 billion cuts to local government this year and the upcoming 'fair funding review' -- which unbelievably, could remove 'deprivation' as a factor in grants formula for local authorities -- which would disproportionately impact boroughs like Hackney. The Mayor promised to lead a campaigning council, and that the Council would fight the Tory stitch-up.
- 9.9 Mayor Glanville explained that despite the Prime Minister's conference spin, austerity was not over for councils. The Mayor would say more about how Hackney Council was not managing decline but innovating, and building a stronger and more sustainable Hackney, when the Council gets the report. Mayor Glanville highlighted the excellent news around the Council's Childminder Bursary Scheme, which the Mayor was pleased to announce the Council would be funding until 2022.
- 9.10 Mayor Glanville next highlighted the work of the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play, Councillor Chris Kennedy. Councillor Kennedy had been analysing the impacts of Hackney Council's childminder bursary scheme which helped prospective childminders cover the cost of the application process. This work included Hackney Council training and accreditation, DBS checks, health

- declaration forms from a General Practitioner (GP), and Ofsted application. All of this was mandatory and cost a minimum of £580. Hackney Council's bursary fully covered these costs to help encourage more childminders to apply and stay in those roles.
- 9.11 The Mayor was pleased to report that while there had been a national decrease of 24% in registered childminders, in Hackney there had been an 11% increase.
Hackney Council's Childminder Bursary, the Mayor added, was making a real difference to keep the number of available and certified childminders high and supported, providing a range of child-care options for working families, and giving children the best start in life. The Mayor added that the financial challenge did not just come directly through government cuts to Hackney Council's grant, but also through the increased pressure on council services thanks to cuts to other public sector bodies.
- 9.12 Mayor Glanville next highlighted how homelessness had risen 66% since the Tories had been in government. The Mayor believed this was a shameful stain on the government's record. Hackney now spent £13 million on temporary accommodation. The Mayor added that he had taken part in Hackney's rough sleeper count, joining residents from across Hackney, hitting the streets in the early hours of the morning. The Mayor highlighted that rough sleeping had increased again this year. Hackney Council had found the number of rough sleepers had increased from 18 in 2017 to 23 in 2018. The Mayor said that he suspected that there could have been more. Compared to other boroughs, the Mayor explained, this was relatively low, but one person rough sleeping on Hackney's streets was one too many. Mayor Glanville said that the Council was proud of its commitment to ending rough sleeping and of its provision – from No First Night Out and No Second Night Out, through to the work with Streetlink, but the Mayor explained, with austerity hitting Hackney's most vulnerable residents, the Council could always do more, and work with partner organisations better.
- 9.13 The Mayor saw Hackney Council as being a victim of its own success, as the government had not awarded any of its rough sleeper funding to Hackney to date. The Mayor said he was pleased to host a Rough Sleepers Summit alongside Councillor Rennison, joined by representatives from the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government, charities, businesses, social enterprises and other local public sector bodies. Where Hackney Council had lobbied the government, the Council had announced its Hackney Housing First Work and stressed that it was more important than ever to for the Council to pool its resources, knowledge and understanding.
- 9.14 Mayor Glanville, speaking about Section 21, said the greatest cause of homeless in England, was now 'no fault' evictions. This was seen as a shameful piece of legislation that allowed landlords to evict people from their homes with no reason at all. The motion coming to Council tonight was a testament to this administration's determination to make our borough fairer, safer and more sustainable. The Mayor explained that his administration would not just do everything in its power and fight to tackle homelessness, but it would campaign to end the causes of homelessness, even when the levers of power were out of its control. The Mayor hoped that the opposition would agree that

Section 21, allowing families to be removed from their homes for no reason, was shameful and practically Victorian.

- 9.15 The Mayor also hoped that all Councillors recognised the rainbow flag flying above the Town Hall as they arrived at the town hall today. This was a symbol of Hackney Council's commitment to equality and solidarity. Mayor Glanville wished everyone a happy Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) history month. The Mayor added that Hackney was one of only 19 authorities recognised as 'Excellent' in the Local Government Equality Framework (LGEF) peer challenge. This month Hackney Council had been celebrating LGBT History Month. Events had been taking place in Hackney schools, libraries and museum. The Mayor explained that this was a precursor to more activities happening during Pride Month and the whole year round as part of Hackney Council's Pride 365 programme. Hackney Council had made great strides in the past two to three years to support and celebrate LGBT staff, but the Mayor knew that Hackney Council could never be complacent and take its record for granted, which was why, as Council members had heard, from the Cabinet Member for Employment, Skills and Human Resources, Councillor Carole Williams, about the development of Hackney Council's Single Equalities Scheme 2018 – 2022 which included commitment to continue to develop the Council as an inclusive place for everyone to work in.
- 9.16 Mayor Glanville reassured Councillors that the Council was taking the same approach in the Repairs Call Centre; undertaking an independent investigation into workplace culture in the service, working with the trade unions on the terms of reference, meeting them regularly and addressing their concerns, promising to fully implement any recommendations. The Mayor said that he was not going to pre-empt the outcome of that investigation, but he said that it was important that, whatever the outcome, Hackney Council must acknowledge that whatever the Council was doing to tackle inequality and improve workplace wellbeing, it could always do more. The Mayor added that he had announced today, to the UNISON AGM, that Hackney Council's Chief Executive would introduce diversity and inclusive leadership training for all managers in the organisation, both new and existing, and Hackney Council would involve staff in the development of this training. The Mayor explained that it showed that Hackney Council was always listening and demonstrated a firm commitment from the Council to make sure that there was a supportive, inclusive workplace. The Mayor absolutely welcomed this. The Mayor said he was committed to making Hackney a place where everyone who lived here could succeed and thrive. The Mayor explained that that commitment was not just to Hackney residents. It was extended to the Council's workplace, and to every individual who worked at Hackney Council.
- 9.17 The Mayor concluded by highlighting the work of unsung backbenchers, in this case three of the Council's Champions'; Councillor Smyth, Councillor Etti and Councillor Maxwell. The Mayor explained that these three Councillors had really championed the Council's causes around fair trade, Councillor Smyth had set up a stall at the Council earlier in the day, Councillor Etti was doing incredible work on hate crime to ensure those issues were tackled and Council Maxwell was very much at the forefront of the Council's work on dementia, there had been a fantastic event held just last Saturday.

- 9.18 Mayor Glanville paid tribute to Councillor Patrick who had served the Hackney community, the Council and the Labour party for 30 years. Mayor Glanville highlighted that Councillor Patrick was the only current member of Council who had held the offices of Speaker, Mayor, Deputy Leader and Chair of Social Services.
- 9.19 Councillor Levy responded by focusing on two points; climate control and Brexit. On Brexit, Councillor Levy commented that a hard Brexit was not something anybody wanted. The Councillor was quite confident that the talks taking place behind closed doors in Europe would have the desired effect with a smooth Brexit which would hopefully not impact adversely on citizens of this country. On climate control, Councillor Levy commented, that this was a national conversation. In terms of the impact on the residents of Hackney, Councillor Levy had written to the lead member about the Council's lack of support for Air Conditioning units, it was a matter of fact that the elderly suffered more from heat than the rest of the population. Where Air Conditioning units were required they should be supported and the idea that cooling systems could be implemented by way of passive air were not going to work. Opening windows, Councillor Levy said, did not reduce the temperature indoors. The Councillor hoped the Council would re-think this and he re-iterated his concerns about the impact on the elderly. The Councillor had received a lot of questions about this issue over the previous months.
- 9.20 Councillor Levy thanked Councillor Chapman for his work in this area such as in the area of Health for example. The Councillor thanked former Hackney Councillor Christopher Sills for his sterling work over 30 years or more. Councillor Levy congratulated Mr Sills in celebrating his 80th birthday today.
- 9.21 Mayor Glanville responded to Councillor Levy's reply by echoing his congratulations to former councillor Christopher Sills on his birthday and for his very good work on the Council and his continuing work as a formidable activist. The Mayor commented that he almost detected a recognition from Councillor Levy of climate change. The Mayor commented that if the Councillor wanted a national conversation he suggested that a good start would be with his colleagues sitting directly to his left. The Mayor added that there was no need for a national conversation, people knew it was happening, it could be felt in the Council chamber this evening, and the evidence supported it. It was not just a national conversation here and now but it was also about the initiatives that were outlined earlier by Councillor Burke. The Mayor thought the mentioning of air conditioning was interesting, he said he did not doubt that in some circumstances access to air conditioning was needed by the most vulnerable, the Mayor had seen this for himself in the borough, and the issue of cold and heat for the most vulnerable was very important. Fundamentally this was about city design, the Mayor commented the he was sure that if Councillor Burke was in the chamber, he would have to talk about the Urban Heat Oven effect, actually everything that the Council had been talking about this evening, about the local plan, about the investment in housing, it was about creating an environment to reduce urban heat. If air conditioning was to be installed completely it would reverse the effect. The air would continue to heat up, resulting in more energy which would fuel climate change, rather than tackling it at source. The Mayor commented that it was about using less energy, reducing carbon and reducing impact on this city and this planet.

10 Budget and Council Tax Report 2019/2020

- 10.1 Mayor Glanville introduced the report and thanked the Group Director for Finance and Resources, Ian Williams and his team for their tireless work in preparation for the Budget and Council Tax Report. He went on to thank his colleagues in the Cabinet, Scrutiny and Backbenches, who have worked through the various options.
- 10.2 Mayor Glanville highlighted the news which surfaced last month regarding the £1.3 Billion council cuts voted for by the Government. It was stated that this was the Mayor's third budget and that each year the budget setting was becoming increasingly difficult. Hackney Council had seen the largest cut out of any local authority, with a £140 million cut to the central government grant since 2010.
- 10.3 It was explained that it was the Council's priority to balance the budget and maintain the standard of services that our residents expected despite the cuts. This had been achieved by streamlining services, reducing layers of management, and other back-office efficiencies which had saved a total of £40 million which would now be used to balance the budget and maintain services. Despite the cuts being made Hackney Council still achieved transformational services and policies that were making Hackney a fairer, safer and more sustainable borough. The Mayor highlighted the following achievements:
- helped over 4,500 residents into employment or training;
 - paid all our staff the London Living Wage (LLW), and ensured staff through our contracted services were paid LLW too;
 - secured 23 Green Flag award-winning parks;
 - secured 12,390m² of new affordable workspace through our planning policies;
 - kept all our libraries open meaning all Hackney residents live within one mile of a library;
 - introduced school streets and play streets where roads were closed to traffic;
 - ranked first in the country for GCSE A*-C for Looked After Children;
- 10.4 The Mayor explained that the Council would need to find an additional £30 million of savings by 2022 which meant that there were many tough decisions to make in the coming year to achieve this. One of those in 19/20 was the decision to increase Council Tax by 4.99% -- which was the maximum the Council could increase it without holding a referendum. The raise in council tax would generate £3.8 million. For the average household in Hackney, the increase would equate to less than £1 a week to their bill.
- 10.5 The Council was advised that the budget would help bridge the gap between the local economy and local residents, and invest in our communities and build the homes they needed. The budget would also protect the £1.5 million that had

been spent on employment services, and invest £5 million to convert unused council-owned garages into affordable workspace for local businesses.

- 10.6 Following the £45 million grant from the Mayor of London and the scrapping of the HRA debt cap. The Council was on target to deliver 800 homes for social rent by 2022, and in the budget the mayor explained that the Council were allocating £85 million of capital resources into regeneration to achieve this. The Council was also investing in the everyday services that matter to Hackney residents, such as:
- £4.9 million for street scene to continue to build and improve the borough's roads, cycle paths and streets.
 - £5.9 million spend on keeping the borough's libraries open and well-maintained, on top of the £4.45 million to improve libraries and the Museum as part of our manifesto pledge.
 - Plans were in motion for the Young Futures Commission, which had a £250k budget to support it.
 - £6.7 million for Young Hackney for targeted support and universal services through our Young Hackney hubs.
 - A £20 million investment to improve older school buildings, as pledged in the manifesto, ensuring children in Hackney were learning in an environment fit for the 21st century.
- 10.7 Councillor Steinberger proposed the Conservative Party's alternative budget. This was seconded by Councillor Michael Levy. Councillor Steinberger thanked the 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, however it was agreed that times were difficult and that budgets were being heavily cut.
- 10.8 Councillor Steinberger felt that budget was not being spent cautiously within Hackney Council by the Labour Party. He highlighted that he had concerns over staff budgeting as many members of staff were being paid per hour rather than on a contract, and also that many of those employees were being paid wages that equated to over £100,000 per annum. Councillor Steinberger also expressed concerns that the Greater London Authority were not using their budget for appropriate spending, he explained to the Council that as a Conservative politician he felt that there could be more policing on our streets to protect the residents of Hackney. Council Steinberger also stated that if the Mayor acted more cautiously when spending the budget, the council tax for Hackney residents would be significantly less. Councillor Steinberger concluded by addressing his concerns over Hackney Today and how it was money spent for inadequate return. He continued by suggesting that there were many options on how the Council could generate money, an example of this would be through renting out community halls.
- 10.9 Councillor Levy highlighted that over the past three years there had been increase after increase in council tax for Hackney residents. He stated that the majority group would blame this on central government however Councillor Levy disagreed. It was stated that taxation was at its highest since 1970 and that the UK now had the highest number of people employed than ever before. However the greatest challenge that local authorities currently faced was social care and the demands which were faced by social care and the gap in

resources which continued to grow. Councillor Levy explained that many residents including us councillors may require social care assistance at a point in our lives, but currently the service was at breaking point.

- 10.10 The Mayor welcomed and agreed with Councillor Levy's concerns in relation to social care and the challenges it currently faced. He stated that the government as a whole had failed to recognise the impact of the budget cuts in relation to social care. The government agreed to increase funding into the NHS whilst deciding not to provide any further funding into social care. However Hackney was setting up a bigger social care fund from the decisions taken from this government. Mayor Glanville explained that Hackney was committed to making long term investments such as the social care fund to future proof Hackney. He also explained how Hackney were changing street lamps to LEDs and how cuts were also being made to highway maintenance again to make long term investments. The Mayor stated that the suggestion of scrapping Hackney Today was not accepted as it was a minimal expenditure within the budget. The Mayor responded to Councillor Steinberger's concerns regarding contractor spend, he explained that he was committed to minimising contractor spend. The Mayor also responded to Councillor Steinberger's plea for more policing he explained that the council tax increase would allow for funding more police officers to patrol the streets of Hackney
- 10.11 Councillor Demirci felt disappointed that the same proposals were being proposed by the opposition such as stopping investments and air quality issues. Councillor Demirci stated issues such as these were important to Hackney residents. Councillor Demirci responded to the Conservatives' concerns regarding the Old Hills Scheme. She stated that she felt disappointed because before the scheme was implemented there were cars regularly driving up pavements. It was a national disgrace. The scheme was put in place to protect the children of Hackney and this was a priority for our residents. Councillor Demirci also addressed Springfield Park and the toilet restructure. She explained that this had been agreed through responses from the resident consultation which had been carried out. She declared that the Council had listened and rectified the issue.
- 10.12 Councillor Odze said that he was on the steering group for the Springfield project. He felt that the toilets that were being installed could not be funded. Councillor Odze also responded to Councillor Demirci's comments in relation to Old Hill. He felt that the new sign that had been erected was not adequate as people could not see it. He explained that due to this people continued to drive around and make U turns and that the signage must be made visible. Councillor Odze concluded by speaking about global warming. He stated that global warming was not man made and that it was an ongoing thing that we as humans had no control over.
- 10.13 Councillor Bramble stressed that local government was looking at a funding gap of almost £8 billion. Councillor Bramble said that she was continuously hearing about poverty and people who were working tirelessly to make ends meet. It was promised by Councillor Bramble that Labour would work tirelessly to continue to stand up and fight for the services Hackney residents deserve.

10.14 Councillor Odze stressed that the Labour Party was blaming all spending cuts and increases in council tax on the Conservative government, however it was felt that the root of the problem was due to Gordon Brown who borrowed large sums of money when he was prime minister which has now been left for our grandchildren and great grandchildren to pay back.

10.15 The Speaker invited Council to vote on the Conservative Party's alternative budget proposals.

For: Cllrs Klein, Levy, Odze, Papier and Steinberger (5)

Against: Mayor Glanville and Cllrs Adejare, Bell, Billington, Bramble, Burke, Cameron, Chapman, Chauhan, Coban, Conway, Demirci, Desmond, Garasia, Gordon, Gregory, Hanson, Hercock, Joeseeph, Kennedy Lynch, Maxwell, McKenzie, McMahon, Moema, Nicholson, Oguzkanli, Ozsen, Pallis, Patrick, Peters, Plouviez, Potter, Race, Rahilly, Rathbone, Rennison, Rickard, Selman, Sharman, Smyth, Snell, Stops, Webb, Williams, Woodley and Wrouth (47)

Abstentions: None (0)

Not Present: Councillors Adams, Etti, Fajana-Thomas Hayhurst, Lufkin, Spence

The vote was not carried.

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

For: Mayor Glanville and Cllrs Adejare, Bell, Billington, Bramble, Burke, Cameron, Chapman, Chauhan, Coban, Conway, Demirci, Desmond, Garasia, Gordon, Gregory, Hanson, Hercock, Joeseeph, Kennedy Lynch, Maxwell, McKenzie, McMahon, Moema, Nicholson, Oguzkanli, Ozsen, Pallis, Patrick, Peters, Plouviez, Potter, Race, Rahilly, Rathbone, Rennison, Rickard, Selman, Sharman, Smyth, Snell, Stops, Webb, Williams, Woodley and Wrouth (47)

Against: Cllrs Klein, Levy, Odze, Papier and Steinberger (5)

Abstentions: None (0)

Not Present: Councillors Adams, Etti, Fajana-Thomas Hayhurst, Lufkin, Spence

RESOLVED, that Council considered the report and AGREED the following recommendations (as set out in the report):

3.2.1 To bring forward into 2019/20 the Council's projected General Fund balances of £15.0m and to note the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) balances of £10.2m

3.2.2 To agree for approval the directorate estimates and estimates for the General Finance Account items set out in Table 1, below.

3.2.3 To note that the budget is a financial exposition of the priorities set out within the Corporate Plan.

3.2.4 To note that in line with the requirements of the Local Government Act 2003, the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources, is of the view that: The General Fund balances of £15.0m and the level of reserves, particularly in relation to capital, are adequate to meet the Council's financial needs for 2019/20 and that considering the economic uncertainty they should not fall below this level. This view takes account of the reserves included in the Council's latest audited Accounts as at 31 March 2018, 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 2019/20. This takes into account the adequacy of the level of balances and reserves outlined above and the assurance gained from the comparisons of the 2018/19 budget with the projected spend identified in the December 2018 OFP. The overall level of the corporate contingency has been set at £2m.

3.2.5 To approve the proposed General Fund fees and charges as set out in Appendix 8 for implementation from 1st April 2019.

3.2.6 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.

3.2.7 To note the summary of the HRA Budget and Rent setting report agreed by Cabinet on 21st January 2019.

3.2.8 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.

3.2.9 To approve: The allocation of resources to the 2019/20 Non-Housing capital schemes referred to in Paragraph 24 and Appendix 7. The allocation of resources to the 2019/20 Housing indicative capital programme referred to in Paragraph 24 and Appendix 7, including the HRA approvals previously agreed by Cabinet on January 21st 2019.

3.2.10 To note that the new capital expenditure proposals match uncommitted resources for the year 2019/20.

3.2.11 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 2019/20 as set out in paragraph 25, and Appendix 7.

3.2.12 To confirm that the authorised limit for external debt of £687m agreed above for 2019/20 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.

3.2.13 To continue to support the approach of using reserves to manage emerging risks and liabilities and to note the latest reserve position.

3.2.14 To note that at its meeting on 21 January 2019 the Council agreed its Council Tax Base for the 2019/20 financial year as 72,552 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.

3.2.15(1) To agree that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2019/20 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Localism Act 2011.

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

(a) £1,149.154m 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.

3.2.16(2) The authority calculates the aggregate of: (in accordance with Section 31A (3) of the Act)

(a) £1,149.154m 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) £2.543m make it 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.

3.2.17 £82.299m 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.

3.2.18 £1,134.35 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

3.2.19 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 2019/20 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

VALUATION BANDS									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
	756.23	882.27	1008.3	1134.3	1386.4	1638.5			
			1	5	3	1	1890.58	2268.70	

3.2.20 That it be noted that for 2019/20 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	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
	213.67	249.29	284.90	320.51	391.73	462.96	534.18	641.02	

3.2.21 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 2019/20 for each of the categories of dwellings as shown below.

VALUATION BANDS									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	

	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
		1131.5	1293.2	1454.8	1778.1	2101.4		
	969.90	6	1	6	6	7	2424.76	2909.72

Note: Subject to GLA confirmation of precept on 25th February 2018

3.2.22 To agree, subject to the decision of Members on recommendations 3.2.16 to 3.2.18 that Hackney’s Council Tax requirement for 2019/20 be £82.299m which results in a Band D Council Tax of £1,134.35 for Hackney purposes and a total Band D Council Tax of £1,454.86 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.

3.2.23 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 2019/20 as shown at Appendix 9 is not excessive (5% or above) and therefore does not require the Council to hold a referendum.

3.2.24 To agree the Treasury Management Strategy for 2019/20 to 2021/22, set out at Appendix 3.

3.2.25 To agree the criteria for lending and the financial limits set out at Appendix 3.

3.2.26 To approve the MRP statement setting out the method of calculation to be used, as set out in Appendix 3

11 Audit Committee Annual Report

11.1 Councillor Nick Sharman, Chair of the Audit Committee, introduced the committee’s annual report. The Councillor began by highlighting a correction on page 346 of the report; it should have referred to an April 2018 meeting. Councillor Sharman stressed the importance of the work of the Audit Committee in making sure the Council allocated and matched resources against objectives so that the Council could provide services and support to the community. Councillor Sharman emphasised that it was important to recognise that the Audit Committee was acting on behalf of the Council, and independent from the executive. Councillor Sharman added that it was especially important for the Audit Committee to be independent and to have a strong checking role, like the House of Commons’ Public Accounts Committee, where it could bring a different perspective on the organisation by focusing on the key issues and putting forward strong proposals. Councillor Sharman reminded members that the government was ‘tightening the funding screw’ on local government and more was expected to come. The Councillor highlighted how already a number of local authorities, especially London Councils, were close to the financial edge, and the Audit Committee’s job was to ensure that Hackney Council achieved value for money and minimised any risks.

11.2 Councillor Sharman continued by highlighting how last year the Audit Committee’s focus had been on three key areas. The first, was the intense pressures on council services. The Councillor stressed how it was vital that the Council ensured there were creditable and robust plans in place and efforts would be made to reinforce the Audit Committee’s oversight of the Council’s performance with the production of a range of

reports on corporate risk with the one of the most immediate of these, as mentioned earlier, being Brexit. The Audit Committee was now monitoring preparations on a weekly basis. Councillor Sharman explained that the main innovation this year had been the Audit Committee's study of high risk areas. The first area that they had tackled was resourcing and planning of the second budget and the five million pounds funding gap. A report on this was anticipated shortly. The second key area of the Audit Committee's focus, Councillor Sharman explained, was Hackney's investment into community re-generation, which as a result had led to greater exposure to risk on capital spending in the raising of money, management of capital projects, standing in for the commercial market place. The Audit Committee in response has had to increase its oversight of capital spending. The third key area was the development of increased working across Council departments. Councillor Sharman explained that rather than silo working, the Audit Committee had increased the range of their reports

- 11.3 Councillor Sharman highlighted that the Audit Committee had also improved its own governance and cycle of work with the committee producing its annual report three months before the end of the financial year. The Councillor cited the example of how the audit team had identified three million pounds in savings in 2018 through combating fraud in tenancy and other council systems. The Audit Committee continued to improve its key area of oversight of external contractors' performance vital for developing a good housing service. Councillor Sharman commented had he was delighted to see that the committee's work was recognised outside of Hackney. Two weeks ago, Councillor Sharman was asked to give his views on what improvements could be made to the local government audit system at the Public Accounts Committee. There was also coverage of the work of the committee recently in the latest issue of the Municipal Journal. Hackney Council's Audit Committee was also one of the main backers in bringing together all of the City of London audit committees. Councillor Sharman hoped this would lead to London-wide measures.
- 11.3 Councillor Sharman concluded by thanking staff in the finance department, with special mention going to Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources, Ian Williams, who headed up a highly motivated team. Councillor Sharman also thanked his fellow Audit Committee members for their commitment and enthusiasm and also the regular training that they had undertaken. Councillor Sharman welcomed Councillor Odze, as the newest member of the Audit Committee. Councillor Sharman believed this would make the committee even more accountable to all Council members as well as the wider Hackney community so to ensure that Hackney Council continued to be one of the most effective local authorities in London and the country.
- 11.4 Councillor Rennison thanked Councillor Sharman, members of the committee and the council staff for all their hard work on the audit committee and also the production of the committee's annual report.

RESOLVED that Council note the Annual Report of the Audit Committee as set out in Appendix 1.

12 Pay Policy Statement 2019/20

- 12.1 The Localism Act 2011 required the Council to publish an annual pay statement for Chief Officer Pay. The draft statement for 2018/19 was attached at Appendix 1 of the report.
- 12.2 There had been no substantive changes to this policy. The statement detailed current pay practice and some paragraphs had been reordered for ease of reading and understanding. The statement did not introduce new policy principles.

RESOLVED, that Council AGREED the Pay Policy Statement.

13 Motion - Support the Abolition of Section 21 'No Fault Evictions'

Support the Abolition of Section 21 'no fault evictions'

Councillor Moema proposed the motion

Councillor Woodley seconded the motion

13.1 This motion calls on the Council to lobby the Government to scrap Section 21 of the Housing Act 1988, known as 'no fault' evictions, as the part of a wider Better Renting campaign to improve awareness and standards in the private rented sector. Section 21 enabled private-sector landlords to evict their tenants with two months' notice, without the need to give a reason.

13.2 Council agreed as there was no time left to fully debate the motion at this meeting it would be deferred until the next appropriate Council meeting.

RESOLVED that the motion be DEFERRED until the next appropriate Council meeting in order to allow enough time for a full debate.

14 Draft Programme of Meetings for 2019/2020

RESOLVED that Council reviewed the draft schedule of meetings and if there were any comments, Members were asked to contact governance services direct.

Duration of the meeting: 7.00pm -10:30pm

This page is intentionally left blank



<p>ESTABLISH COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS AND APPOINT MEMBERS</p> <p>AND</p> <p>NOMINATE THE APPOINTMENTS OF CHAIRS AND VICE CHAIRS</p>	
<p>COUNCIL MEETING DATE</p> <p>22 May 2019 (AGM)</p>	<p>CLASSIFICATION:</p> <p>Open</p>
<p>Appendix 1 – Establish Committees and Sub-Committees and Commissions and Appoint Members and Nominate the Appointments of Chairs and Vice Chairs</p>	
<p>WARD(S) AFFECTED</p> <p>All Wards</p>	
<p>GROUP DIRECTOR</p> <p>Tim Shields, Chief Executive</p>	

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report requests the Council to establish its Committees and Over View and Scrutiny Commissions and as set out in paragraph 3 for the municipal year 2019/2020. All the terms of reference are set out in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution.
- 1.2 This report also requests Council to approve the membership of these Committees and Commissions and recommends the Chairs, Vice-Chairs and Sub-Committees in accordance with the details set out in paragraph 3 below.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 It is recommended that Full Council:
- i) Approves the establishment of the Committees and Overview and Scrutiny Commissions as set out in paragraph 3 of this report; and
 - ii) Approves and appoints to the membership of the Committees and Overview and Scrutiny Commissions as set out in appendix 1 attached to this report and tabled at the meeting and
 - iii) Approves the nominations for the Chairs and Vice Chairs of these Committees and Overview and Scrutiny Commissions as set out in appendix 1 and tabled at the meeting. These appointments shall be ratified at the first meeting of each individual Committee meeting following the AGM

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Council must allocate in accordance with the political balance rules. The allocation of seats on appropriate Council Committees to achieve a political balance where required by law will be based on the following formula:

Labour	52	91%
Conservative	5	9%

- 3.2 Those Council Committees to which the political balance rules apply are as follows with the total number of seats available on those Committees, excluding co-optees, being in brackets:

- Audit Committee [7]
- Appointments Committee [5]
- Corporate Committee [16]
 - Planning Sub [9]
- Licensing Committee [15]
 - Licensing Subs [3]
- Pensions Committee [7]
- Standards Committee [9]

Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission [12]
 Working in Hackney Scrutiny Commission [7]
 Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission [8]
 Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission [7]

3.3 Applying the formula provides the following allocation

Committee/Commission	Total Number	Lab	Con
Audit Committee	7	6	1
Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission	12	11	1
Working in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7	6	1
Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	8	7	1
Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7	6	1
Scrutiny Panel – drawn from the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Commissions plus 1 minority group member and 1 majority group member who is not on the Executive or the Commissions	10	9	1
Appointments Committee	5	5	
Corporate Committee	16	15	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Sub Committee [to be drawn from the membership of the Corporate Committee] 	9	8	1
Licensing Committee	15	14	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five 3 Member Licensing Sub Committees will be drawn from the membership of the Licensing Committee to reflect the overall political proportionality of that Committee 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensing Sub A 	3		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensing Sub B 	3		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensing Sub C 	3		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensing Sub D 	3		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensing Sub E 	3		
Pensions Committee	7	6	1
Standards Committee	9	8	1

3.4 The political balance rules do not apply to the appointments in relation to the Health and Wellbeing Board which has a core membership prescribed by the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

3.5 Standards Committee shall be exempt from the political balance requirements in order to provide for a place for the Minority Group on the Standards Committee.

- 3.6 Details of the named membership of all Council Committees and Commissions are set out in appendix 1 attached to this report to this report and which will be also tabled at the meeting when details of all nominees are available.
- 3.7 Council is also asked to recommend to the Committees, Commissions and other bodies the proposed appointments of the Chairs, Vice-Chairs and Sub-committees, which will also be tabled at the meeting.
- 3.8 The relevant appointments will be made at their first meeting, an extraordinary meeting has been called for both the Corporate and Licensing Committee, to make these appointments and to establish the sub-committees in order to avoid any delay in these sub-committees being able to meet and carry out their functions.

COMMENTS OF THE GROUP DIRECTOR, FINANCE AND CORPORATE RESOURCES

- 4.1 There are no additional budgetary implications arising from the changes outlined in this report. All costs are contained within the current approved budget.

5 COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR, LEGAL

- 5.1 This report asks full Council to approve the arrangement of the Council's Committees and (Commissions) in order to perform statutory and other functions on behalf of Full Council.
- 5.2 The Council must allocate seats on Committees and other prescribed bodies so as to give effect to the political balance rules.
- 5.3 The rules for the allocation of seats are set out in Sections 15 and 16 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 (The 1989 Act) Local Government Committee and Political Group Regulations 1990.
- 5.4 Section 15 of The 1989 Act sets out how Committees must be constituted when the Council is divided into one or more political groups.
- 5.5 The Council must give effect, as far as reasonably practicable in constituting its Committees or Sub-Committees, to the following four principles set out in Section 15(4):
- (a) where there is more than one political group, all the seats must not be allocated to the same political group
 - (b) the majority of seats must be allocated to the political group with the majority on the Council

(c) the number of seats on each individual Committee or sub-committee of the Council allocated to each political group bears the same proportion on the full Council.

(d) the number of seats on the total of all the Committees or sub-committees allocated to each political group should bear the same proportion to the proportions on the full Council .

5.6 Details of the numerical allocation of seats on the Committees to the political groups, together with each group's nominations to fill those seats (and substitutes where appropriate) should be circulated to all Councillors prior to the Council meeting.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

Report Author	Tess Merrett 020 8356 3432 Tess.merrett@hackney.gov.uk
Comments on behalf of Director, Finance and Corporate Resources	Michael Honeysett 020 8356 3332 Michael.honeysett@hackney.gov.uk
Comments on behalf of Director, Legal	Dawn Carter-McDonald 020 8356 4817 Dawn.carter-mcdonald@hackney.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Council AGM – 22 May 2019

Agenda Item 12 Appendix 1

Schedule of Committees, Sub Committees and Commissions 2019-2020

Audit Committee

Allocation of seats: Labour: 6 Conservative: 1 Total: 7

Page 51

Labour

Councillor Nick Sharman – Chair
Councillor Michelle Gregory – Vice Chair
Councillor Brian Bell
Councillor Clare Potter
Councillor Yvonne Maxwell
Councillor Patrick Spence

Conservative

Councillor Harvey Odze

Nominated Chair - Councillor Nick Sharman

Nominated Vice Chair - Councillor Michelle Gregory

Corporate Committee

Allocation of seats: Labour: 14 Conservative: 1 Total: 15

Labour

Councillor Brian Bell
Councillor Ajay Chauhan
Councillor Mete Coban
Councillor Susan Fajana-Thomas
Councillor Katie Hanson
Councillor Ned Hercock
Councillor Clare Joseph
Councillor Anthony McMahon
Councillor M Can Ozsen
Councillor Steve Race
Councillor Peter Snell
Councillor Vincent Stops
Councillor Jessica Webb
Councillor Carole Williams

Conservative

Councillor Michael Levy

Nominated Chair - Councillor Jessica Webb

Nominated Vice Chair - Councillor Susan Fajana-Thomas

Licensing Committee

Allocation of seats: Labour: 14 Conservative: 1 Total: 15

Labour

Councillor Brian Bell
Councillor Sophie Cameron
Councillor Sophie Conway
Councillor Margaret Gordon
Councillor Sem Moema
Councillor M Can Ozsen
Councillor Sharon Patrick
Councillor James Peters
Councillor Emma Plouviez
Councillor Ian Rathbone
Councillor Caroline Selman
Councillor Peter Snell
Councillor Gilbert Smyth
Councillor Penny Wrout

Conservative

Councillor Harvey Odze

Nominated Chair – Councillor Emma Plouviez

Nominated Vice Chair – Brian Bell

Pensions Committee

Allocation of seats: Labour: 6 Conservative: 1 Total: 7

Labour

Councillor Kam Adams
Councillor Polly Billington
Councillor Robert Chapman
Councillor Michael Desmond
Councillor Ben Hayhurst
Councillor Rebecca Rennison

Conservative

Vacancy

Page 54

Nominated Chair – Councillor Robert Chapman

Nominated Vice Chair – Councillor Michael Desmond

Standards Committee

Allocation of seats: Labour: 8 Conservative: 1 Total: 7

Labour

Councillor Soraya Adejare
Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble
Councillor Humaria Garasia
Councillor Katie Hanson
Councillor Anna Lynch
Councillor Sem Moema
Councillor Jessica Webb
Councillor Carole Williams

Conservative

Vacancy

Co-opted

Adedoja Labinjo
Onagete Louison

Page 55

Nominated Chair - Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble

Nominated Vice Chair – Councillor Jessica Webb

Children and Young People Scrutiny Commission

Allocation of seats: Labour: 11 Conservative: 1 Total: 12

Labour

Councillor Ajay Chauhan
Councillor Sophie Conway
Councillor Sade Etti
Councillor Humaira Garasia
Councillor Margaret Gordon
Councillor Katie Hanson
Councillor Clare Joseph
Councillor Sharon Patrick
Councillor James Peters
Councillor Clare Potter
Councillor Caroline Woodley

Conservative

Vacancy

Nominated Chair – Councillor Sophie Conway

Nominated Vice Chair – Councillor Margaret Gordon

Co-opted Members for Children and Young people Scrutiny Commission for the municipal period 2018 – 2020

Name	Voting/ Non- voting
Reverend Graham Hunter (Church of England Representative)	Voting
Mr Michael Lobenstein (Orthodox Jewish Community Representative)	Non-voting
Liz Bosanquet (Parent Governor Representative)	Voting
Jane Heffenan (Roman Catholic Representative)	Voting
Ernell Watson (Free Churches Group Representative)	Non-voting
Sevdie Ali (Parent Governor Representative)	Voting
Jo Macleod, (Hackney School Governor's Association (HAGSA) Representative)	Non-voting
Shuja Shaikh, (Muslim Community Representative)	Non-voting

Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission

Allocation of seats: Labour: 7 Conservative: 1 Total: 9

Labour

Councillor Ben Hayhurst
Councillor Yvonne Maxwell
Councillor Deniz Oguzkanli
Councillor Emma Plouviez
Councillor Tom Rahilly
Councillor Peter Snell
Councillor Patrick Spence

Conservative

Vacancy

Nominated Chair – Councillor Ben Hayhurst

Nominated Vice Chair – Councillor Yvonne Maxwell

Health and wellbeing board

Clr Feryal Demirci (Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care, Transport and Parks)
Clr Anntoinette Bramble (Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member, Education, Young People and Children's Social Services)
Dr Sue Milner (Director of Public Health)
Dr Navina Evans (Chief Executive East London Foundation Trust)
Alistair Wallace (Health and Social Care Forum)
Anne Canning (Group Director, Children, Adults and Community Health, Hackney Council)
David Maher (Managing Director, City and Hackney Clinical Commissioning Group)
Raj Radia (Local Pharmaceutical Society)
Dr Mark Rickets (Chair, City and Hackney Clinical Commissioning Group)
Rupert Tyson (Chair, Hackney Healthwatch)
Tracey Fletcher (Chief Executive, Homerton University Hospital, Hackney Council)
Laura Sharpe (GP Confederation)

Corporate Parenting Board

Allocation of seats: Labour: 5 Conservative: 1 Total: 6

Labour

Councillor Anntoinette Bramble
Councillor Sophie Cameron
Councillor Anna Lynch
Councillor Tom Rahilly
Councillor Sharon Patrick

Conservative

Vacancy

Chair – Councillor Antoinette Bramble

Page 59

Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission

Allocation of seats: Labour: 7 Conservative: 1 Total: 8

Labour

Councillor Sade Etti
Councillor Anna Lynch
Councillor Anthony McMahon
Councillor M Can Ozsen
Councillor Sharon Patrick
Councillor Ian Rathbone
Councillor Penny Wrout

Conservative

Vacancy

Nominated Chair – Councillor Sharon Patrick

Nominated Vice Chair – Councillor Sade Etti

Skills, Economy and Growth

Allocation of seats: Labour: 6 Conservative: 1 Total: 7

Labour

Councillor Polly Billington
Councillor Mete Coban
Councillor Richard Lufkin
Councillor Sam Pallis
Councillor Steve Race
Councillor Gilbert Smyth

Conservative

Vacancy

Page 60

Nominated Chair – Councillor Mete Coban

Nominated Vice Chair – Polly Billington

Appointments Committee (to be tabled)

Allocation of Seats: Labour 5. Conservative 0. Total 5

This page is intentionally left blank



APPOINTMENTS AND NOMINATIONS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

COUNCIL AGM 22 May 2019	CLASSIFICATION: OPEN Appendix 1 – Schedule of Appointments
WARD(S) AFFECTED All	
CORPORATE DIRECTOR Tim Shields, Chief Executive	

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Council appoints and nominates Councillors to represent it on various Outside Bodies. The Council's arrangements for the appointment or nomination of its representatives to Outside Bodies differ depending on the type of nomination or appointment being made.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

Council is recommended to

- 2.1 **Agree the appointment or nomination of Members to Outside Bodies on behalf of the Council as listed in the Schedule which will be tabled at the meeting.**

3. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP DIRECTOR, FINANCE AND CORPORATE RESOURCES

Any costs associated with appointment or nomination of Members to Outside Bodies on behalf of the Council are likely to be small and are provided for within existing budgets

4 COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR, LEGAL AND GOVERNANCE

Under the Council's Procedural Rules 1.1 (ix) the Council has power to appoint or nominate Councillors and other people from the community to represent it on outside bodies to which it appoints or nominates representatives.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None

Report Author	Tess Merrett, Governance Services Manager Tess.merrett@hackney.gov.uk 020 8356 3432
Comments of the Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources	Ian Williams, Group Director, Finance and Corporate Resources 020 8 356 3003 ian.williams@hackney.gov.uk
Comments of the Director, Legal and Governance	Dawn Carter-McDonald Deputy Monitoring Officer 020 8356 4871 dawn.carter-mcdonald@Hackney.gov.uk



COMPOSITION OF THE CABINET AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CABINET SUB-COMMITTEES AND MAYOR'S CHAMPIONS

And

THE MAYOR'S SCHEME OF DELEGATION

COUNCIL MEETING DATE

22 May 2019 (AGM)

CLASSIFICATION:

Appendix 1 Schedule of the membership of Cabinet and Cabinet Sub-Committees and the Mayor's Champions

WARD(S) AFFECTED

GROUP DIRECTOR

Tim Shields, Chief Executive

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report advises Full Council of the membership of the Executive for the coming year and the membership of any Executive sub-committee together with the names of the Mayoral Advisor and the Member Champions for the next Municipal Year.
- 1.2 This report also reminds Full Council of the Mayor's Scheme of Delegation for Executive Functions; no changes are proposed to the current scheme which was last revised in January 2017 and is always publically available here: <http://mginternet.hackney.gov.uk/ecSDDisplay.aspx?NAME=Mayoral%20Scheme%20of%20Delegation&ID=309&RPID=2683921&sch=doc&cat=12659&path=12659>

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 It is recommended that Full Council notes
- the membership of the Executive, Executive sub-committee, the Mayoral Advisor and the Member Champions as set out in appendix 1; and
 - the Mayor's Scheme of Delegation for Executive Functions

3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Council is made up of the Elected Mayor and 57 Councillors from which the Mayor appoints a number of Councillors to be Cabinet Members. He has also chosen to appoint Mayoral Advisors.
- 3.2 In addition to this, the Mayor has decided to appoint Councillors as Mayoral Champions who advocate for a specific area of the Council's business, and provide insight and additional capacity to the Council in relation their specific areas.
- 3.3 The Scheme of Delegation as set out and located on the London Borough of Hackney's website sets out the executive functions which are to be discharged by the Mayor and/or Mayor and Cabinet.

COMMENTS OF THE GROUP DIRECTOR, FINANCE AND CORPORATE RESOURCES

- 4.1 There are no additional budgetary implications arising from the changes outlined in this report. All costs are contained within the current approved budget.

5 COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR, LEGAL

- 5.1 The Executive will consist of the Elected Mayor together with at least two but not more than nine Councillors appointed to the Cabinet by the elected Mayor one of whom will be the Deputy Mayor. The Mayor has appointed two Deputy Mayors. The background as set out above confirms the position with regards to the elected Mayor and the Executive. The Council operates a Mayor and Cabinet governance model

- 5.2 The Scheme of Delegation has been agreed by the Mayor and sets out which executive functions are to be discharged by the Mayor alone, the Mayor and Cabinet or a Cabinet Committee. No functions are to be discharged by individual Cabinet Members. Matters referred to in the Mayor's scheme can therefore be referred to the Mayor alone, the Mayor and Cabinet or a Cabinet Committee for decision. Decisions will be made on the basis of formal reports and in compliance with Access to Information requirements.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

Report Author	Tess Merrett 020 8356 3432 Tess.merrett@hackney.gov.uk
Comments on behalf of Director, Finance and Corporate Resources	Michael Honeysett 020 8356 3332 Michael.honeysett@hackney.gov.uk
Comments on behalf of Director, Legal	Dawn Carter-McDonald 020 8356 4817 Dawn.carter-mcdonald@hackney.gov.uk

Appendix 1 - membership of the Executive, the Mayoral Adviser, Executive sub-committee membership, and the Member Champions

Membership of the Executive

Member	Portfolio	Responsibilities
Philip Glanville	Mayor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Property ● ICT ● Strategic Communications and Consultations (with support from the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play) ● Strategic Housing ● Housing Regeneration ● Devolution and Policy [with support from the Cabinet member for Community Safety, Policy, and the Voluntary Sector] ● Private Sector Housing and housing affordability [supported by a Mayoral Adviser as outlined below]
Cllr Anntoinette Bramble	Deputy Mayor and Cabinet member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Statutory Deputy Mayor ● Ethical governance and chair of standards committee ● Democratic and electoral services ● Legal services ● Hackney Education and Schools (Hackney Learning Trust) ● Children's social care ● Looked after children and fostering ● Troubled families [with the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play] ● Young Black Men Project ● Young Hackney ● Young Speakers and Youth Parliament ● Mayor's Fair Futures Commission [with Cabinet Member for Community Safety, Policy, and the Voluntary Sector] ● Making Hackney 'A Child Friendly Borough' [with the Cabinet Member for Families, Early Years and Play]
Cllr Feryal Demirci	Deputy Mayor and Cabinet member for Health, Social Care, Leisure and Parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adult Social Care ● Older People Strategy ● Supporting People ● Health and Wellbeing Board ● Public Health and the relationship with the wider NHS ● Health devolution and integrated commissioning ● Mental Health ● Leisure and sport

Cllr Caroline Selman	Community Safety, Policy, and the Voluntary Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strategic relationship with the police ● Crime reduction and antisocial behaviour ● Integrated Gangs Unit ● Noise nuisance ● Environmental Health and Trading Standards ● Licensing enforcement ● Licensing policy [working with Chair of Licensing] ● Youth Justice ● Environmental Protection ● Emergency Planning ● Strategic relationship with the voluntary sector, including voluntary sector grants ● Policy, strategy and devolution [working with the Mayor] ● Refugees and vulnerable migrants ● Mayor's Fair Futures Commission [with Deputy Mayor and Cabinet member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care]
Cllr Chris Kennedy	Families, Early Years and Play	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Early years ● Children's centres and nurseries ● Child Minding ● Special Educational Needs and alternative settings ● Tackling child poverty ● Food Justice including Food Poverty ● Play and adventure playgrounds ● Play Streets ● Waterways and boaters ● Communications and Consultations ● Making Hackney 'A Child Friendly Borough' [with Deputy Mayor and Cabinet member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care] ● Troubled Families [with Deputy Mayor and Cabinet member for Education, Young People and Children's Social Care]
Cllr Guy Nicholson	Planning, Culture and Inclusive Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Planning – performance and policy ● Economic Development ● Strategic infrastructure development [inc. economic regeneration – the latter with Cabinet member Energy, Sustainability, Transport and Waste] ● Impact of Brexit ● Town Centres ● Olympics legacy

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Markets ● Building Control ● Culture ● Hackney Museum and archives ● Libraries and library services
Cllr Rebecca Rennison	Finance and Housing Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Housing needs (inc. lettings and allocations policy) ● Rough sleeping ● Homelessness and temporary accommodation ● Advice services (particularly housing options / homelessness related) ● Domestic violence and abuse ● Revenues and benefits ● Insourcing ● Audit & Procurement ● Pensions ● Customer services and complaints ● Registrars
Cllr Clayeon McKenzie	Housing Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Housing Management / Services ● Housing Service Transformation and Improvement ● HRA business plan and strategic Asset Management Plan ● Better Homes Partnership ● Fire and resident safety ● TMO Champion ● Travellers ● Maintaining strong relations with the tenants and residents movement
Cllr Jon Burke	Energy, Waste, Transport and Public Realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Energy - generation, efficiency, and procurement ● Climate Change - including responding to the emergency, mitigation, adaptation, and public awareness ● Corporate decarbonisation ● Environmental sustainability ● Waste services and waste prevention ● Recycling ● The circular economy ● Street and estate cleansing ● Clean air and tackling pollution ● Parking control ● Public Realm and Streetscene ● Strategic and local transport ● Liveable neighbourhoods
Cllr Carole Williams	Employment, Skills and Human Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Employment Strategy and Partnerships ● Hackney Works ● Apprenticeships ● Supported Employment ● Human Resources and Organisational Development ● Relationship with the Trade Unions

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adult Learning and ESOL ● Post 18 skills ● Equalities ● Fair Trade with the Fair Trade Champion ● Volunteering
--	--	--

Mayoral Adviser

The Mayor is also the lead within Cabinet for Private Renting and Housing Affordability, and remains supported in these areas by a Mayoral Adviser as outlined below.

Councillor	Portfolio	Responsibilities
Cllr Sem Moema	Private Renting and Housing Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● private sector housing ● housing affordability ● promoting shared ownership and other intermediate products ● housing association relationships and accountability ● Hackney's housing company and living rent homes ● older people's housing

Executive sub-committee membership

Membership of Cabinet Procurement Committee CPC is as follows: Cllr Rebecca Rennison will Chair the committee, and the other committee members will be Cllr Anntoinette Bramble, Cllr Caroline Selman and Cllr Jon Burke, with Mayor Glanville a substitute member.

Member Champions for 2019/20

The Mayor is keeping the following Member Champions in post for 2019/20:

Councillor	Member Champion role
Cllr Tom Rahilly	Mental Health champion
Cllr Yvonne Maxwell	Dementia champion
Cllr Sade Etti	No place for Hate champion
Cllr Peter Snell	Heritage champion
Cllr Gilbert Smyth	Fairtrade champion
Cllr Sophie Conway	Care leavers champion

Member Champions act as an advocate for a specific area of the Council's business, and provide insight and additional capacity to the Council in relation their specific areas. Member Champions are not paid an allowance and do not have executive authority; political accountability and oversight of each area remains with the Mayor and Cabinet.

This page is intentionally left blank



PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2019/2020	
COUNCIL MEETING DATE (AGM) 22 May 2019	CLASSIFICATION: Open
WARD(S) AFFECTED All	
CHIEF EXECUTIVE Tim Shields	

1. Summary

- 1.1 In accordance with the Council Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 of the Constitution of the London Borough of Hackney, the Annual General Meeting of Council is required to approve a programme of ordinary meetings of the Council for the Municipal Year.
- 1.2 The attached schedule lists the ordinary meetings of the Council that are proposed to be held over the Municipal Year 2019/20.

2. Recommendation:

Council is recommended to:

- 2.1 Approve the programme of meetings for the Municipal Year 2019/20.**

Enclosures

Appendix 1 – Programme of Meetings

Tim Shields
Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Programme of Meetings - Municipal Year 2019/2020

Date	Committee	Time
May-19		
22 May 2019	Council AGM & Extraordinary meetings	7.00pm
Jun-19		
03 June 2019	Corporate Committee	6.30pm
03 June 2019	Licensing Committee	7.00pm
11 June 2019	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
12 June 2019	Planning Sub-Committee	6.30pm
13 June 2019	Integrated Commissioning Board	10.00am
13 June 2019	Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
13 June 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
17 June 2019	Cabinet	6.00pm
17 June 2019	Skills Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
19 June 2019	Audit Committee	6.30pm
19 June 2019	Inner North East London Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny	7.00pm
19 June 2019	Corporate Parenting Board	6.30pm
24 June 2019	Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
25 June 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
25 June 2019	Pensions Committee	6.30pm
26 June 2019	Full Council	7.00pm
Jul-19		
01 July 2019	Standards Committee	6.30pm
02 July 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
03 July 2019	Planning Sub-Committee	6.30pm
04 July 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
08 July 2019	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
08 July 2019	Skills Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
09 July 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
10 July 2019	Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm

11 July 2019	LBH Integrated Commissioning Board	10.00am
11 July 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
11 July 2019	Health & Well Being Board	6.00pm
15 July 2019	Cabinet	6.00pm
15 July 2019	Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
16 July 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
18 July 2019	Scrutiny Panel	7.00pm
23 July 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
24 July 2019	Audit Committee	6.30pm
30 July 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
31 July 2019	Planning Sub-Committee	6.30pm
Aug-19		
07 August 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	7.00pm
14 August 2019	Licensing Sub-committee	7.00pm
21 August 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	7.00pm
29 August 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
Sep-19		
02 September 2019	Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
03 September 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
04 September 2019	Planning Sub-Committee	6.30pm
05 September 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
09 September 2019	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
09 September 2019	Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
10 September 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
10 September 2019	Pensions Committee	6.30pm
11 September 2019	Corporate Committee	6.30pm
12 September 2019	LBH Integrated Commissioning Board	10.00am
12 September 2019	Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
12 September 2019	Corporate Parenting Board	6.30pm
16 September 2019	Cabinet	6.00pm
16 September 2019	Skills Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
17 September 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
18 September 2019	Licensing Committee	7.00pm

18 September 2019	Inner North East London Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny	7.00pm
19 September 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
18 September 2019	Health & Well Being Board	6.00pm
24 September 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
26 September 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
Oct-19		
02 October 2019	Planning Sub-Committee	6.30pm
03 October 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
07 October 2019	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
07 October 2019	Scrutiny Panel	7.00pm
10 October 2019	LBH Integrated Commissioning Board	10.00am
10 October 2019	Audit Committee	6.30 pm
10 October 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
16 October 2019	Cabinet	6.00pm
16 October 2019	Skills Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
17 October 2019	Pensions Board	10.00am
23 October 2019	Planning Sub Committee pre-app	6.30pm
29 October 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
29 October 2019	Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
30 October 2019	Full Council	7.00pm
Nov-19		
04 November 2019	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
04 November 2019	Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
05 November 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
06 November 2019	Planning Sub-Committee	6.30pm
07 November 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
11 November 2019	Skills Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
12 November 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	7.00pm
13 November 2019	Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
14 November 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	7.00pm
18 November 2019	Cabinet	6.00pm
19 November 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
20 November 2019	Health & Well Being Board	6.00pm

25 November 2019	Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
26 November 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	7.00pm
27 November 2019	Planning Sub Committee pre-app	6.30pm
27 November 2019	Inner North East London Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny	7.00pm
28 November 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
Dec-19		
02 December 2019	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
02 December 2019	Corporate Parenting Board	6.30pm
03 December 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
04 December 2019	Planning Sub-committee	6.30pm
04 December 2019	Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
05 December 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
09 December 2019	Corporate Committee	6.30pm
10 December 2019	Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
11 December 2019	Licensing Committee	7.00pm
12 December 2019	LBH Integrated Commissioning Board	10.00am
16 December 2019	Cabinet	6.00pm
16 December 2019	Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
17 December 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
18 December 2019	Pensions Committee	6.30pm
19 December 2019	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
Jan-20		
06 January 2020	Skills Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
08 January 2020	Planning Sub Committee	6.30pm
09 January 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
13 January 2020	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
14 January 2020	Health & Well Being Board	6.00pm
15 January 2020	Audit Committee	6.30pm
16 January 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
20 January 2020	Cabinet	6.00pm
20 January 2020	Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
21 January 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
22 January 2020	Full Council	7.00pm

23 January 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
27 January 2020	Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
28 January 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
29 January 2020	Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
Feb-20		
03 February 2020	Scrutiny Panel	7.00pm
04 February 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
05 February 2020	Planning Sub-Committee	6.30pm
06 February 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
10 February 2020	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
11 February 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
12 February 2020	Health In Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
13 February 2020	LBH Integrated Commissioning Board	10.00am
13 February 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	7.00pm
13 February 2020	Standards Committee	6.30pm
17 February 2020	Cabinet	6.00pm
18 February 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
19 February 2020	Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
20 February 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
24 February 2020	Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
26 February 2020	Full Council	7.00pm
Mar-20		
02 March 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	7.00pm
03 March 2020	Pensions Board	10.00am
04 March 2020	Planning Sub-Committee	6.30pm
05 March 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
11 March 2019	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
12 March 2019	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
12 March 2020	Skills Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
16 March 2020	Corporate Committee	6.30pm
17 March 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
18 March 2020	Licensing Committee	7.00pm
19 March 2020	Pensions Committee	6.30pm

23 March 2020	Cabinet	6.00pm
23 March 2020	Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
24 March 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
25 March 2020	Health & Well Being Board	6.00pm
26 March 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
30 March 2020	Health in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
31 March 2020	Corporate Parenting Board	6.30pm
Apr-20		
01 April 2020	Planning Sub Committee	6.30pm
02 April 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
06 April 2020	Cabinet Procurement Committee	6.00pm
07 April 2020	Licensing Sub-Committee	2.00pm
14 April 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
20 April 2020	Cabinet	6.00pm
20 April 2020	Skills Economy and Growth Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
21 April 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
22 April 2020	Audit Committee	6.30pm
23 April 2020	Children & Young People Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
27 April 2020	Scrutiny Panel	7.00pm
29 April 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	7.00pm
30 April 2020	Living in Hackney Scrutiny Commission	7.00pm
May-20		
06 May 2020	Planning Sub-Committee	6.30pm
07 May 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00pm
14 May 2020	Licensing Sub Committee	2.00 pm
20 May 2020	Council and AGM	7.00pm